Box 16

Folder C

Isaac C Bates, of Massachusetts was a Elected a United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts in 1841 and Served tele 1845

he was a Senator of Uprightness and talent, of a Manly and honorable bearing worthy to fill a Seate in the Senate he was very faithful in the discharge of his duties in the Committe Room and the Senate Chamber — he was a Member of the Senate for five years — not over ambitious to attract attention as a public debater he. left Occasion to friend him out, and Call him out,

his thoughts were Clear his topics, well Chosen and his illustration often happy and Convincing his Manner was Simple and earnest — he was Chairman of the Committe on Pensions, he Spared no pains in the investigation of Cases. in Which parties appeared to have a Claim on the bounty of the Country

16C 48

Robert J Walker of Mississippi
ther war few Senators that filled
a larger space in the public eyes
than did Robert J Walker. in person
he was the lightest man. then in the Senate
some five feet, 2 inches high, rather stooping
as he walked. small bones little flesh
he had a large head, for the size of his
body. bald to behind the crown,
high forehead, large nose, wide mouth
he mouth was very delicate. he was
a good speaker. his voice rather shrill.
he was considered very formidable in
debate, he stood high in his party.
he spoke as often as any other Senator

Robert J. Walker of Mississippi
Was Elected United States Senator in
1836. Served untile 1845.
he was Considerd as one of the leaders.
of his party in the Senate his Senatorial Speaches
were evencive, of great ability.
he was warm harted. and Conngenal.
his political Sagacity were displayed in a
wonderful Manner
he was a Man of grate astetcness. adroit
and Accomplished,
he was of ardent temperament grate abilities
and a Strong Will.

in the Senate May 20. and 21. 1844. he Spoke at grate
lenth on the Subject of the Texas Treaty in Exectiv Session
they Hav Spoken of by Several Senator as being Strong for his
Side. Senator Walker Made a Speech. on the Bill

16C 50

Senator Walker as a popular Orator, was capable of prodigious mental toil, he had a grate memory rare enthusiasm and intense Convictions. polished Manners and Simplicity of Character. his arguments in the Senate were heavy Strong, he brought to the discussion all his powers. he was a ~~fine~~ patriot in the larger sense. and like many outher Senators died poor—

16C51

introduced by Senator Benton February 5. 1845
to provide for the annexation of Texas to the United
States. Mr Walker said that he was rejoiced
that the grate American question of the reannexation
of Texas was being placed orignaly by
him. in his Texas letter of the. 8 of
January 1844.
on the 25. of January 1845 Senator Walker
made a rather grate Speech on the annexation
of Texas. it attracte grat attention by all of the
Senator ——

16C 52

Alexander Barrow of Louisiana

was Elected a United State Senator from 1841. to 1847. - he died befor his tim Expired December 29. 1846. -

While he was a Senator. he was distinguished for his bland and Courteous Manners, for his frank and Manly ~~[illegible]~~ deportment, and for his Many Generous and noble traits of Character, he performed his duties in the Senate with Zeal, and ability, and I am Sure that it is no exaggeration to Say, that in his intercourse with his Brother Senator his deportment on all Occasion was Such as to Command the respect and Confidence of Every Senator — he had a Quick Clear and Strong Judgment —

in the Senate March 30. 1846 Senator Barrow mad a long and animated Speech on the Oregon question —

16 C 53

he died quite young he had not passed the prime of his years he was a man of fine appearance, and manly nature,

Mr Crittenden a warm friend of Mr Barrow on the day of the announcement of his death arose to speak and after uttering a few words was, so, overcome that he ~~burst~~ bursted into tears and sank into his seat —

16C 54

William L Dayton of New Jersey was Elected United State Senator in 1842. and Leaved tele 1851—

Mr Dayton of New Jersey — in the Senate February 9. 1844 presented Certain resolution from the State of New Jersey instructing the Senator from that State to vote for the bill to refund to General Jackson. the fine which was imposed on him in 1815, for a Contempt of Court,

Mr Dayton said inasmuch as he did not propose to address. the Senate on the bill itself, he would briefly but respectfully respond to the resolution now, I am sad he most happy to receive instructions. in the Course of my official duties, from any Source, but when those instruction emanate from a Source so high. as the Legislative Council of New Jersey. I feel Myself peculiarly honored

in the Senate February 23. 1844.

Senator Dayton Mad a Speech on the Oregon Question. not Concluding he gave way for a

motion to adjourn. the Senate then adjourned untill Monday —

in the Senate Monday 26, 1844 Senator Dayton resumed his argument in opposition to the Annexation to the point where he had suspended it. at the adjournment. on Friday he made a very strong an impressive argument —

in the Senate February 24. 1845 Senator Dayton address the Senate on the annexation of Texas. his speech was argumentative in its matter and brilliant and effective in its delivery

in the Senate April 29, 1844. Mr Dayton made a speech vindicated the Tariff of 1842, from the imputation of injustice and partiality —

in the Senate July 26. 1848 Mr Dayton made a speech on the bill to establish a territoral government in Oregon New Mexico and California —

in the Senate April 17. 1848
Mr Dayton made a great Speech
on the War with Mexico. the
bill for the Adjustment of California
Claim being under Consideration —
in the Senate Febuary 22, 1849 Mr Dayton
Spoke at grate length on the bill making
appropriation for Civil and Diplomatic Expences
of the Government for 1850 —
in the Senate June 11. 1850 and 12. Mr
Dayton made Speeches on the bill
reported by the Committee of Thirteen
William L Dayton held his Seat in the
Senate from July 1842, until March 4, 1851
when he entered the Senate he had just
passed the age of thirty five, and was the
youngest Senator at that time, he did not
often Speak, he was a Member of the
Committee on Judiciary ~~Committee~~ he Continued
to Serve on that Committee while he was in
the Senate, with the exception of a Single
Session

16C57

MATERIAL TOO LARGE TO BE FILMED AS A WHOLE FILMED IN SECTIONS ONLY

Daily National Intelligencer.

VOL. XXXVIII. WASHINGTON: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1850. No. 11,569.

PUBLISHED BY GALES & SEATON.
TERMS
DAILY PAPER $10 A YEAR—COUNTRY PAPER $6 A YEAR.
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

SPEECH OF MR. DAYTON,

OF NEW JERSEY,

ON THE TERRITORIAL QUESTION.

IN SENATE, MARCH 22, 1850.

