L. D. Tuckle

THE CAMBRIDGE WEEKLY CHRONICLE,
AND FARMER'S REGISTER.

"THE MAIN END OF EVERY GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE THE WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE, AND THE DIFFUSION OF SOCIAL HAPPINESS."

NEW SERIES—VOL. 2. *CAMBRIDGE, Md.—Saturday Morning, March 2, 1839.* NUMBER 21.

THE CAMBRIDGE WEEKLY CHRONICLE, AND FARMER'S REGISTER,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
E. RICHARDSON HOOPER.

TERMS:—The CAMBRIDGE WEEKLY CHRONICLE AND FARMER'S REGISTER is published every *Saturday Morning*, at TWO DOLLARS & FIFTY CENTS per annum payable half yearly, *in advance*. Subscriptions will not be taken for less than six months. No paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid, unless at the option of the publisher; and the failure to order a discontinuance previously to the expiration of the time already subscribed for, will be considered a new engagement.

Single papers can be had at this Office, for six and a quarter cents, each.

☞ *Advertisements not, exceeding Fourteen Lines* will be inserted three times for one dollar: and twenty five cents for every subsequent insertion. Larger ones in proportion.

In cases where the number of insertions is not limited, advertisements will be continued until direction to omit them is received, and charged accordingly.

☞ *All letters addressed to the Editor, must be post paid.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REMARKS OF Mr. STANLY,

On the motion for an inquiry into the late Defalcations of Public Officers.

THRSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1839.

Immediately after Mr. Duncan (of Ohio) concluded his remarks, Mr. Petrikin moved the Previous Question, but at Mr. Stanly's solicitation withdrew it, upon Mr. Stanly's promising to renew it before he sat down.

Mr. Stanly then rose and said he was not about to detain the House as long as the Representative from Ohio had done.

It is now 20 minutes past 4 o'clock, (said he.)—We have been consuming time by listening to remarks upon all sorts of subjects. We have had much upon extravagance and economy—a most extravagant oration upon matters and things in general, from the battles of Cæsar and Pompey down to the recent democratic disturbance in Pennsylvania. Yesterday the House adjourned for the gratification of the Representative who had just finished his oration against "Henry Clay," "corporations" "associated wealth," and what in his elegant lauguage he calls "whiggery." The House has listened to all this with commendable patience, to the abuse of the Whigs, and to the high praises upon the new Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Tappan,) Mr. Van Buren, and Mr. Woodbury. I claim the right for a few minutes to reply to part of the speech just delivered. In the remarks I shall make, I will not attempt to answer the arguments of this defender of the Administration upon all the matters he referred to; I should consume too much time, and could not avail myself of the same helps. He is so great a favorite at the Treasury Department, he can call on his "Dear Sir," Mr. Woodbury, and get all the information he wishes.—If a Whig should apply, as one did at the last session he would meet with a refusal.

Sir, he has had the utmost liberty, the most unlimited indulgence, yesterday and to-day. I cannnot in courtesy or justice, be denied the right to say a few words upon one subject to which he has alluded; I mean abolition. I shall not discuss this subject, but I wish to call attention to some part of the gentleman's language in reference to this, and to a celebrated letter written by him when he was a candidate a few months ago.

It will be recollected, Mr. Speaker, that when I called the gentleman to order for irrevalency when he was reading letters from his "dear" Amos and his "dear" Levi, showing how many Whigs and how many Democrats were in office in the Departments, the Chair decided, (Mr. Connor, of North Carolina, was occupying the chair at the time) that the gentleman was in order. I submitted most cheerfully to this; and I took the liberty of interrupting the gentleman, and asking him how many abolitionists there were among the Democrats in office. To which he replied, with a pompous elevation of tone, and with a confidence which evidently defied contradiction, that they (abolitionists) did not "belong to that family." They were all among the "Federal Whigs," as he calls them. Well, sir, I was glad to hear the assertion made on this floor, and I witnessed with a smile the self-satisfactory whimperings of slaveholding Democrats at this declaration from the Sampson of locofocoism.

But I have the evidence in my possession to drive away this pleasing delusion. This declaration but affords additional evidence of the attempt which the Administration party are making to impose upon the Southern People.

