msa_sc3415_scm3600-0017 ©Maryland State Archives

SPEECH OF HON. T. . BOWIE,

OF MARYLA"

IN THE HOUS OF REPRESENTATIVES,

January 13, 57.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and being under consideration the tariff bill—

Mr. BOWIE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not propose to consider the tariff question at this time. I propose to reserve what I have to say on that subject to some more convenient season. I have not directed my mind to the consideration of that question at this time, because I had no idea that it would be sprung in the House this morning; but, with the consent of the House and of the Chair, I shall proceed to give my views upon some of the topics embraced in the President's message, to which the attention of the House has been called by the various members who have addressed the committee. With reference to the tariff tion, therefore, I shall only say, "Go thy way for this time, and when I have a more convenient season, I will call for thee." [Laughter.] I shall proceed with my remarks, availing myself of the latitude of debate allowed under the rules of this House. I propose to address myself in reply to some of the remarks of my colleague, [Mr. DAVIS,] who has found so much fault with the President's message. I shall not, in the remarks which I propose to submit, dwell much upon that portion of the President's message which relates to the organization of the Black Republican party. That subject has been so ably handled, so thoroughly sifted, and the arguments on it so thoroughly exhausted, that I shall give them a passing notice—merely to give it a blow as I pass. It is true that we are told that we should not strike down a fallen foe; but when that foe struggles in death, and in his struggles gives warning of a future attack, it is the part of wisdom—it is the part of prudence, to put him beyond the reach of harm forever.

Now, sir, the President, in the exercise of a clear constitutional duty—of an obligation imposed on him by the Constitution to give information from time to time to the Congress of the United States, of the state of the Union, not only in reference to its foreign, but domestic relations, has announced what, in his judgment, is a conspiracy to overturn the Constitution. He has conceived, in his judgment, that there is a design upon the part of the Black Republican party—I strike out the word "Black" for the sake of courtesy, [laughter]—to strike down the fundamental principles of our Government. He conceives that the organization of a party, based upon the principles announced by Mr. Speaker Banks, in his great commercial speech in New York, that mere numbers should prevail, attempting to array all that portion of our great country who are not slaveholders against those who are slaveholders, as in violation of the spirit of the Constitution; and this being his judgment, in which the great Democratic party concurs, I thank him for the bold, fearless, and patriotic manner in which he has presented to the mind of the American people the momentous issues involved in the consideration of such a question.

The attempts to bring into conflict the commercial interests of the North and South, and to generate in the minds of the people of these sections feelings of bitter and unrelenting hatred towards each other, could only result in the destruction of our Government. Conceiving this to be the design of that party, it was undoubtedly the duty of the President, under his oath of office, to inform promptly the people of all the States of the dangers which gathered around the Union of these States. Under the Constitution it is his duty to inform the Houses of Congress, and the people, of threatened dangers, either from domestic or foreign enemies. Then, how could he conscientiously have withheld his note of alarm in this matter? If he had done so, he would have been derelict to every constitutional obligation. This no one will doubt; for is there one here who does not believe that if this sectional organization had succeeded, there would have been great danger of disunion? I appeal to Fillmore men, and to the Democratic party, now composed of conservative Whigs and conservative Democrats, of the present and of times gone by—I appeal to the great masses of the people for the truth of this assertion. Even if disunion had not been the immediate result, there would have been anarchy and civil discord. There would have been those bitter contentions between the North and the South that would have resulted, ultimately, in civil war. It was time for the President to warn the people and their representatives; and he has done so calmly, considerately, and dispassionately. A domestic foe is more insidious and deadly than a foreign one. It is stealthy in its approach to the citadel of our rights. And what would be the character of the civil war against which the President has warned us? He has said truly that its history would be written in records of desolated fields, conflagrations of houses, murder, rapine, and all the horrible and dreadful attendants on internecine war. When once begun, we know not when and where it would terminate. Ruin and devastation would follow it everywhere. The President would have been a traitor to the trust confided to him, and to the country which gave him birth, if, believing that the aims of this sectional party, if carried out, would have led to the dissolution of the Union, he had not proclaimed the fact in his annual message. I thank him for his message in the name of the constituency I represent, and in my own name. I thank him in the name of constitutional law, and in the name of liberty and equal rights. Now, while the bugle note is sounding for another conflict four years to come, like that we have just passed through, I deem it only fair to say that I will, as I hope every lover of the Union will, be found standing side by side with the President and his party. Of course we cannot expect that the Republicans will take kindly this exposure of their designs. "The galled jade" winces. They can have no more love for the present Chief Magistrate than the followers of Aaron Burr had for Jefferson, or those engaged in the whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania had for Washington. They may heap abuse on the President—they may accuse him of having libeled them—they may allege that he is a partisan President, and may continue to pour upon him the vials of their wrath; but, sir, if I mistake not, the American party of the South (with the exception of my colleague) and the Democratic party—all conservative men everywhere—will give against them the same verdict that the President has. If what the President says does not apply to them, why do they take it to themselves? If they do not belong to the Garrison, the Wendell Phillips school, who would burn the Bible and the Constitution—if they do not belong to that school of politicians who are in favor of abolishing slavery in the States, and who claim the power to do so, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BINGHAM] this morning announced unequivocally, under those principles of the Constitution which secure the right of trial by jury, the *habeas corpus* act, and the great, eternal principles of liberty which are to be found in every line of that sacred instrument—if they do not belong to the school to which the honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BINGHAM] and the senior member from Ohio [Mr. GIDDINGS] do, why trouble themselves with all this abuse of the President's message? I hope that message will be scattered all over the world, as a warning everywhere against men who would strike down, or attempt to strike down and destroy the eternal principles of constitutional liberty which are found in that instrument.