The Senate having under consideration the resolutions of compromise submitted by Mr. BELL, together with the motion of Mr. FOOTE to refer them to a committee of thirteen—

Mr. DAYTON said: Mr. President, the war with Mexi[illegible] brought with it much territory and much trouble. [illegible] early foreseen. It was not only early fore[illegible] strongly deprecated. We now have a na[illegible] national wants or means of enjoy[illegible] the subject of conten[illegible] among the [illegible]tlemen on this side of the chamber, in anti[illegible] difficulties which now surround us, never as[illegible] treaty by which this territory was acquired: [illegible] the h[illegible]rd of a continuance of the war with [illegible]her than a peace which should bring territory along [illegible] There were a few upon this side of the chamber, [illegible] of the number, who preferred, as an alternative, [illegible] terms then offered rather than a continuance [illegible] with the chance of a larger amount of territory [illegible]th at its close. I do not now, Mr. President, re[illegible]tion upon that subject. It is easy to appreciate dif[illegible] are around us and upon us; but it is hard to say [illegible] would have been had that war been con[illegible]e treaty, and, as a probable consequence, [illegible]feated at the ensuing election. I hesitate [illegible] conclusion of that war, under the aus[illegible] Administration, would have brought [illegible]ount of territory further south, and [illegible]lave labor. It would have increased [illegible] difficulties which now surround [illegible]t, the acquisition of this territory was [illegible] policy of the South. This matter, [illegible] evil, has been forced upon the North, [illegible]vill, but against our remonstrance and [illegible]sed in this chamber. But the territory [illegible] step in the progress of this matter is as [illegible] made of it. That the citizens of [illegible]e confederacy [illegible] equal rights there, no [illegible]ut that very equality of right repels the [illegible] in interest shall have an absolute con[illegible] equity," but a system which shall give [illegible] lesser interest) the control of the many, is [illegible] equity.

[illegible]troversy, then, in regard to the principle [illegible] friends have with us, politically and per[illegible]ts in the Territories; but they are no more [illegible] is the application of this principle of equality [illegible] issue between them and us. The first diffi[illegible]ut of California. That country has accomplish[illegible] the last session, I did not suppose could be accom[illegible]n so brief a space. Her condition must have been misunderstood or misrepresented. There have been, it would seem, but few comparatively of her population engaged during the past season in the mines and washings. Others have met in convention, and formed a constitution, which her people have adopted. They have appointed Senators and elected Representatives in the usual forms; and they are now here asking admission for California as one of the States of the Union. The question then occurs, Why shall not the request be granted? California was not at the last session a *State*, and that, though not the whole, was a principal objection to her admission then. That she is now a State *de facto* no man can dispute. But, sir, they have incorporated, it seems, an anti-slavery clause in their State constitution. This, however, I understand distinctly from our friends of the South, is to their minds no objection to the admission of California into the Union. I understand that they stand now, as they ever have, upon the principle of non-intervention; and the fact of the incorporation of this principle into the California constitution forms of itself no objection in their minds to the admission of the State into the Union. That being so, it narrows very much the ground of opposition. We get rid in this way of those sources of excitement which have pervaded the country from North to South. The matter is thus brought to stand, not upon a question of right, or honor, or power, but as a mere question of political expediency.

Now, sir, what are the objections to the admission of California, looked at as a matter of form and with an eye to expediency? I know these objections have been gone over by others, and what little I have to say upon them will be said as briefly as the nature of the circumstances will admit.

It has been said that, by the admission of California under the circumstances, the Federal Government will acknowledge her admission as a State of the Union. If the coming census do not entitle her to her *present representation, she will lose* it in the next Congress.

But again, sir, the boundaries of the State of California are made the subject of objection. These boundaries, though not embracing all of California, as did the bill of last session, are perhaps too large upon the coast to admit in the future of the convenient workings of the State Government itself. Seven hundred miles is a long stretch to be covered by the interior municipal arrangements of a State. But if this State be admitted now, I see not how it is possible that she can be admitted with any other boundaries. The late influx of population is about the centre of the State, around and at San Francisco, and in the neighborhood of the mines. Now, sir, you could not with propriety have run a line around that population and cut out a piece of country in the centre, for a State, leaving a fragment of territory to the north and another to the south unprovided for. In the present situation of things, you are compelled, if you admit the State at all, to admit her with her present boundaries. They may not have been wisely made; it may in future so appear. If so, we must trust to the patriotism of posterity to do in the future, what they have in like cases done in the past, rectify their mistake by the light of experience.

But, sir, there is another branch of this same objection; and that, I apprehend, arises from the fact that a part of these boundaries go south of 36° 30′—that they cover land that would have been left to slavery in the event of the Missouri compromise line being extended to the Pacific. But the answer to this is, if answer were necessary, that the people have settled this question for themselves, north as well as south of that line; and, under all the circumstances, it is "hoping against hope" for the South to look in the future for the formation of a slave State upon the Pacific. Why, sir, when the citizens of the South go there, they do not seem to desire slavery themselves. They slough off their prepossessions at once. If the institution be a blessing at home, it is, at all events, a blessing that they are not disposed to carry along with them! They leave the South and this institution behind, and the very moment they get into the sunshine of freedom, they change their color; they cast their coats. Why, sir, what have we seen in this very California Convention? The South was represented there—nay, was not only represented, but, in proportion to their numbers, more than represented in delegates to that Convention. True to their past history, the South have already obtained in that territory nearly all its offices and its honors. Their citizens are there, looking, not for emolument only, but it would seem for power and place. Ours more generally are delving in the mines; they are scouring the *dirt*. The citizens of the South are not, it would seem, after the glittering dust only, but power and position.

Mr. FOOTE. The Senator, I presume, does not wish to do injustice to his own section; the Representatives in the other House are, I believe, both from the North.

Mr. DAYTON. I did not overlook that fact. I qualified my remark by saying that the citizens of the South had acquired *nearly* all the honors and offices of the Territory. If the Representatives in the other House are from the North, those in this are both from the South; the one from Mississippi, and the other from South Carolina. And looking at home, at California herself, we find that the whole body of her State officers, with a single unimportant exception, are Southern men. Sir, I do not censure, but I rather commend the South for their spirit there. But when we see that they were fully represented in the California Convention—that the leading and influential men there are men of the South, and yet we find them all, *una voce*, going against the introduction of slavery, I ask, is it not over-sanguine to expect slave territory in California south of 36° 30′? Men do not emigrate from mere political motives, and with a view to political results. The leading inducement to emigration is always personal; generally pecuniary. Some few there are who may go with a view to honor and office, but the great body of emigrants have another creed. Their's is what some one has cynically called the American creed: "they believe in the golden eagle, they believe in the silver dollar, they believe in the copper cent." The sarcasm is scarcely more bitter than true; it is at least the inducement which controls emigration here—that controls emigration every where. You will never get a slave population to emigrate to that Territory with a view to constituting a political equilibrium. In the business of life, in the daily transactions of men, they are governed and controlled by other motives and other objects. Slave labor is Southern capital, and Southern capital, like capital of every other description, will pursue the general law of trade. It will go permanently nowhere except where the investment will produce an adequate return.

California, south of 36° 30′, embraces the town of San Diego, the city San Angelos, and other populous towns and villages along the coast. In point of fact, it was, I believe, the best populated part of the Territory prior to the late rush of emigration. Can it be required that we shall keep out that portion of California from the benefit of State gov[illegible]

wings, literally her *golden wings*, fresh, full grown, before us! You can no more remand her to the state of a Territory than you can force back a development of nature into its condition of yesterday. Nor is it desirable that you should. As a Territory, she is a charge upon your coffers, (and it would seem no mean one,) while as a State she is a charge upon her own.