But, sir' as far as I can, I will awaken the attention of the people of my district and my State to the doings of their self-constituted democratic friends.

But to the letter, the letter.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a letter dated at Montgomery, Hamilton county, Ohio, signed "A Duncan," in which the writer gives his views of slavery. I wish to read some extracts to the House, and I respectfully solicit the attention of the slaveholding democrats—to the opinions of their trusty and well-beloved brother in democracy upon the subject of slavery. I want to show them what a democrat in Ohio, who is no abolitionist, thinks of their country and their constituents. Towards the latler part of the letter the writer says:

"There is no man living, perhaps, who is more deadly hostile to slavery than I am. My feelings my education, the circumstances which surround me through life, together with my principles of what I believe to constitute the natural and political rights of man—all conspire to make me abhor it as one of the greatest evils that exists on the earth."

[Mr. Duncan here rose and asked to explain.]

Ofcourse, Mr. Speaker, I will hear him explain, said Mr. S.

Mr. Duncan then said, that when he was asked the question, whether there were any abolition democrats, he meant to say they did not belong to the Democratic party, particularly in his district and State. The letter was in answer to interrogatories put to him before the election. I can read it, said he (Cries of No! no!) I will then briefly state the contents.

Here Mr. Stanly said: Mr. Speaker, I cannot consent to yield the floor to allow the gentleman to "state the contents." I will do that for him, sir. I only gave way for explanation. The short extract I have read, sir, ought not to make the gentleman uneasy. It is mild, compared with what follows. But listen attentively, ye exclusive guardians of the South ye only good democrats, to the declaration, that slavery is one of the greatest evils on the face of the earth, and that this democrat is "deadly hostile" to slavery. The gentleman's uneasiness, I presume, is on account of his Southern friends. They, in North Carolina, as I was told by one of them, denied the authenticity of this letter: yes, sir, they pronounced it a forgery! the people had been taught to believe that Mr. Van Buren had no abolition friends—no friends opposed to slavery. But here, sir, we have from the pen of the Sepresentative from O-hi-O, the outpourings of more abuse, more hellish slander, deliberately concocted, on slave owners, than it has ever been my lot to hear from any avowed abolitionist.

Yes, sir, the same abhorrer of slavery, so "deadly hostile", to it, is of all other democrats the chosen advocate of the Globe—the chosen champion of this Southern-loving Administration. Another extract. I want to give my constituents some information of the opinions of this personal and political friend of Mr. Van Buren- The letter says, in continuation:

"Yes, greater in its moral effects and corrupting tendencies than all other human evils put together. It is not only a moral and political evil within itself, or intrinsically so of the darkest and most damning character, but in all its bearings and effects calculated to produce the most fatal effects on both the moral and political institutions of our country."

[Here Mr. Duncan asked leave to explain again. Mr. Stanley yielded for explanation; and Mr. Duncan said he was "not an abolitionist; and any individual or any newspaper that floats on the breeze, that said he was an abolitionists, was a vile calumniator."]

[Here Mr. Thompson; of South Carolina, rose, and called on the speaker to enforce the rules, and see that a gentleman who was occupying the floor should not be thus frequently interrupted.]

Mr. Stanley continued. I have yielded the floor with pleasure to hear any explanations, but not to hear speeches of defence. I must insist upon my right to the floor, and will not again be interrupted for speeches of this character.

Sir, I am not acquainted with the kind of newspapers to which the gentleman refers. I have never seen any that floated on the breeze that charged him with being an abolitionist. Sir, it would better become the assumed galantry of the distinguished democrat from Hamilton county! O-hi-O, who carries a rifle for personal defence, to wait until he is charged with being an abolitionist, before he throws out such bold denunciation. I have not charged him, and I do not now charge him with being an abolitionist. I am willing to admit that he and his newly elected Senator (Mr. Tappan) whom he has be-praised "as sound a democrat, and as pure a patriot, as ever honored the names; and, withal, of the first order of talents, and of the most unexceptionable deportment!" are neither of them abolitionists. I am willing to admit that they are both as good friends of the South as any Van Buren caucus Democrats, who voted on the resolutions of the 12th of December last.