Sir, the message is not "unprecedented." My colleague [Mr. DAVIS] is not singular in the use of that term. There has not a Black Republican spoken upon this floor who has not denounced the message as "unprecedented" and false to the history of the country. It was commenced upon that side of the House, and has been followed up by my colleague. He, at least, seems to agree with them in this respect. How, sir, is it unprecedented? Why, sir, from the earliest history of this Government—from the days of Washington down to the days of General Jackson, you will find precedents of this kind in presidential messages.

General Washington made the insurrections in Pennsylvania in reference to the tax upon whisky, the subject of a special message to Congress; and he not only did that, but asked for a force to suppress it, and Congress gave it to him. That message was more vituperative and abusive of the enemies of constitutional liberty than this. Jefferson denounced the alien and sedition laws of 1798, in round terms. He denounced the conspiracy of Aaron Burr and all his coadjutors. Madison denounced the conduct of Governor Strong, of Massachusetts, during the last war, for refusing to bring out his troops to fight a foreign enemy.

And, sir, [illegible] there has been danger from combination of men to suppress or to obstruct the process of law, it has been the practice of every President to communicate such facts to Congress. We have had an instance during this very Congress, in President Pierce's Kansas message. There were obstructions to the laws in Kansas. I care not whether it came from what Black Republicans call the border ruffians of the Missouri, or the emigrant aid society. There was a state of revolution there, and the President communicated the facts to Congress, and asked for power to suppress the troubles. It was all well enough then with the Black Republicans. It was music in their ears when the so-called "border ruffians of Missouri" were referred to; but when an attack was made upon the "emigrant aid society," it was all discord and distraction.

I say it is the duty of the President, upon all emergencies of this sort, to communicate the facts to Congress, and let the people decide for themselves. Then my colleague is mistaken when he says this is an extraordinary and unprecedented message. I have pointed out the precedents, and whether there were precedents or not, there is a constitutional obligation upon the President to communicate such facts to the Congress of the United States.

In everything which has been said by my friend from Georgia, [Mr. STEPHENS,] my friend from North Carolina, [Mr. BRANCH,] and every gentleman who has spoken upon this side of the House relating to the power of Congress to exclude slavery from the Territories, I fully and thoroughly concur, and I take opposite grounds from what my colleague has taken. I denounce that claim of power, as the President has denounced it, as a gross and palpable usurpation of power. It will not do for gentlemen to refer us, as they have done over and over again, to that clause in the Constitution which gives Congress power to "make (as they say) all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States," and to claim to derive the power under that clause. They, in the first place, *misquote the text*, and then afterwards set aside the clear and deliberate judgment of the highest court of this country.

This is nothing new to my colleague. Though he may differ with the whole South American party upon that point yet he has been true to himself. From the time I first knew him he has been an anti-slavery, Wilmot proviso, Missouri restriction man. But I propose now, in passing along upon this branch, to examine the reasons which my colleague has advanced heretofore upon this floor to establish the constitutionality of the Missouri restriction and the Wilmot proviso. They are both based upon the same idea—the idea that there is power in Congress to limit or restrain slavery in the Territories. I will do my colleague the justice to say that he has never gone to the extent of claiming the right to abolish it in the States.

And here, Mr. Chairman, you will perceive that the nature of the power is the same in both cases. If Congress have no power to abolish slavery in the States, because of the want of constitutional grant, there is the same want of power in regard to the Territories. And you have at last to fall back on some general proposition—some general derivative power. My colleague says "that there is no provision of the Constitution which prohibits Congress from legislating on the subject of slavery in the Territories; and he defies any one to show him the provision which forbids it." Where, sir, does my colleague get his notions of constitutional law? Does he regard the Congress of the United States as the representatives of a great Federal Government, unrestrained in its power, except by the limitations to be found in the Constitution? You must look to the Constitution for limitations of powers in the States, because the States themselves were, at the time of its formation, sovereign nationalities. But, do you look to the Constitution to find out what are the restraining powers so far as the General Government is concerned. No, sir, you look to see where the grant of power is. If there be an absolute grant of power, then the Federal Government has the power—otherwise it has not. Now, sir, let me refer to the views of my colleague on that point.