But, sir, there is yet another objection, and perhaps the most serious of all, to the admission of California; one about which, though least is said, perhaps most is thought. There is no slave State ready to come in, as a balance against this free one. Now, sir, I think this is the first time that it has been assumed *openly*, as a principle of action, that no free State should come in unless there was a slave State to come in with it. I admit, sir, it has long been acted upon—adroitly acted upon—by Southern statesmen. They have manifested upon such occasions a degree of political strategy, which, considering that the interests of the South must through so many years have been in the hands of different statesmen, indicates great ability and great power. Why, sir, the two last slave States which were admitted, Arkansas and Florida, have each now one Representative upon the floor of the other House only, and the population only which entitles them to it; while of the two last free States, Iowa and Wisconsin, both admitted subsequent to those last named, the one has two, and the other, Wisconsin, the last admitted, has three Representatives upon that floor, and of course a commensurate population. But, sir, let me now call the attention of the Senate and of the country to this matter of admission of new States, and to dates; and I think that a little reference to this subject will serve as a useful lesson to Northern politicians. It will show how they (though having the numerical force themselves) have constantly permitted the South to anticipate them in the admission of States into the Union. Louisiana, a slave State, was admitted in 1812; Indiana, a free State, in 1816; Mississippi, a slave State, was admitted in 1817; Illinois, a free State, came in in 1818; Alabama, a slave State, was admitted in 1819; Maine, a free State, came in 1820; Missouri, a slave State, was admitted in 1821—nothing to balance it; Arkansas, a slave State, was admitted, in 1836; Michigan, a free State, in 1837; Florida, a slave State, was admitted in 1845; Iowa, though in the same bill, was postponed until 1846. Now, sir, here is a course of things, running through forty years, showing that, ever and always, without reference to population, our Southern friends have managed to anticipate us a year or two in the admission of States. But, sir, after Florida was admitted our Southern friends had used up their *materiel;* they had got at last to the end of their tether; here was a difficulty. Wisconsin was looming up in the distance, just upon the horizon, and there was not only no slave State ready, but there was no Territory to make one of; not a foot remained south of 36° 30′ unoccupied. The territory west of Arkansas had been permanently appropriated, by act of Congress, to Southern Indians, removed there. Here, then, was a dilemma; but even here the South was equal to the emergency. Just at this point of time there was, we are told by the Senator from South Carolina, a World's Convention in London for the general abolition of slavery; and simply for the purpose of preventing that world's convention from carrying its resolves into effect, a Southern Executive actually secured Texas, and *admitted* Texas, before Wisconsin was ready. Now, I say that again, as matter of strategy, if it were so, was well done.

But, sir, now comes another difficulty. Out of this annexation of Texas came the war with Mexico, and out of that again, by force of Southern policy, comes this acquisition of California. But in getting this the South "have got more than they bargained for." Circumstances wholly accidental, and which no human foresight could anticipate, have thrown a vast free population suddenly into that Territory; they have put their veto upon the slave principle; organized a government, and they are now here respectfully asking admission at our hands, and there is no slave State ready to meet them. Well, here in truth is a dilemma. The South have the territory in Texas, but they have no men. What is to be done? The case is desperate, but if it be so, so is the remedy? *Compromise* say they, or we will *secede*. Now, what in Heaven's name are we to compromise? Here is a state of things brought about by your own policy, against which we have protested from the beginning; it has taken a turn against you which human foresight could not anticipate, and now you say compromise or we will secede. Sir, but for its importance, the claim, under all the circumstances, is almost laughable. The North has been led along as by a string, blindfold, for forty years, and now it has got in California a little the start, not by its wit or its wisdom, but by pure accident, and the South says *compromise* or we *secede!* Sir, if our friends of the South seriously mean to say that upon the admission of California they will hold it as ground of secession, in God's name let the trial come; let the issue be made. Never, never, can it come upon a point weaker for the South, or stronger for the North than that. If the power of this Government is to be tested, let it be tested just in such a cause, and just under such circumstances. But, sir, this is a useless anti[illegible] such a crisis can never originate in such a cause; the

Mr. SEWARD. I intended to state, and I think I did state, that the resolution for creating new States at all in Texas, is one which requires consent to be given hereafter; not only the consent of Texas but of Congress; and that, therefore, if the question was to-day before me, I should vote, under present circumstances and with my present opinions, against creating any new States in Texas; and that the result of it would be that no new State could be admitted as a State.

Mr. DAYTON. If the Senator mean to say that he would vote now, under existing circumstances, against the admission of a slave State in Texas, I agree with him.

Mr. SEWARD. Now and hereafter. If he will refer to the words, he will see that new States *may be* admitted, with the consent of Texas to be hereafter given, and with the consent of Congress to be hereafter given; that the Congress of the United States is not committed in that resolution to the creation of States hereafter.

Mr. DAYTON resumed. That is not the language of the resolution. If that were the language of the resolution there might be something in the gentleman's argument. But the language of the resolution is this:

"New States of convenient size may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed, &c., which *shall be entitled* to admission under the provisions of the Federal constitution."

I repeat that I would not hurry their admission; I would not anticipate the necessary preliminaries; I would take full time to see that they are of convenient size; to see that they have a sufficient population; to see that they come in with the consent of Texas; to see that they have complied with the whole spirit and letter of that resolution; but when that is done, I see not how the Government is fairly to escape from the contract.

I thus pass from the subject of California and its proposed equivalents, and say I am in favor of her admission without restriction, without limitation, and without equivalent.

Well, sir, there is another question——

Mr. SEWARD, (interposing.) Will the Senator from New Jersey allow me to ask him whether the resolution for the annexation of Texas, as he has quoted it, was found in the book called "The Constitution?"

Mr. DAYTON. I believe I copied it from that.

Mr. SEWARD. Will the Senator excuse me if I read from that volume, the one to which I had access before, and which I presume is right, for the purpose of avoiding misapprehension? It is as follows: [Mr. S. here read the resolution as before recited, and commented upon the language, "new States may hereafter be formed," as giving to Congress an option.]

Mr. DAYTON resumed. The Senator misunderstands, I think, the application of that language; if critically examined, it will be seen that the word *may* applies to the option on the part of Texas; or, if applied to this Government as well as that, it is controlled by the language of the next sentence. The word *shall* applies to the obligation which rests upon this Government. [Two or three Senators near: "That's it, clearly."] I do not think there can be any great difference of opinion with regard to the fair construction of that resolution. But I pass from that branch of the subject, trusting that we may not be called upon to act upon it for years to come.