I will take this letter as proof of their affection for the South; or, if he pleases, I will take the reputed declaration of this "Democrat and patriot," (Mr. Tappan) about the time of the Southampton insurrection, as proof of his "sound democracy and pure patriotism."*

I am willing, I say, sir, to believe they are not abolitionists. I do not know what signification they attach to the words democrat and abolitionist. But, sir, I charge him with being the author of this letter, and he cannot deny that. I charge it in the presence and hearing of my democratic or Van Buren colleagues, and I wish them no longer to consider this a forgery.

But to the letter. The gentleman told us that he dealt in figures, and from this letter I can prove that he does deal as largely in figures, of imagination as any member on this floor. Hear a little more from this patent democrat, this herald of anti-abolition, of Tappan democracy.—Hear a little more of what he says about slavery.

"It is an evil that has, does now, and will in all time to come while it exists, involve in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery, murder, and death. For the truth of what I say, as to its present effects upon the institutions of our country, I have only to refer you to a view of the slave States in our Union, and a comparison between the relative condition of the improvements of them and the free States happy and flourishing, to the admiration and astonishment of all who see them. Public improvements and private prosperity are swift and head and head in the race, while, on the other hand, poverty, lean and hungry sterility, and squalid wretchedness, seem to cover the face of the land in many parts where slave institutions have a residence."

Would to God, sir, that those who entertain such opinions could go into my district, or into yours! How different would be their opinions could they visit the western part of our own North Carolina—one of the most beautiful and prosperous, though almost unknown, parts of the world; "that good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths, that spring out of valleys and hills;" a land whose hills thou mayst dig brass." Would to God, sir, that some reasonable creature, if any such there be who entertains such sentiments, could visit my district! Instead of "lean and hungry sterility and squalid wretchedness," which this democrat says "covers the face of the land," he would find a happy, independent, and intelligent People; he would pray Heaven to make the laboring classes in other parts of the world as free from want, as contented as our slaves. Instead of barren deserts, perplexed with thorn, he would see countless thousands of acres in a high state of successful cultivation He would see fields of beautiful green, in spots which, a few years since, were untrodden save by the wild beasts of the forest, who roamed in undisputed sway. He could find cultivated fields on the borders of lakes, in my district, yielding as abundant crops as the choicest land on the borders of the mighty Father of rivers, and vieing in beauty with the most enchanting scenery on the Island of Calypso. And all this, too, was brought about by slave labor. Yes, sir, there he would see, in our negroes, the happiest population on the earth—well fed, well clothed, and well treated. "Content, and careless of to-morrows fare," they perform their labor with cheerfulness—labor

"Made the pledge
Of cheerful days, and nights without a groan."

Instead of finding a country upon which the anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven seem to rest," as this democrat says is the case where "slave institutions have a residence;" instead of seeing men who are cruel "murderers, robbers and pirates," (as abolitionists sometimes call slaveholders,) he would find (in the language of the sacred volume I just now quoted) "a land of wheat and barley, and vines and figtrees, and pomegranites; a land in which we eat bread without scarceness," inhabited by men remarkable for hospitality, plain, unassuming habits, and indomitable attachment to republican institutions.

But, sir, remember, I beseech you, this slander comes from a democrat, who is no abolitionist! Yes, sir from one of the friends of those who go into a midnight caucus and prepare Janus faced resolutions for the protection of the South; this comes from a Van Buren protector of the South—a whole hog Van Buren democrat. A little more of this democratic letter.

[Here Mr. GALLUP, of New York, rose to a point of order, but the Speaker decided that Mr. STANLY was not out of order.]

Mr. STANLY continued. M. Speaker, I regret that I am inflicting pain upon any member of the party, but the gentleman from New York must bear it. Sir, he cannot save his friend from Ohio from having this shameful letter published to the world. I am rejoiced, sir, that the rules of order this time are construed as liberally for me as for the representative from Hamilton county, Ohio—rules, sir, which, like the inscriptions on the sabres of Vathek, hold another language to-day from that they yesterday held, and, like those sabres, can only be deciphered by one man—the usual occupant of that chair.