In 1849, my colleague wrote certain letters under the signature of Hampden—letters of which he has acknowledged himself to be the author—advocating the power of Congress to adopt the Wilmot proviso, as well as the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise of 1820. I will read an extract from one of these letters, to show what was the doctrine of my colleague at that time:

"Now, I have never yet from any source, in any discussion, by any effort, been able to get any one opponent of this power to Congress (to pass the Wilmot proviso,) to put his finger on any clause of the Constitution which expressly, or by implication, forbids Congress to exclude slavery from a Territory."

Sir, is it possible that I have now to meet with a man so ignorant of constitutional law as to claim a power in Congress to do anything and everything which is not expressly prohibited by the Constitution? Why, sir, even in the days of blue-light Federalism, I have not been able to find the political writer who claimed that this Federal Government was so far a unit as to possess all power not expressly denied to it by the limitations of the Constitution. I thought that we had been, before the adoption of the Constitution, separate, distinct, and independent sovereignties, and that we came into the Federal Union only for specific purposes.

I do not care to go, at this time, into an elaborate examination of this great question of the relative powers of the Federal and State Governments. The subject has been already exhausted by those who have preceded me. But I must say that it is the first time I have ever heard, from any man professing to be a constitutional lawyer, that Congress has all the powers of Government, unless there are restrictions expressly to be found in its limitations. The reverse of this has always been considered as the true exposition of the Federal compact. There must be an absolute and unequivocal grant of power in the Constitution itself; and if there be no such grant, then the power itself does not exist. The Constitution, it is true, contains limitations on the powers of the States, and, in some instances, limitations on the powers of Congress; but in these latter instances they are always made to prevent a conclusion from a foregoing expressly granted power, and are designed to prevent an enlargement of the power granted by constructive implications.

Now, sir, when there is an express grant in the Constitution, the powers for carrying out that grant are as clearly given as is the grant itself. An implied power to carry out a grant is just as much a granted power as the original grant itself. It is one of those things which, being necessary and appurtenant to the grant, must go along with the grant itself.

I feel no surprise at the course of my colleague, when he maintains the doctrine that Congress has the power to pass the Wilmot proviso, or the Missouri restriction bill. It is no new doctrine with him; he has maintained it all his life, ever since I have known him, and I am willing to give him credit for his consistency, in this respect at least. But, sir, I have a right to quarrel with his logic, no matter how much I may respect the man; and when I choose to find fault with his logic, I must claim the right to express my surprise that he has not shaped his reasoning to meet the crisis which surrounded the constituency of us both. He has gone out of the way to find conclusions against them, when, by following the well-beaten path of logical deductions, he might have found ample supplies to have reinforced those of them who have been all the time struggling to maintain their equality with the other great States of this Confederacy.

But my colleague, by way of laying great stress on his interpretation of the Constitution in this respect, says, in that same Hamden letter: "On the contrary the Constitution gives to Congress expressly the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States." Ay, sir, is this so? I ask my colleague to turn to that clause in the Constitution and read it over again. It says: "The Congress shall have power to *dispose of* and make all needful rules," &c. Why did my colleague leave out those words "dispose of?" Why did he, when he was making an argument as a constitutional lawyer, leave out these words, significant and full of meaning as they are?—Who ever heard of the words "dispose of" being used to denote the establishment of a territorial government? Who ever supposed they were intended to relate to political powers or political rights in any sense whatever? Dispose of a government! Why, sir, the idea is absurd, ridiculous, incomprehensible. I ask my colleague, then, why did he leave out these words when he wrote and published his Hamden letters? They are the key to the text, and unvail every mystery that hangs around its construction.

But, sir, it is useless to argue this question further. Of what avail is it for gentlemen to argue against the decision of the highest judicial tribunal in the country? That question has been distinctly settled by the Supreme Court of the United States. That court has said, in the case of the United States *vs.* Gratiot and others, (13th Curtis, p. 647,) that the term "territory," as used in this clause of the Constitution, is simply descriptive of one kind of property, and is equivalent to the word "*lands*." The term "territory" used here is merely descriptive of the character of the property designated. And when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BINGHAM] goes into an elaborate argument, as he has done this morning, upon the terms "rules and regulations," as used in the Constitution, I turn him over to the decision of the Supreme Court just referred to. But, sir, I care but little for the opinions of Black Republicans. I care but little about the opinions of Know-Nothings. I care still less for the opinions of men who are following in the footsteps of Hartford Convention disunionists.

Lord Coke says, "There are precedents to be followed, and also precedents to be avoided;" and I choose to avoid, not only the precedents, but the opinions which such men may bring me. The man who, in this enlightened age of American republicanism, would plant himself upon such treasonable doctrines as these, deserves no toleration at the hands of the American people.