There is another topic of a practical character to which I beg to call the attention of the Senate, and that is the *fugitive slave bill*. This subject has been much spoken of, in the general, in the Senate, but it has been very little spoken of in its details. The constitution provides that fugitives from service "shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." I trust that I may be pardoned a few preliminary remarks in calling the attention of the Senate to the mode in which that provision came into the constitution, with a view to what I consider the truth of history; and to rectify a mistake recently made upon the subject by the Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. CALHOUN.) That Senator said that he understood that the ordinance of 1787 had been opposed in the Congress of the Confederation from 1784 to 1787, and had been kept out; but that finally, in 1787, the Congress of the Confederation and the Convention which formed the constitution, (sitting at the same time, the one in New York and the other in Philadelphia,) acting upon a mutual understanding, the one passed the anti-slavery clause of the ordinance and the other put this clause into the constitution providing for the delivery of fugitive slaves; leaving us to understand that the one was in consideration of the other; and that we had now faithlessly refused to carry out that understanding.

In the course of a few years, this statement, unless contradicted here and now, will become history; "*vires acquirit eundo*." I beg to ask upon what it rests? The ordinance, as drawn by Mr. Jefferson, was not defeated, but passed in 1784, without the anti-slavery clause. (It was a meager skeleton, wanting in all those noble properties which have since given it so just a celebrity.) It provided, as drawn by Mr. Jefferson, for ten States instead of five, which, if continued, would have made a great difference in the relative strength of the two sections of the Confederacy. As it was, it continued the law from 1784 to 1787. The subject-matter of the Northwest[illegible]

that the National Government, in the absence of all positive provisions to the contrary, is bound, through its own proper departments, legislative, executive, or judiciary, as the case may require, to carry into effect all the rights and duties imposed upon it by the constitution."

Again: That

"It would seem, upon just principles of construction, that the legislation of Congress, if constitutional, must supersede all State legislation upon the same subject, and by necessary implication prohibit it."

Again: That

"The provisions of the act of 12th February, 1793, relative to fugitive slaves, is clearly constitutional in all its leading provisions; and, indeed, with the exception of that part which confers authority on State magistrates, is free from reasonable doubt or difficulty. As to the authority so conferred on State magistrates, while a difference of opinion exists, and may exist on this point, in different States, whether State magistrates are bound to act under it, none is entertained by the court that State magistrates may, if they choose, exercise the authority, unless prohibited by State legislation."

Mr. President, there seems to have been a general expression of opinion in the Senate against the validity or correctness of this decision, so far as it pronounces State laws unconstitutional. Sir, I was happy to hear the honorable Senator from North Carolina, (Mr. BADGER,) whose judgment as a lawyer we all respect, say that in his opinion the decision was right. That is my opinion. Now, sir, having ascertained what the Supreme Court of the United States has decided upon this subject, and that it is the duty of Congress to carry this provision of the constitution into effect, I am willing to do so.

Here permit me to say, without the slightest disrespect or unkindness towards the Senator from New York, who has expressed himself upon this subject, (Mr. SEWARD,) that I have no sympathy in some of the sentiments thus expressed. Every man, it is true, is the judge of what is due to himself. I only judge of what I feel is due to myself. Having entered this chamber and bound myself by a cable stronger than iron to the constitution, I hold that it is too late to go behind it when its text is clear. As soon, sir, as we begin to speculate not upon what the constitution is, but upon what it ought to be; to try it by the laws of God, and the powers of conscience, as *we* understand them, I fear that our anchorage is gone, that we are adrift in the night. I am willing to carry out this provision without paltering with my duty. But I may look upon this question differently from the honorable Senator from North Carolina and others who have addressed us upon this subject. I am prepared to vote for a law for the recapture and redelivery of fugitive slaves; but you must present a law that is reasonable, not one anomalous in its provisions or unreasonable in its character.

It is my purpose to examine a little in detail the law which is now before the Senate, and the proposition which is intended to be introduced by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. MASON) as an amendment. In my judgment, it would have been better, in the present excited state of the public mind, simply to have amended the act of 1793, by a supplement providing merely that certain named persons be substituted in the place of the State officers, (of whose services you have been deprived by the decision of the Supreme Court,) and that they be vested with powers to carry that act into effect. But another course has been taken. The committee have thought proper to report an entire bill, and I propose to examine that bill; I think we shall find it the most anomalous and extraordinary bill ever brought before us for legislative action.

The bill reported by the Judiciary Committee, in its first section, gives power to all commissioners of the Supreme Court, clerks, marshals, postmasters, and collectors of the customs, to carry into effect the duties and powers of that act. Now, sir, if you recollect who and what the individuals here named are, scattered all over the country, does it not strike you as most anomalous and extraordinary that they should be vested with the power of pronouncing in effect upon the slavery or freedom of a human being? Is there a State in this Union—is there a Southern State that has or would vest a power of this kind in such a tribunal; a power without appeal and without revision? I think not one. And if you pass such a law, I take it upon myself to say that you will generate a species of kidnapping, of fraud and outrage, which has been unknown even in the past history of this subject. I admit that the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is better than the provisions of the law as it now stands. That amendment provides, however, for the appointment of commissioners by the Federal courts of the United States, and I observe that by that amendment my little State would get between sixty and seventy commissoners, three to each county, for carrying this law into effect. Here, again, in the amendment as well as in the original bill, it seems to me there is a mistaken principle of action, of which I will speak further hereafter.

The second section of that law authorizes the individuals to whom judicial power is given, to issue process upon application of the claimant, before the arrest of the fugitive is made. That is right, unquestionably right. The only difficulty is, that, instead of being optional, if we have the power,

collectors of customs, and others, who have never perhaps seen the inside of a law-book in their lives, to exercise high judicial powers; you then propose to authorize them to name any body else to act as executive officers, and these again to call to their assistance any other persons to aid them to carry their extraordinary powers into execution! And then, in the event of difficulty and force being opposed, the United States are to pay all the expenses and costs.

The fifth section is a mere increase of penalties upon those who obstruct the claimant. I care little for this, though in point of fact the penalties are severe enough now, if enforced: you only increase the difficulties of a recovery by enlarging them. I now submit to honorable Senators, do you believe that this law, or any law like it, can be carried into effect through the agency of such a tribunal? You will increase, rather than diminish, your difficulties. Upon each arrest and trial there will be but a repetition of scenes of confusion, exasperation, and excitement. You are taking the wrong course. You are endeavoring to augment your chances of recovery by increasing the numbers of your agents; *the error is radical.* You should, instead of this, elevate the character and standing of persons to be selected as agents. That is the only mode in which we can ever expect to succeed in enforcing the provisions of the constitution. You must lodge this power in the hands of those whose position and character will make that power respected. You catch and reclaim your fugitive criminals without difficulty with the aid of *one* governor; and when you get a governor's order for the delivery of a criminal no one thinks of interfering with the authority of that distinguished official. If you will confide this affair of fugitive slaves to the district and circuit judges of the United States courts, or even if you should extend it to those commissioners of the United States courts who may be appointed with their consent from the judges of the supreme courts of the several States, you will be able, I have no doubt, to secure the execution of your law. Such persons will give weight of character and respectability to the offices which they are called upon to perform; but if you put this power in the hands of a great number of petty commissioners, you will inevitably surround its execution with new and augmented difficulties. You do not need an agent stationed at every cross-road through the free States for the purpose of catching your fugitive slaves. Southern men do not go into the free States to hunt a slave as they would start a partridge, which must be taken on the wing or it is gone; they first ascertain where he is, or obtain some knowledge of his whereabouts, locate him, and then go for the purpose of arresting him. There is, therefore, no difficulty in their arming themselves with the proper process beforehand, whether there be five or fifty persons charged in the State with the execution of the law for delivery of fugitives. You are proceeding upon a false principle. You are legislating with a view to finding facilities to *run* your slaves out of the free States, as though they were *contraband* goods, to be run across the border in the face of a revenue officer. It is a false principle of legislation, and proceeds upon an entire mistake as to the feelings of our people.