Another extract, sir, from this letter:

"Cross the line that separates the free from the slave State, or stand upon it and look across the former; you will see comparatively all life, all happiness, prosperity, both public and private; but turn your eyes upon the latter and survey it: every thing material, (except a few of the wealthy proprietors,) bears the impress of poverty and dilapidation; all look as if pestilence and famine had been making their sad innovation."

Now, sir, all this is from one of your patent democrats, one of Levi Woodbury's "dear sirs," one of the select friends of Martin Van Buren, and one of the friends of the South! and no abolitionist! Sir, let me ask the gentleman how he can be other than an abolitionist with these sentiments? If he believes that "slavery is an evil that has, does now and will in all time to come, while it exists, involve in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery murder, and death!" I ask him how, with a clear conscience, and as an honest man, who feels for what he calls "violated humanity," he can be other than an abolitionist? It, he" abhors it as one of the greatest evils that exists on the face of the earth," if he thinks that the "anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven seem to rest" upon the slave States, if he believes that slavery has such "corrupting and corroding effects," if, sir, I ask, he is sincere in saying, "but the curse be on the head of those who sustain such an institution," how can he be other than an abolitionist? Is it because, as he says in the latter part of his letter, "the effects would be more fatal to the unhappy and unfortunate African than even slavery itself?" Or can it be that he wishes the "anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven, and the frowns and disapprobation of avenging justice," still to rest upon the Southern country? Now, sir, this democrat is in daily social intercourse with the Southern men who support Mr. Van Buren, and it is all right and proper; he goes no doubt, into caucus with them, strongly advocates the sub-Treasury, and they are, or would be, the exclusive friends of the South; while I sir, am accused of acting with abolitionists if I vote with any of them on a motion to adjourn.

The representative from Hamilton county, Ohio, said there were no abolitionists in the democratic family. Has he ever seen the letter of the democratic sub-Treasury candidate for Governor in Massachnsetts, in which he says, "I deem slavery to be the greatest curse and the most portentous evil which a righteous God ever inflicted upon a nation?' and, like this good democrat, he is opposed to the admssion of any new State whose Constitution tolerates slavery; for he says:

'In relation to the admission of new States with the power to hold slaves, I need no more than to refer you to my recorded votes against the admission of Missouri with this power. That opposition, which required some firmnes to preserve in, would doubtless have proved successful but for the extraordinary influence and extraordinary efforts of one man, (Henry Clay,) who was supposed by some to have resorted to extraordinary means to accomplish his purpose."

It is amusing to see how well these abolitionists agree with the gentleman from Ohio in abusing all slaveholders, and the distinguished statesman (H. Clay,) to whose extraordinary efforts, we are told, we are indebted for the admission of Missouri. The Southern People, sir, will heed these things; they shall know how the abolition democrats, and the anti abolition abhorrers of slave holders, such as this democrat from Hamilton county, Ohio, abuse this great man. Sir, I have no compliments to bestow, no eulogium to pronounce upon his (H. Clay's) character. He needs none. The whole country appreciates his merits. I am not skilled "to paint the lily." I shall not attempt "to add another hue unto the rainbow." I will not enter into competition with the Representatives from Ohio, either in plastering the characters of those I admire with fulsome eulogy, or in vilifying those with whom I differ in opinion. Sir, he is a well-selected instrument to bespatter with praise Mr. Van Buren; his newly elected Senator, the pure patriot and good democrat, (Mr. Tappan) Mr. Kendall, and his dear sir at the head of the Treasury Department, and vilify the favorites of the South.