Sir, my colleague says that he is supported in his views of the constitutionality of the Missouri restriction by the opinions and the judgment of the immortal William Pinkney; that Mr. Pinkney voted for the eighth section of the Missouri compromise act, which contains the slavery restriction; and from this fact my colleague infers that Mr. Pinkney advocated the constitutional right of Congress to exclude slavery from the Territories. But, sir, does not my colleague know that the whole scope and purpose of Mr. Pinkney's great speech on that occasion was to show that Congress had no constitutional power to impose such a restriction upon the people of the Territory of Missouri, then asking for admission into the Union as a State?

The great argument used by him and mostly relied on by him in that speech was, that if Missouri came into the Union as a State at all, she had a right to come in as an equal with each of the other States, and that Congress had consequently no right to impose terms and conditions which would deprive her of that equality. The argument was, that to impose such restrictions would be like maiming a State in the very act of its birth, making it cripple, blind, and halt, instead of giving it life, with all the full powers and harmonious proportions of full-grown sovereignty. It is true that Mr. Pinkney voted for the eighth section, which was introduced as an amendment, and expressly intended to exclude all the territory embraced within the limits of Missouri, and to apply only to territory, then a wild and uninhabited region, where no white man's foot had ever made its print, and no trace of civilization had ever existed. To get Missouri in as a State of the Union, without the slavery restriction, was, in his opinion, more than an equivalent for an imaginary line extending exclusively over an uninhabited desert, which could in no sense impair the constitutional right of self-government which the teachings of our revolutionary struggles had implanted so deeply in the bosom of the American people. There were no people in existence there to be affected by that line. There were mountains, to be sure, and valleys not a few—hill and dale, plain and desert sands, rivers and streamlets, rocks and shells and mineral gems—the music of birds and the sweet fragrance of flowers; but these, altogether, howsoever enchanting to the eye, could not speak a government into being. This alone was reserved for the civilization of man, and could be molded in times to come to suit the wants of an inexorable will.

Mr. Pinkney, therefore, in voting for that eighth section, acted wisely in holding on to the substance, instead of grasping at the shadow.—He knew that the same immutable principles which he had laid down in reference to the people of the Territory of Missouri, in their then territorial condition, would apply with equal force to the people of this vast wilderness, whenever, in the progress of civilization, and emigration, they might choose to form a government for themselves. He left to the wisdom of time what could not have been done in the madness of the hour. How, then, does my colleague derive any support from the opinions of Mr. Pinkney? I commend that great speech to my colleague again, for a second and more considerate perusal!

But, Mr. Chairman, I pass away from this portion of my colleague's speech. My colleague says that the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act and the repeal of the Missouri restriction, have brought upon the country its present unhappy condition. I have no doubt my colleague thinks so. But, sir, there is an old adage which I believe to be a very true one: "The wish is father to the thought." The prophet who wishes evil will be sure to prophesy evil; and my colleague has not been slow in gloomy prognostications of this description. In his celebrated "Kingsphilip" speech, delivered in this House, at its last session, beginning thus: "*Is King Philip dead? No; but he is sick, by Jove.*" my colleague likened the Democratic party to a sick man, and prophesied, then and there, its speedy dissolution. But, sir, my colleague's prophecy was but "*leather and prunella.*" It wanted the inspiration of a true prophet, and was itself but "the sickly growth of a poisonous weed." King Philip is not only *not dead, but not even sick.* The Democratic party was never in better health, and is now *most marvelously convalescent.* I commend this to my colleague's more charitable reflections.

But the Kansas-Nebraska act, and the repeal of the Missouri restriction, have been condemned by the people. Mr. Buchanan has been elected by a minority vote, and will be a minority President. Franklin Pierce aspires to the imperial robes of Napoleon, and the indignant verdict of the people has been sent up from all parts of the country against the wicked policy of his administration. Such is the lugubrious spiritedness of my colleague's speech. Mr. Chairman, I had given my colleague credit for more of prudence than is exhibited in these *philippical jeremiades.* I had not supposed he would have risked this good name and fame" on propositions "leading to such lame and impotent conclusions." If the doctrines of non-interference by Congress in excluding slavery from the Territories, and of the repeal of the Missouri-restriction act of 1820—which are the only leading features of the Kansas-Nebraska act—have not been ratified by the people in the election of Mr. Buchanan—if the doctrines of State equality, and of the equality of each and all the citizens of the country, without respect to their religious faith, place of birth, or residence, have not been sanctioned by the verdict of the people, will my colleague tell me what then has been settled by their verdict? Has the Presidential election been a mere mockery? Have the people, for more than eighteen months, been engaged in the most violent, and in many respects the bloodiest, political struggle that ever convulsed the country, with no practical results arrived at and no political principles settled? Has frenzied excitement slaughtered its hundreds of men, women, and children, in its wicked zeal for political ascendency, in the large and populous cities of our Union—New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Louisville, &c., and yet no responsive throb of devoted patriotism been found to sanctify and glorify the immortal maxim of Tertullian, "*Plures efficimur, quotiens metimur a vobis; semen est sanguis christianorum?*" No, Mr. Chairman, this political contest has not been a mere idle show—a mere plaything or pastime. It is significant of the deep, eternal, and ever-living truths of the Constitution of this our glorious country—the right of a republican people to establish their own forms of republican government, the right to have secured to them by law the full enjoyment of civil and religious freedom, and the inalienable rights of expatriation and emigration. These, sir, are the jewels of that casket which contains the vital breath of republican freedom; and when these jewels are gone, the casket itself will not be worth preserving.