But, again, sir, much has been said as to the propriety of affording the fugitive slave a trial by jury; the most strenuous objections are made to the proposition. And the honorable Senator from North Carolina, (Mr. BADGER,) who expressed himself with so much clearness and legal acumen, took occasion to say that the granting of such a trial would render the whole remedy of the slaveholder illusory; and I recollect that the honorable Senator from Maryland (Mr. PRATT) said the other day that it was equivalent to the denial of all remedy to the master for the recovery of his slave. I was surprised, sir, to hear these expressions. I speak from some knowledge of the subject, when I declare that a jury is in my judgment a thousand times better tribunal than that of any of the petty officials your bill proposes to create; not better for the slave only, but fairer for the claimant. I do not mean to say that after a jury has rendered its verdict, and an order for delivery and removal is made, that an appeal or certiorari or writ of error is to be provided for, and thus a ruinous procrastinated litigation to be entailed upon the claimant. Not at all. I mean that the verdict of the jury shall be final and conclusive as respects the question then and there submitted, and that the order for delivery be based thereon. That is now the law of New Jersey, first enacted in 1836, and again re-enacted in 1846. A jury can be summoned in an hour; there is no harassing and annoying delay, nor any but the most trifling expense about it. It is simply the substitution of another tribunal in the place of the judge or commissioner who has been proposed to try the questions of fact. Nor do you have to prove any thing more before a jury than you would before a judge or commissioner. You have to prove exactly the same things, nothing more or less.

But my learned friends from Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina say that this is a change of *venue*. With all respect, sir, I assert that it is nothing of the kind. It is a change of nothing but the character of the tribunal that is to try the question of fact. The finding of that tribunal and the finding of the judge or the commissioner has the same effect, and none other. They investigate the same matters—decide upon the same evidence—and you have to prove no more before the one than before the other. How, then, can it be [illegible] The finding of a jury and

they ever have, upon the principle of non-intervention; and the fact of the incorporation of this principle into the California constitution forms of itself no objection in their minds to the admission of the State into the Union. That being so, it narrows very much the ground of opposition. We get rid in this way of those sources of excitement which have pervaded the country from North to South. The matter is thus brought to stand, not upon a question of right, or honor, or power, but as a mere question of political expediency. 57A

Now, sir, what are the objections to the admission of California, looked at as a matter of form and with an eye to expediency? I know these objections have been gone over by others, and what little I have to say upon them will be said as briefly as the nature of the circumstances will admit.

It has been said that, by the admission of California under the circumstances, the Federal Government will acknowledge that the people of that country had a right to legislate for themselves—that it will in fact be an abandonment by this Government of the sovereign power of legislation over the Territories. Not at all, sir. The very fact that California comes here and asks admission, not *over* our legislation, but through and with the consent of our legislation, admits the fact that our power upon that subject is sovereign; and the very fact that we do admit her upon such application is not only a claim, but the full exercise upon our part of the power of legislation over the country. Why, sir, Congress itself for legislates for a Territory. It creates a Territorial Government, and it constitutes that government its agent. It acts and we supervise. Now, suppose a State of things arise where there is no prior act granting Territorial power, and yet, for the purposes of self-protection, are passed by its local legislature, and subsequently ratified by Congress, can any man doubt that these laws be binding? Is not the act of Congress giving an subsequent as binding as if given prior? Does not general rule apply as to the recognition of an agency or before or alter an act done? Did we not in the admission of this very territory recognise this principle? The by by which it was acquired was not only negotiated by Trist without authority but against authority; and yet it sent here and ratified by us. We acknowledged the act sequent to the negotiation, and it is now the law of the . Our action in admitting California is no abandonment our right of legislation.

But then again it is said that California is not a *State*, and constitution authorizes the admission of States only. California, sir, is a State—a State *de facto;* its exercises the powers of an organized Government. Whether it is or shall be a State *de jure* depends upon the action of this Government. She has within herself all the powers, all the rights, and is charged with all the obligations of a State: not of a State independent, but of a State dependent—of a State formed with a view to admission into this Union, and consequently curtailed somewhat by its own constitution of the powers of sovereignty. She has adopted the only character of Government which was in her power upon principles of national law. She could not adopt a territorial form of government; that is the creature of Federal legislation. She has within herself now all the elements, rights, and powers of a State. If her conduct has been revolutionary, as has been contended, it would be so against this Government only, and we merely can waive the wrong.

But, sir, this objection, if it existed at all, is an objection which is answered by the past action of the Government. In the case of Texas, some sixteen States have been since the formation of the constitution, and eight of been admitted without any prior consent of Congress to the formation of the State Government. It is said, that they previously had Territorial Legislatures. The powers of a Territorial Government are limited by the which creates it. They can have no authority to change fundamental character of the Territorial Government, and it into a State. Outside of the powers delegated they much without power as though no Territorial Government had ever existed. No amount of argument can make plainer, nor can any metaphysical subtlety fairly distinguish between the case of States admitted (if without the consent of Congress) with or without a prior Territorial government.

But, again, it has been said there has been no prior census. To this I reply, that five if not six States have been admitted without such prior census; that there is no provision of the constitution, and no provision of public law, which makes it essential. The question addresses itself to the just discretion of Congress, whether, in point of fact, the population there is sufficient to entitle them to become a State. Now, sir, this population has increased beyond all my expectation, and I suppose beyond the expectations of almost all who hear me. The best information that we have upon this subject makes the population about 120,000. The last number of the *Alta California* gives the number of arrivals in San Francisco in the space of a little more than nine months, prior to the 1st of February last, as 48,000. Unquestionably large numbers entered the country from other points, and others, doubtless, left it. But I think there can be no doubt that in point of fact the population of California is amply sufficient to entitle her to admission.

I regret one thing, and that is, that she has elected two members to the House of Representatives. I think it would have been better and wiser to have waited the result of the coming census. But for that alone I would not reject or delay

57A

true; it is at least the inducement which controls emigration here—that controls emigration every where. You will never get a slave population to emigrate to that Territory with a view to constituting a political equilibrium. In the business of life, in the daily transactions of men, they are governed and controlled by other motives and other objects. Slave labor is Southern capital, and Southern capital, like capital of every other description, will pursue the general law of trade. It will go permanently nowhere except where the investment will produce an adequate return.