If I had time I could give him many instances of democratic abolitionists. Only one more now, sir: You know, sir—for there are many things you know, Mr. Speaker—that there was an election recently held in Massachusetts, in which a brother of Mr. Woodbury received the votes of the abolitionists; they refusing to vote for either of the other candidates. Now, sir, the Globe, (which never departs from the truth, you know, sir) in the paper of Thursday night, December 27th, 1838, has the following article:

"ANOTHER ABOLITION MISREPRESENTATION.—In mentioning the result of the late election for Congress in Mr. Parmenter's district, where the choice was prevented by abolition votes, several of the Federal papers, and among them that model of candor, the Intelligencer, have remarked that a great part of the abolition votes were thrown for James T. Woodbury, a brother of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"We regard this transaction, upon the facts which have been communicated to us, as one of the most palpable illustrations of the intrigues and management between whiggery and abolitionism that we have heard of. While they unite in opposing the Administrrtion on account of the inflinching support it accords to the rights of property guarantied by the Constitution of the United States, they have sought out the name of a person who is the brother to a member of the Administration, well known throughout his whole political life to be totally opposed to their disorganizing schemes, and this brother, a clergyman, settled in a obscure parish and have cast enough of their votes for him undoubtedly against his consent, for the double purpose of defeating an election, and, at the same time, affording some possible ground for suspicion and prejudice against the sincerity of the Administration!—This scheme, in refinement, even exceeds the joint management of the abolition whigs in New York, and may afford a beneficial lesson to the Public."

It is not often, sir, I see that paper, and the article might have passed without notice, but that I soon after saw the letter of Mr. Woodbury, the brother of the 'My dear sir' of the Representative from Hamilton county, Ohio. I want this editorial article and this letter to appear together in my speech.

"ACTON, Dec. 15, 1838.

"BROTHER PHELPS: The resolutions of *our* late anti-slavery meeting at Concord, as they ultimately passed, pleased me, particularly those about questioning candidates. I could not well stay to meet you in committee on the same, as I desired and designed.—On reflection, I see the propriety and the necessity of holding the candidate to his first answer. If that answer be doubtful or defective, I think it must be designedly so; for the interrogatories are few, and unambiguous, and simple.

"I believe '*We the People*' of the North are beginning to find out what *we* have to do with slavery, and, what is far bettter, are beginning faithfully and consistently to do it. I belive that this carrying our abolition to the ballot-box may, with great propriety, be made a test question. What is the amount of all our talk, if we refuse efficiently to act for the slave? The Richmond Enquirer man just begins to tremble about abolition. What! go to the polls and vote for a man as Representative to the United States Congress who will not declare himself in favor of immediately abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia and the United States Territories, and the internal, or if you please, INFERNAL slave-trade? I could, with my present views, no more do it than I could be a slaveholder or a slavedealer in the District of Columbia, or own one of those slave ships that ply between Alexandria and New Orleans; for the one, *in effect*, enacts the laws under which the other carries on the bloody business. And any man, on slight reflection, must see this. I am confident that all true abolitionists will very soon come up to the mark on this point, and let all the world see our consistency.

"Yours in labor and sacrifice for the slave.

"JAMES T. WOODBURY."

I hope this will satisfy the gentleman that a democrat, a friend of this Administration, may be an abolitionist.

But let us return to the letter.

Every thing the writer said in the last extract (*except a few of the wealthy proprietors*) "looks as if pestilence and famine had been making their sad innovation." It is remarkable how fond all these followers of Mr. Van Buren are of railing against wealth. In this sentence we have a little of it. The gentleman's speech repeatedly referred to the "anti-republican tendencies of associated wealth." He railed against the "moneyed associations" of our country. The letter continues, sir—(and I hope you will remember that this coarse, horrible abuse is applied to North Carolina as one of the slave-holding States)—

"The anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven seem to rest upon every thing upon which you can cast your eyes.—Every prospect seems to be withered and wilted by the frown and disapprobation of avenging justice and violated humanity. In short, almost every institution, every prosperity, public and private, seems to be sickening and dying from the corrupting and corroding effects of slavery. But the curse be on the head of those who sustain such an institution."