It is a little curious, Mr. Chairman, to see how my colleague reasons himself into this most singular idea, that the election of Mr. Buchanan is a condemnation of the present Administration, and of the general policy and principles of the Democratic party. And how is it done? Why, sir, he says, that the votes given to Fremont and Fillmore put together, are larger, by four hundred thousand, than those given to Buchanan, and therefore Buchanan stands condemned by the people upon the *issues* presented by the Democratic platform. Now, sir, does not my colleague perceive the dangerous ground upon which he is treading when he resorts to the idea of a *fusion* between Fremont and Fillmore for the purpose of beating Buchanan? Does not my colleague know (or if he ever did he seems to have forgotten it) that, with the exception of himself, the entire American party South, and for aught I know North too, were struck with holy horror at the idea of a *fusion*, in political opinions, with the Black Republicans of the North? And yet it is only by this doctrine of *fusion*, so odious to his own political party South, that he can sustain, in argument, a minority in the popular vote of the Democratic party. Sir, the American party South may well exclaim, "Save us from our friends and we will take care of our enemies;" while to my colleague I commend Hamlet's reflections on his mother:

"Then there's hope, a great man's memory may outlive his life half a year: But by'r lady he must build churches then: or else shall he suffer not thinking on, with the hobby horse, whose epitaph is, *For O, For O, the hobby horse is forgot.*"

The Know Nothing party South disclaimed all alliances with the Black Republican party. They were as much in favor of the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska act, and against the restoration of the Missouri line, as were the Democrats themselves. They so proclaimed it in all their speeches and addresses to the people. They have so proclaimed it on this floor, and have uniformly acted with the Democratic party (my colleague alone excepted) *on these particular issues*, whenever they have been brought to the consideration of this House. It is not then, sir, fair and legitimate in us, when counting popular numbers, which my colleague seems to have done, to claim as belonging to us all those of the people who agreed with us and voted with us in reference to these great measures? How, then, does my colleague put Mr. Buchanan or the present Administration in the minority, in regard to these issues at least? Give us the vote of the Democratic party, and of the American party South, to which we are clearly entitled, on the questions growing out of the *power of Congress to exclude slavery from the Territories*, and I will show you a very large and decided majority of the people, upon these issues, in favor of the principle of the Democratic party.

On the other hand, how is it with reference to the issues involved in the peculiar principles of the American party? And here, Mr. Chairman, allow me to say that I wish to tread lightly on the ashes of the dead.

"The evil, that men do, lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones.
So let it be with"——the Know Nothing Party.

But how is it, I say, with regard to the doctrines of the Know Nothing party? Does not my colleague know that the Black Republicans, not only on this floor, but throughout the country, have "the lynx's eye and the weasel's form?"—Does he not know that they have thrift and cunning enough not to engage in a crusade against the great principles of the freedom of the elective franchise? Why, sir, they not only wanted all white men to vote, but they wanted all black men, too, to vote. The Black Republican party are as much opposed to the proscription of Roman Catholics, and of naturalized foreigners, as are the Democrats themselves. Sir, they have not built their pyramids "with the base at top and the apex at bottom" as my colleague and his party have done. In this respect, at least, I commend their prudence to the judgment of my colleague. And, sir, does not my colleague see, in all this, an utter condemnation of the peculiar doctrines of the Know Nothing party? Does he not see that religious intolerance and civil disabilities have met with an almost universal rebuke at the hands of the American people—both Democrats and Republicans? And yet, my colleague says that the people of the country, for the next four years, must look to the American party as the only safe depository of true constitutional doctrines. "They now stand (says he) the hope of the nation, around whose firm ranks the shattered elements of the great majority may rally and vindicate the right of the majority to rule, and of the native of the land to make the law of the land." What strange delusions these are, Mr. Chairman, and how singular are my colleague's opinions. What, sir! The Know Nothing party the hope of the nation! Why, sir, look to the history of all the political parties which have been formed in this country from the earliest period to the present time, and tell me if one has ever existed whose principles and practices have been so emphatically condemned by the awakened intelligence of a free and enlightened people? It has had, indeed, but a short and fitful existence, like—

"A poor player,
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more."