California, south of 36° 30′, embraces the town of San Diego, the city San Angelos, and other populous towns and villages along the coast. In point of fact, it was, I believe, the best populated part of the Territory prior to the late rush of emigration. Can it be required that we shall keep out that portion of California from the benefit of State government, with the expectation at some future day of the miraculous advent of a controlling slave emigration? Sir, it cannot be; it is hopeless, and the demand unreasonable. I know that our Southern friends may look at this as another mode of changing the equilibrium. Sir, no such equilibrium was ever intended, and if it were intended, it has been destroyed, not by reason of, but in despite of the action of this Government. In showing up the means by which this supposed equilibrium has been destroyed, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. CALHOUN) has ciphered up with the rest the amount of unoccupied territory appropriated to the two sections since the adoption of the constitution. He seems to have forgotten that it is not territory *unoccupied*, but occupied (of which the South has two acres to our one) that alone could effect such results. He seems to have overlooked another striking fact, when saying that this equilibrium has been destroyed by the action of this Government; a fact, indeed, in our political history, which has been wholly overlooked through all this debate. The action of this Government hostile to the South, forsooth! Why, sir, do they remember that, since the adoption of the constitution, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida have all been added to the slave territory of the Union, by the direct action of this Government, out of territory acquired since the adoption of the constitution? Up to the 28th December, 1848, there had not been a solitary free State added, except out of land which we owned upon the treaty of peace in 1783, recognising our independence. By that treaty with Great Britain our boundary ran from the northwest point of the Lake of the Woods due west to the Mississippi, thence down the Mississippi. That boundary was never disputed by France, or any other Power; and before the admission of Iowa there had not been a solitary free State formed, except out of territory on this side of the Mississippi. Now I appeal to the Senate, and to the country, how, in the face of palpable facts like these, can it be contended that the equilibrium has been changed by the action of the Government? If it has been changed, it has been done by causes over which the Government had no control, and in despite of its constant action to the contrary.

Again, it is said that it is not just or fair that the adventurers who first rushed into this Territory should settle its organic laws, and thus presume to exclude the institutions of the South. And yet, Mr. President, this is but the history of all Territorial Governments. The first who go there, as soon as there is a sufficient number, settle the organic law of the Territory; some in longer, some in shorter time. Alabama settled her organic law by forming her constitution in little over two years after she became a Territory. Circumstances will force the settlement of one Territory more rapidly than another, but as soon as their population is sufficient, and they have complied with other essential preliminaries, equal justice requires that we apply one rule to all.

I admit, sir, if the influx of population were made in fraud of the rights of the South, and merely with a view to exclude their institution, it would present a question for the exercise of a just discretion by Congress. But in this case nothing like this is pretended; the settlement has been in good faith, with a view to business interests, and not to the political control of the country. But there is another reason why we should look favorably upon this application; the Government has itself encouraged and fostered this rapid growth and sudden development of California. Witness its great mail system, its line of steamers, the routes secured across the Isthmus, the ports opened, and revenue collected upon the other side of the continent! The Government, in connexion with individual enterprise, has given such an importance to these Territories that an arrival of a steamer from Chagres is looked for with an anxiety equal to that of an arrival from the marts of the old world; aye, sir, and in the agricultural sections of our country with greater anxiety and greater interest. These are quick, unexpected, and unparalleled results. I had supposed that this influx of population upon that coast would before now have ceased, and as suddenly as it began, but I was mistaken. The precious metals still hold out, and the tide of emigration sets steadily, though not as strongly, as ever to the Pacific coast. There is one thing before us that indicates with some accuracy the present condition of that country. The constitution she has sent here shows the pay and salaries fixed for the officers of her government—sums better fitted for the meridian of California than of Washington, and least of all fitted for the people of a Territorial Government. Ten thousand dollars a year for their governor, and $16 a day to their members of the Legislature, with other salaries and incidentals in proportion, show that California either never was, or that she has passed the *grub-worm* condition; she spreads her

is a state of things brought about by your own policy, against which we have protested from the beginning; it has taken a turn against you which human foresight could not anticipate, and now you say compromise or we will secede. Sir, but for its importance, the claim, under all the circumstances, is almost laughable. The North has been led along as by a string, blindfold, for forty years, and now it has got in California a little the start, not by its wit or its wisdom, but by pure accident, and the South says *compromise* or we *secede!* Sir, if our friends of the South seriously mean to say that upon the admission of California they will hold it as ground of secession, in God's name let the trial come; let the issue be made. Never, never, can it come upon a point weaker for the South, or stronger for the North than that. If the power of this Government is to be tested, let it be tested just in such a cause, and just under such circumstances. But, sir, this is a useless anticipation; such a crisis can never originate in such a cause; the just feeling of the South will revolt against it. I hold, therefore, that the South makes no concession to the North in the admission of California, and we are bound to make no equivalent to them.

But, sir, in this connexion, and I suppose as connected with equivalents, a slave State has been spoken of in Texas. The great difficulty is, that they have got no men there to make a State of. They want, however, a legislative declaration of willingness upon our part to make a State when the men go there. Now, Mr. President, I do not know that that is of any service. There has been a legislative declaration of willingness made, as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. WEBSTER,) and I confess I am not fond of putting my willingness upon this subject upon paper. In point of fact I am not willing, but still I suppose it must be done when the time comes. Whatever other gentlemen may say upon the subject, I cannot but think the Government is bound to do so upon the fair construction of the contract of annexation. But, as before stated, I am opposed to all unnecessary expressions of willingness in advance. I will abide by the contract, but I did not make it, and will not *willingly* do it. I will do it if the time shall ever come, (which I hope may be far distant,) because, acting as a fair man, I cannot help it. I think, as a legal proposition, that matter is rather too plain to be controverted.

The clause in the resolution for the annexing of Texas is this: "New States, of *convenient size*, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having *sufficient population*, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which *shall be entitled* to admission under the provisions of the Federal constitution;" and those States formed south of 36° 30′ "*shall be admitted* into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire." Mr. President, neither I nor my friends voted for that resolution. Texas was annexed in pursuance of it, in despite of our remonstance and opposition. But the act being done, the obligation of good faith is imperative upon the Government. There is no escape from it. Two answers are given to this. The Senator from New York (Mr. SEWARD) says it is true these States south of 36° 30′ may come in as *slave* States, if they desire it; but Congress may refuse to admit them as States at all, and, as I understand, for the reason that they are slave States. This seems to me a clear evasion of the contract. The resolution says "they shall be *entitled* to admission;" it says "they shall be admitted," with or without slavery, as *they*, not we, desire. I would not hurry or anticipate the time of their admission, but, on the contrary, shall be very careful to exact a full compliance with all precedent conditions; but when a State of a "convenient size," having a "sufficient population," shall apply, with the "consent of Texas," and in conformity with other provisions of the constitution, the letter and spirit of the resolution should be fairly complied with. That Congress may exercise, and is bound to exercise, a just discretion as to whether the preliminaries have occurred, no man can doubt; but the fact that they have chosen slave and not free institutions is *expressly excluded* from its consideration by the contract of annexation. To make the slave institution *a bar* to admission is to nullify that part of the resolution which says they "*shall* be admitted" with or without slavery as *they* may desire. Sir, I struggled against this resolution or contract then. I regret it now. But its terms are plain; the consideration of the question of slavery was expressly reserved to the newly-formed States by the act of admission, and the obligation of good faith demands that the Government abide the contract. But a second answer has been given by the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. HALE.) He says the resolution admitting Texas was unconstitutional, and consequently not binding; but without discussing that point—for it is too late to do so—we are precluded by the fact that Texas has been admitted; the contract has been thus far executed. The Government has taken the country under that contract. We cannot claim its benefit in that which makes for us, and disclaim its obligation in that which makes against us. This is not only a principle of good faith, but a rule of law recognised in every court, whether of equity or law, in christendom. No, sir; no, sir; let us stand by our contracts, without subterfuge or evasion, and that whether they be for us or against us.