Now, sir, I ask you if you have ever heard or read from any avowed abolitionists more horrible, shameful, miserable, malicious slander upon slaveholders & the slaveholding country that I have here read in this letter from this defender of the Administration? Did the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. ADAMS) in all his intemperate, unjustifiable remarks about slavery, ever assert any thing half as abusive? Has the gentleman from Vermont, (Mr. SLADE,) who is regarded as the great leader of the abolitionists in this House, has he ever used expressions so unworthy a man of feeling, so unbecoming a Representative on this floor? No, sir; no, sir; neither one of them, or any other abolitionist, has ever done the South greater injustice, has ever given expression to such detestable opinions. No ebolitionist ever uttered sentiments of more venomous malignity. And yet, sir, this man who says slavery "involves in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery, murder, and death!"—who says "but the *curse* be on the head of those who sustain such an institution"—this individual is—Who, sir? Who is he, Mr. Speaker? Why, sir, he is the representative from Hamilton county, O-hi-O. A loco-foco democrat—the very personification of loco-foco democracy—the "dear sir" of Amos Kendall and Levi Woodbury—the beloved defender of the measures of Martin Van Buren! And has he, sir, lost any of the love or confidence of the President or friends since he wrote this letter? No, sir, far from it. At the last session he published a speech, "by authority," which was never spoken; and now, sir, we find him addressing letters to the heads of the Departments, asking information for the purpose of enabling him to make some reply in favor of "the Administration and the Democratic party!" He tells us in his speech to day that he had "information furnished him," and he has shown us, by the letter he read, from whom the information came. Mr. Van Buren is a great friend of the South, but he loves those who abhor slavery, and the abhorrers love him. Does not this strengthen the already strong evidence before the world, that the President is but

"A hovering temporizer that
Can'st with thine eyes at once see good and evil,
Inclining to them both?"

Sir, the gentleman who deals so largely in *figures*, (and I again give him the credit of dealing in figures, and I believe he can take as many *strong pints* in a case as any democrat on this floor)—the gentleman surely never has been in a country where slavery was tolerated. Are there any evidences of the "anger of God, and the vengeance of Heaven" to be seen here, except what loco-foco democracy has inflicted upon us? Did he see the evidences of the "blighting effects" of slavery in Kentucky? The Kentucky line is not far from his home. Where are you, Representatives from old Kentuck? Ye who come from that State which has been proudly called "the land of the brave and the home of the free?" Is this a correct account of your homes? Does your fair land "bear the impress of poverty and dilapidations," and does it look "as if pestilence and famine had been making their sad innovations?" [Here several voices were heard, "No, no! false, false!" &c. &c.] Where is the Representative from the district in Kentucky; near Hamilton county, Ohio? Does "lean, hungry sterility, squalid wretchedness, seem to cover" the face of your district? Is every prospect there withered and wilted by the frown and disapprobation of avenging justice and violated humanity?—Are all your institutions sickening and dying from the corrupting and corroding effects of slavery?

[Here Mr. SOUTHGATE, of Kentucky, said: It is a foul libel, a base slander, upon my constituents and upon my State.]

Mr. STANLY. Mr. Speaker, my blood runs cold when I read such expressions as these, and think of my home and my constituents. I sicken at reading such disgraceful slander upon men of all parties, upon Christians of all denominations, who are slaveholders. Nothing, sir, but the rules of the House restrain me from expressing, in language which my feelings would dictate, my abhorrence, detestation, and contempt of the author of such sentiments—of this "dear sir" of the party, of this Caliban pet of the Globe, who writes thus of slaveholders, and then votes with the South upon all the caucus resolutions except that which lays petitions on the table!

Would it be unkind, Mr. Speaker, to ask if the gentleman from Ohio attended the caucus? Would it be respectful, sir, to hint that these resolutions were so deliberately prepared, so carefully worded, as to allow the anti-abolition abhorrers of slavery to vote upon them, and yet be consistent? Could it have been, sir, that these resolutions were reconsidered & amended to please such democratic friends of the South as these anti-abolitionists? Veriy, sir, I suspect as much.

Towards the conclusion of the letter the writer says, "he has not been able to concur in abolitionism;" he "fears the effects would be more fatal to the unhappy and unfortunate African than even slavery itself!" How kind, how full of philanthopy, how full of feeling for the "*unhappy and unfortunate African!*" but for the whites not a word of pity!

Although not an abolitionist, how kindly he speaks of them:

"It would be arrogance in me, and show a great want of generosity and liberality, to hesitate for a moment to believe that, in the greater number of cases, the spirit of abolitionism flows from any other than this purest fountains of charity and humanity!"