It has seen its shadow in the sunlight of popular indignation, only that it might

"*Descant on its own deformity.*"

Sir, it does not even rise to the respectability of a faction. It is all delusion, then, to imagine that it can ever attain to permanent power in this land of civil and religious freedom.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when my colleague and myself were united with other conservative men under the great Whig banner of the country. There was a time, indeed, when he and I were candidates on the same electoral ticket. I thought then that he cordially approved of most of the principles of the Whig party. I thought then that he held the same opinions in reference to the rights of naturalized citizens—of Roman Catholics—and in regard to any change in the naturalization laws, which were held by the Whig party and its prominent leaders.

In the great Harrison campaign of 1840; in 1844, when Mr. Clay was our candidate; and in 1852, when we rallied under the lead of the gallant Scott, and in which latter campaign no man acted a more prominent part than my colleague, opposition to the principles of the Native American party, as it was then called, was distinctly and unequivocally declared by the Whig party as one of its essential articles of political faith. It was announced on the floor of the Senate by our great leader, Mr. Clay, when the Philadelphia convents were burnt. It was announced in 1840 and 1844, by the public speeches of our prominent men, and by the written addresses of central, State, and other committees. It was announced in 1852 by General Scott himself, and every prominent Whig in the country. And what were the principles of the Native American party? The extension of the naturalization laws; proscription of Roman Catholics by excluding them from office; opposition to all foreigners; and, in fine, that electrical watch-word which reads in this way: "Americans shall rule America"—precisely, sir, the doctrines of the present so-called "American party." Shall I, then, be called on to approve of doctrines which I have repudiated all my life? No, sir. Let my colleague, if he chooses, lead the way to such tergiversations. For one, I mean to remain true to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I really thought that Know Nothingism had been killed in the recent Presidential contest. I have seen eulogistic obituaries to its memory: and had wished for it uninterrupted repose in the tomb to which it had been consigned. But, sir, it seems I am mistaken.—*Monsieur Tonson* has come again. [Laughter.] I had hoped, sir, that the spirit of *Monsieur Tonson*, like all other perturbed spirits, had gone to that place of rest assigned to them, which ancient writers do call by the name of *Limbo*—a place, sir, which, we are told, "neither Heaven nor Hell would have." [Great laughter.] But, sir, it is not so. The dead carcass of *Know Nothingism* has been galvanized by my colleague, and made to stand erect upon this floor. But oh! how changed in all its features! "Its bones are marrowless; its blood is cold; and there be no speculation in those eyes which once glared withal." Sir, spirits do often revisit this earth. They come as spirites and myths, and sometimes, too, as hobgoblins damned. Nay, sir, it has oft been told that they do appear as spirits of light to call wanderers back from the paths of vice. It may be, sir, that my colleague is the chosen trunk of such a spirit. But I can tell him he must be so clear in his high office—must be sure to give such proofs of Holy Writ, "that inspiration's mantle doth surround him," or else the more fleshly spirits of this earth will resist him and his elfs, and drive them back to the dark caverns from which they sprung.

Mr. Chairman, the voice of Maryland has been heard in this contest. No, sir; I correct myself. The vote, and not the voice of Maryland, has been heard. "Truth crushed to earth will rise again;" and smothered embers are but the food of fresh conflagrations. Maryland! my own dear native State! Thou art loyal to the Constitution, and thus loyal to the South! But thou wilt be loyal to the South, even if our enemies throw away the Constitution. I pray God, sir, in his infinite mercy, that the doctrines of my colleague, the great master spirit of Free-Soilism in Maryland, may not prevail among the great masses of our people. He wooes the Black Republican party. I wish "to avoid these nuptials." And with the blessing of God, they shall not come off. I will meet him on the hustings. I will meet him anywhere, and everywhere, on the face of this broad earth, sooner than surrender my dear native Maryland to the embraces of Free-Soilism.

Sir, with reference to the vote of Maryland in the late Presidential contest, I have but little to say. She is my mother, and I will not raise a parricidal arm against her. No matter how she may have been led into the ways of error; no matter how she may have been seduced from the paths of political truth; no matter how she may have been driven from her constitutional allegiance—I love her still. She is still my mother. Her destinies are indissolubly mingled with mine, and I shall stand by her, and with her, in all and every vicissitude of fortune. When the day of trial and tribulation comes, I shall be found a faithful subject of her sovereign will. But, sir, I must confess that I look to the glorious future for redemption of her error. I look to a time, not far off, I am sure, when the birthplace of religious freedom shall be as a light-house in the skies, to allure every wanderer on the globe, who pants for civil liberty.

The Planters' Advocate.

UPPER MARLBOROUGH:

WEDNESDAY MORNING, January 28, 1857.

According to our promise of last week, we devote the larger part of our columns to-day to the republication of the recent speech of Hon. THOMAS F. BOWIE, in the House of Representatives, which, we are sure, will be more welcome to our readers generally than much of the other matter whose place it occupies.