Mr. SEWARD. I think my position was not stated correctly; but, if it is the pleasure of the Senator, I will wait until he gets through.

Mr. DAYTON. By no means. I will hear the Senator now.

a mutual understanding, the one passed the anti-slavery clause of the ordinance and the other put this clause into the constitution providing for the delivery of fugitive slaves; leaving us to understand that the one was in consideration of the other; and that we had now faithlessly refused to carry out that understanding. 57A

In the course of a few years, this statement, unless contradicted here and now, will become history; "*vires acquirit eundo*." I beg to ask upon what it rests? The ordinance, as drawn by Mr. Jefferson, was not defeated, but passed in 1784, without the anti-slavery clause. (It was a meager skeleton, wanting in all those noble properties which have since given it so just a celebrity.) It provided, as drawn by Mr. Jefferson, for ten States instead of five, which, if continued, would have made a great difference in the relative strength of the two sections of the Confederacy. As it was, it continued the law from 1784 to 1787. The subject-matter of the Northwestern Territory and this ordinance was then referred to a committee of the House, of which Mr. Carrington, of Virginia, was chairman. On the 9th of July, 1787, this reference was made; and on the 11th, Mr. Carrington, as chairman of that committee, reported the ordinance as it now is, without the anti-slavery proviso. On the 12th, Mr. Dane, a member of that committee, moved the insertion of this proviso as an amendment; and it was inserted unanimously. On the 13th the bill passed and became a law, having gone through all the forms of legislation in five days. Now it is supposed that this bill, with its anti-slavery clause, was connected with the clause in the constitution for the surrender of fugitive slaves, and that they were passed together and upon mutual understanding of the two bodies. By reference to the proceedings of the Convention which formed the constitution, it will appear that that Convention never approached the subject of fugitive slaves until the 28th of August, nearly seven weeks after the time that the Congress of the Confederation had passed the ordinance with the anti-slavery proviso in it! This would at once, and of itself, end the hypothesis, but there is no trace of any such understanding in the debates in the Convention; nor is there a trace of such an understanding, so far as I have seen, in the debates of the several State Conventions when they came to consider the adoption of this constitution. I have looked particularly into the debates in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and I find nothing of the kind. The only reference from which the consideration given the North for this consent to surrender fugitive slaves may be implied, I find in the remarks of General Pinckney, in the Convention of South Carolina. He, in speaking of the abandonment of the right of importing slaves after twenty years, said, in that connexion, that the South had secured a provision for the surrender of fugitive slaves, which they would not have been entitled to, and had made the best bargain they could. If there was any question (which is very uncertain) which had a bearing upon this fugitive slave clause, it was that provision for giving up the right of importation of African slaves after twenty years. I may add here, that the adoption of that constitution in the Convention of South Carolina was violently opposed, but when the decisive vote came there was a long burst of applause and approbation from the surrounding spectators; confusion followed; the minority protested against it as insulting to them, and the House was cleared. Long, long may it be, before other and different feelings shall reign in the hearts of that people!

I was speaking of the mode in which this fugitive slave clause came into the constitution, and deny that there is any evidence that it came there as a consideration for the anti-slavery clause in the ordinance of 1787. That clause as to fugitive slaves being there, as soon thereafter as might be, the act of 1793 was passed for the purpose of carrying the provision into effect. Upon that act of 1793, and the powers originating under it, there has been a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and, before I come to consider in detail this fugitive slave bill, it is necessary that we see what the Supreme Court has decided. I hold the case of Prigg *vs.* Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 16th of Peters, page 540, in my hand. I do not mean to read the case, but I wish to read some of the points which the case decided:

It lays down these principles, among others, that

"The clause in the constitution of the United States relating to fugitives from labor, manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right, on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can, in any way, qualify, regulate, control, or restrain."

Again: That

"The owner of a fugitive slave has the same right to seize and take him in a State to which he has escaped, or fled, that he had in the State from which he escaped; and it is well known that this right to seizure, or recapture, is universally acknowledged in all the slaveholding States. The court have not the slightest hesitation in holding that, under and in virtue of the constitution, the owner of the slave is clothed with the authority, in every State of the Union, to seize and recapture his slave, whenever he can do it without any breach of the peace, or illegal violence. In this sense, and to this extent, this clause in the constitution may properly be said to execute itself, and to require no aid from legislation, State or National."

Again: That

"The clause relating to fugitive slaves is found in the national constitution, and not in that of any State. It might well be deemed an unconstitutional exercise of the power of interpretation to insist that the States are bound to provide means to carry into effect the duties of the National Government, nowhere delegated or entrusted to them by the constitution. On the contrary, the natural, if not the necessary conclusion is,

if you pass such a law, I take it upon myself to say that you will generate a species of kidnapping, of fraud and outrage, which has been unknown even in the past history of this subject. I admit that the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is better than the provisions of the law as it now stands. That amendment provides, however, for the appointment of commissioners by the Federal courts of the United States, and I observe that by that amendment my little State would get between sixty and seventy commissioners, three to each county, for carrying this law into effect. Here, again, in the amendment as well as in the original bill, it seems to me there is a mistaken principle of action, of which I will speak further hereafter.

The second section of that law authorizes the individuals to whom judicial power is given, to issue process upon application of the claimant, before the arrest of the fugitive is made. That is right, unquestionably right. The only difficulty is, that, instead of being optional, if we have the power, it ought to be peremptory; because most of these difficulties arise from the fact that claimants act without process. A black male or female lives in a free community, and has, perhaps, for years; they are recognised as free by our laws, and have children born there, (as was the case of the female carried off by Prigg from Pennsylvania.) Upon some calm day a stranger, unknown to the community, presents himself there, and, without process or evidence, simply says, that man, or that woman, is my slave! The black denies it, and yet he lays violent hands upon that slave and carries him off by force. That community know nothing of the man who presents himself, nor of his right. They only know that the black has been there, perhaps for years, and supposed to be free. Can it be matter of surprise that, under such circumstances, there should be mobs, and riots, and outrages? The case is calculated to create excitement, and the feelings of all free communities revolt against it. It is, therefore, I say that if we have the power, it is best for the master as well as the slave, that we make the prior issue of process imperative, and not optional.