Mr. Speaker, I have in my comments come to near the end of the letter. I hope I have not wearied the House, though, impelled by my feeling, and excited by frequent interruptions, I may have occupied more time than I am aware of. Before I turn away from this subject, let me read from the beginning of the letter the answers to the first and second queries:

"Question 1st. Do you believe that Congress should maintain, unabridged, the right of the People to petition for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia?"

[Here Mr. DUNCAN, who was standing in front of Mr. STANLY, answered "I do."]

There, sir, he comes out like a man, and answers that question here on this floor.

Well, sir, after speaking in favor of the right of petition, he says:

"So long as I have a seat in Congress, I will receive and present abolition and all other kinds of petitions, proper to be presented. I will also move their reference to the appropriate committees, and do whatever else may be proper to be done, to bring the subject matter before the body in which I may have a seat, for its regular action. This far I would consider it my unavoidable duty; but as I am not interrogated as to the balance of my duty, it is not expected that I should answer."

A little of non-committal in this avoiding to answer when not interrogated. But then comes the second question; and I want my democratic colleagues to hear this answer, and I call attention to the coincidence of opinion between the gentleman from Ohio and abolitionists on this point.

"Question 2d. Are you opposed to the admission of any new State into the Federal Union whose Constitution tolerates slavery?"

[Mr. STANLEY read this question, and Mr. DUNCAN was standing near him, and answered "I am."]

There, sir, said Mr. STANLY, the gentleman has answered the question himself, here on this floor; there is no Van Burenism in that answer; this is the first symptom of what he calls whigery that I have seen in him, though I do not believe he has a whig spot even on the heel, he gives a plain, direct answer, "I am."

Mr. Speaker, here we have from a democrat, a supporter, friend, and champion of this Administration, the confession that he is opposed to the admission of Florida into this Union. Here, sir, we have the authorship of this letter admitted, and the queries responded to in our presence. Let none of my colleagues hereafter say this letter is a forgery; let them see, now, in his true character, their democratic friend of Southern institutions, who voted so well will them on the resolutions of the 12th December!

Mr. Speaker, if any one of my colleagues should feel alarmed, either individually or for his constituents on account of abolition; if he thinks he cannot act with the Whigs, because some of them are abolitionists, let me ask him if he will join that party in which this letter-writer is a great warrior? If, sir, he flies from the cold, icy embrace of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SLADE,) let me beseech him to avoid the arms of the democratic representative from Hamilton county, Ohio! Sir, I could not predict the consequences of such an embrace. He would be most horribly "absorbed." For my own part, I had rather

——"Lie in cold obstruction and to rot:
This sensible warm motion to become
A kneaded clod; and the delighted spirit
To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
In thrilling regions of thicked ribb'd ice;
To be imprisoned in the viewless winds,
And blown with restless violence round about
The pendent world:"

Yes, sir, all this, rather than be the victim of such absorption!

It may be a matter of taste, and it may be bad taste, but I had rather pass a night in Falstaff's buck basket, rammed in with socks, foul stockings, and greasy napkins, "afflicted by the rankest compound of villanous smell that ever offeneed nostril," than to undergo such a loco-foco embrace!

Mr. Speaker, I have finished with the letter; I quit, I turn away from its disgusting details, with pleasure.

[Here Mr. DUNCAN said, Read the whole of the letter.]

Mr. STANLY said there is too much of it, I can't stand it.

[Let me read it, said Mr. DUNCAN.]

Mr. S. Mr. Speaker, I wish he had an opportunity of reading the letter to the House; I should like to see the Southern democrats listening to him! If it is in order, I would make a motion that he be allowed to go to the Speaker's chair, and read, expound, and explain—I should like to see the exhibition! Sir I have not the physical strength to read and comment on the whole of that letter at this time; I have not strength of lungs sufficient to answer all the remarks of that good democrat. Sir, a great part of his speech was about matter I did not understand; he had much about "yelping and howl, howl, howling." If I should enter into competition with him in bellowing

---

* Mr. Tappan said, if a man was such a fool as to keep a fellow being in bondage, the slave has an unbounded right to cut the throat of his d—d master.—And if his son should go into Virginia, to assist the whites in such a contest he would disinherit him!