The principal feature of Congressional action during the past week has been that growing out of the inquiry by the House Committee into the alleged corruption of sundry members. Our readers will have observed, no doubt, the proceedings had a few days since in reference to one SENSTON, a correspondent of a New York paper, who, having been summoned before the Committee, had refused to disclose the facts which he alleged to be within his knowledge. This brought the Committee to a dead stand, and together with the absence of any law to force an answer from a witness under such circumstances, rendered necessary special legislation to meet the case. A bill was therefore prepared and introduced by the Committee to effect the desired purpose, making it a misdemeanor on the part of a witness to refuse to answer, and providing for punishment by fine and imprisonment, &c.—which was promptly passed through both houses and has been approved by the President. It will perhaps facilitate the enquiry. We may say that we are sorry to notice a disposition among some of the "knowing ones" of the press to slur at this investigation and throw cold water upon it, under the cloak of reproving the wholesale charges that have been made against Congress in the matter of corruption. Such general denunciation on the part of the press is certainly reprehensible, and, to say the least, very much out of good taste. But such tirades, of course, can have no effect to injure innocence, and may perchance direct inquiry towards the guilty.—Nor does it seem safer or more just to give Congress an undiscriminating good character than the contrary. We are glad to observe, however, that the Committee of inquiry is displaying a spirit which will be apt to sift the matter to the bottom.

THE FIRE AT ST. JAMES' COLLEGE.—The Hagerstown *Mail* states that the loss by the burning of Kemp Hall, at St. James' College, near that place, is about $25,000. The building was insured in the Baltimore and National Insurance Companies of Baltimore. The fire is supposed to have originated from the furnace used for warming the building. So rapidly did the devouring element spread that the students and others in the building had barely time to escape with their lives, not even time to put on their clothing. Everything in the building was destroyed.

THE INAUGURATION BALL.—The Hon. John C. Breckinridge, the Vice President elect, has accepted an invitation to attend the inauguration ball to be given in Washington City on the evening of the 4th of March next. Mr. Buchanan had previously accepted a similar invitation.

Mr. GOWAN has deposited in the State Department, at Washington, the necessary bonds and authenticated documents that he has discovered a guano island, called Sonburo, containing over 6,000,000 tons, within eight days sail of New York. The Secretary informed him that government would protect him in its occupation.

WILLIAM FERGUSSON, formerly a merchant of Port Tobacco, and one of the most estimable citizens of Charles county, died on Saturday morning last.

Hon. TRUSTEN POLK, the newly elected United States Senator from Missouri is a native of Delaware.

Watertown, N. Y., carries off the palm for cold weather. It was forty degrees below zero up there on Monday!

FROZEN TO DEATH.—Three persons were frozen to death in Schenectady last Wednesday night—a father, mother and child.

AN INTERESTING MEMENTO.—H. Clay Trumbull, Esq., has presented to St. John's Lodge of Free Masons, at Hartford, a "Key Stone" made from fragments of a rock taken from the ruins of King Solomon's Temple, at Jerusalem. The Times says:—"The stone is suspended by a link of gold, representing an arch, attached to a wedge of the material, made in imitation of those used by operative masons in raising ponderous pieces of stone.

A "LORD" CONVICTED OF SWINDLING.—On Friday last, at Pittsburg, the trial of "Lord Arthur John Hudson," for petty swindling, took place and resulted in his conviction. His "lordship" conducted himself after the most approved fashion of the gentry—was suave, self possessed and fascinating, even upon the door still of the penitentiary. Though but a bogus nobleman, Lord John is evidently of the best of the English "swell-mob" class.

The Weather.

OSWEGO, Jan. 23.—The weather to-day is colder. At 7 A. M. the thermometer marked 14 and at 11 8 degrees below zero.

PROVIDENCE, Jan. 23.—To-day has been the coldest on record for forty years. The thermometer this morning ranged from 14 to 20 degrees below zero in different parts of the city.

ALBANY, Jan. 23.—The thermometer in the upper part of the city at 7 o'clock this morning registered 26 degrees below zero—colder than it has been since '23.

HARTFORD, Jan. 23.—The mercury at 7 o'clock this morning was 20 degrees below zero, and at 11 o'clock 6 below.

MONTREAL, Jan. 23.—The thermometer this morning registered 28 degrees below zero.

QUEBEC, Jan. 23.—In the Upper Town the mercury this morning is 20 degrees, and in the Lower Town 21 degrees below zero.

BOSTON, Jan. 25.—Yesterday is reported to have been the coldest ever known in Vermont. At several places in that State the mercury is said to have congealed.—Weather judges estimate the temperature at 50 degrees below zero.

New Jersey U. S. Senator.

TRENTON, January 24.—The impression is that Hon. JOHN R. THOMPSON will be re-elected United States Senator, though there is much feeling upon the subject. His principal opponent is JOHN P. STOCKTON, Esq., of Princeton.

Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, *Jan.* 25, 1857.

For seven days we have lived almost isolated from the rest of mankind. A visit even to Georgetown could hardly be attempted without risk of life or limb; and the consequence has been, that we have been cooped up in our densely inhabited portion of the ten miles square like so many Japanese within the precincts of Nakodadi. Still, the cold weather, and the formidable snow-drifts which are piled along Pennsylvania Avenue, have not checked the progress of legislation—and the investigating committee are doing their utmost to impart voice and words to the obstinate witnesses who are reluctantly brought before them. The contempt law which is now before the President may make them martyrs, but, it is generally believed, will not extort from them any confessions—and for the best reason in the world—because they—some of them, at least—would thereby inculpate themselves.

The best of the fun, however, is not confined to Washington. New York is the theatre where the corruption charges are bringing to light, day after day, plots, and schemes, and wholesale villany that puts even Wall street to the blush. What a pity that we should, at this interesting juncture, be deprived of our regular mail communication with that city! The *Times*, in which the charge of corruption and bribery was first made, and the specification that members had offered their votes for $1,000 first appeared, persists in reiterating these charges; and, although its editors and correspondents have refused to disclose the names of the guilty members to the committee, and have voluntarily submitted to the penalties of contempt rather than do so, yet they do not hesitate to declare through the columns of their paper, in New York, that, "if the 'investigations of this committee are properly 'pushed, and lead to the disclosure of any con'siderable amount of facts, that members of the 'Republican party will be implicated in these 'disclosures;" and, further, "that members 'claiming to be Republicans have been parties 'to transactions which were to make them shar'ers in the pecuniary profits of bills they were to 'aid in passing." Well, this relieves us to some extent, at least; for the same authority from which the charges first emanated, now saddles them, without qualification or division, upon the "Kansas bleeders." But what says Bennett upon these avowals? Listen to him:—"Now, we 'should like to know what members of the Re'publican party are implicated?—who are these 'lobby members inside and outside of Congress? 'Two associates of Raymond, namely, Thurlow 'Weed and James Watson Webb, have been at 'Washington most of the time since this Con'gress commenced, and are generally supposed 'to be interested in some of the bills before Con'gress. Are they the members of the Republi'can party implicated in the bribery transac'tions?" Thus it goes on in New York. What times we shall have when the snow-banks disappear before the genial warmth of the sun, and the witnesses are forced to speak under the thumb-screw of the contempt enactment.

To judge from one of your editorials of last week, I should suppose that the snow-storm has been dreadfully severe in some portions of St. Mary's county. What could have come over the brains of the individual you *wrote at* last Wednesday? My few remarks in a former letter were designed to aid in perpetuating the ascendancy of national Democratic principles in your congressional district; to save it from the Know Nothing taint that attaches to a neighboring district—not by a preference, expressed or implied, of any one good and true man over another; but by concentration of public sentiment, by consultation among leading politicians, and, above all means, by avoiding rash, hasty, or precipitate action. The will of a convention, fairly expressed, is with me *ex Deo*. The opinion of individuals is estimable according to circumstances; and I am free to confess that the circumstances connected with the two published opinions of our mercurial friend in St. Mary's do not strike me in the most favorable light. When I penned the lines which have given cause for his ire, I could safely swear I had not seen or spoken to a Prince Georgian for four months previously: but I did see and consult with several friends from St. Mary's—and on that very subject, too. VINDEX.

The Foreign News.

The "Persia" arrived at New York on Saturday last with Liverpool dates to the 10th inst.

The news is important, inasmuch as it states that the Swiss difficulty is virtually settled by the interposition of France, supported by England. The Emperor Napoleon undertakes that Prussia shall renounce all claim upon Neufchatel, in return for the release of the prisoners. Further, France undertakes to prevent any aggression by Prussia upon Switzerland. Switzerland approves these terms, and the Federal Assembly is summoned to ratify them.

The Conference of Paris closed on the 6th instant, having signed a protocol, which is expected to terminate all the difficulties, in fulfilment of the treaty of peace of March last. Russia cedes Bolgrad and Tabak to Moldavia, and receives the town of Komrat, on the right bank of the river Yalpuk, with a territory of three hundred square verstes. The Isle of Serpents is decided as belonging to the mouths of the Danube, and goes with them. The new boundaries shall be fixed, and the Austrian troops and British fleet shall have evacuated the Turkish territory by the 30th of March next. Immediately thereafter the Conference will reassemble at Paris to ratify these proceedings.

The New Minister to the United States.

Lord Napier having been appointed the representative of her Majesty at Washington, on the occasion of the completion of diplomatic intercourse between England and the United States, will leave for America on the 7th of February, and will be accompanied by the new consuls to be appointed in the place of those whose *exequatur* had been withdrawn last summer.

Lord Napier is not a peer of the United Kingdom. He is only a Scotch nobleman, but he is the representative of one of the most illustrious families in British history, and, whatever his own personal merits be, he is related to an immense number of heroes and distinguished men. He is descended from the renowned Sir John Napier, of Morchiston, who invented logarithms; his father