The third section authorizes the marshal and his deputies, of the federal courts of the United States, where force or violence is anticipated, to retain the fugitive in their own custody, and that they deliver him over to the claimant in the State where the claimant lives. Here is a new reading of the duties of United States marshals! A man who is marshal in Michigan is, under this provision, is compelled to deliver, and is of course held responsible under this law for the safe delivery, of a fugitive in Texas. These marshals are appointed under the Judiciary act of 1789; let me read a few lines from the 27th section:

"A marshal shall be appointed in and for each district, &c. whose duty it shall be, &c., to execute *throughout the district*, all lawful precepts directed to him, and issued under the authority of the United States, and he shall have power to command all necessary assistance in the execution of his duty."

He is then required to take the official oath and to give bonds as marshal of that district. He is appointed only to execute writs and other precepts or orders within the district. Now, sir, I put it to professional gentlemen on this floor, can you surcharge him with these additional duties, extra-territorial in their character? And if you do so surcharge him, are his securities responsible for their due performance?

But, sir, again: It is said that this demand for the delivery of a fugitive is a demand upon the jurisdiction of the State. I grant it. The act of delivery is, in contemplation of law, the act of the State. Now, recollect that all your authority to deal with this subject is an authority which comes from the constitution, and you cannot legislate an inch beyond the powers there given. When the constitution says the fugitive shall be delivered up on claim made, where does it mean he shall be delivered up? In this law you require that it shall be done in the State from which he fled. That is not the contitutional provision.

The power under the constitution is to deliver up, but to deliver up *on claim made*, and of course where the claim is made. Why, sir, take the preceding section of the same article, which requires the delivering up of fugitives from a criminal charge, the language of which is identical in this particular. Where is that delivery to take place? Can you, under the constitution, require the delivery of the alleged criminal in the jurisdiction from which he fled? No man can pretend it. That delivery under the constitution can only be made *then* and *there*, and if you attempt to legislate beyond that, you are legislating outside of the powers conferred by the constitution. I hold, therefore, that we are without power to pass this part of the 3d section of the act.

But there is another provision in the section, and that is that the marshals shall have the power in certain cases to call assistance for purposes therein specified. Sir, this is simply unnecessary; by the judiciary act of 1789 any marshal has already the power to call all such assistance as he may require for the execution of his duties. This 3d section of the bill is then in its parts unconstitutional and unnecessary.

The 4th section is obnoxious to the same criticism applied to the preceding, only with increased power and force. It provides that in the event that there shall be no marshal or deputy within ten miles, the person issuing the warrant shall appoint some fit person to execute it, and deliver up the fugitive, with all the powers to call assistants, &c. named in the preceding section. Of course this subjects the section to the remarks which I have applied to the preceding one. It moreover develops, in its fullest extent, the incongruous character of this law. Here you are appointing postmasters,

say, first enacted in 1836, and again re-enacted, jury can be summoned in an hour; there is no harassing and annoying delay, nor any but the most trifling expense about it. It is simply the substitution of another tribunal in the place of the judge or commissioner who has been proposed to try the questions of fact. Nor do you have to prove any thing more before a jury than you would before a judge or commissioner. You have to prove exactly the same things, nothing more or less. 16C 57A

But my learned friends from Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina say that this is a change of *venue*. With all respect, sir, I assert that it is nothing of the kind. It is a change of nothing but the character of the tribunal that is to try the question of fact. The finding of that tribunal and the finding of the judge or the commissioner has the same effect, and none other. They investigate the same matters—decide upon the same evidence—and you have to prove no more before the one than before the other. How, then, can it be said that it is a change of venue? The finding of a jury and the judge's order thereon for delivery has no effect upon the question of the abstract right of property; but it is effective *then* and *there*, and for the purpose only contemplated by the constitution; to wit, the delivery up of the slave or its denial. But suppose, after a finding in the fugitive's favor, he return to the state from which he fled, could he plead the verdict or denial of the order of delivery in bar of the claim of the master to his service? Or, if the verdict were in favor of the claimant, could that in a Southern State, to which he might return with his slave, vest a title if he had none before? Would it *bar* the negro's claim in your courts to his freedom? Surely not. It is conclusive only for the purpose which is *then* and *there* under consideration: a verdict is not on general principles pleadable in bar; it is the judgment alone which has that effect; and in this case that consists of nothing but *an order for delivery*. A jury under these circumstances is any thing but injurious to the interests of the claimant, or insulting, as supposed, to the rights of the South.

But, sir, the whole argument against the allowance of a jury is based upon a supposed analogy between the two provisions in the constitution relating to fugitives—the one relating to the delivery up of fugitives from justice, the other to fugitives from labor. My learned friend from North Carolina (Mr. BADGER) said yesterday or the day before that the cases were identical. How strange that, on a question of legal construction, we should so widely differ! To my mind the line of distinction between the two is as broad and clearly marked as a turnpike. Let us look and see whether the argument based upon this position is well founded. Here is one section:

"No person *held to service* or labor in one State, &c., *escaping* into another, &c., shall be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom *such service or labor may be due.*"

Now, upon this claim of fugitive slaves, what is to proved? You are in the first place to prove that the person was held to service; in the second place that he has escaped from such service; and in the third place that the service is due to the person making the claim. That is not only plain on the face of the constitution, but if you look at the decision of the Supreme Court before referred to, it recognises a full and fair hearing of this entire question upon the merits, and says in substance that the question of *title* may be gone into. Well, sir, upon the provision under which the claimant claims the slave, cannot the slave offer evidence that he is no slave, that he is no fugitive: cannot he bring testimony that the claimant is not and was not his master? And yet if this tribunal were the mere "*committing*" tribunal—as is so earnestly contended by these Senators—a tribunal sitting to take preliminary evidence to ascertain whether there was a *prima facie* case sufficient to justify an arrest and commitment for trial, would the fugitive have a right to such evidence in chief? Does criminal ever exercise such right? No, sir, nothing of kind. The constitution contemplates a full and impartial hearing with a view to the decision of the question there submitted, and the slave is not to be given up until those things are satisfactorily proved. Now, let us look at the provision which provides for the delivery up of criminals fugitive from justice; which they say is in language identical, and that the practice under the former should assimilate with that under the latter. Here it is:

"A person *charged* in any State with treason, felony, other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall on demand of the Executive authority of State from which he fled be delivered up, to be removed the State having *jurisdiction* of the crime."

Sir, is there no distinction between the two sections? In the one case the constitution makes the plain question, is he a slave, a fugitive, and the claimant his owner? In the other, the question made is, has the person been *charged* with crime, and has he fled? If so, he is not to be tried where found, but in *the jurisdiction* where alone he could be tried, and that is where the crime was committed. By the act of '93 if you produce an affidavit or copy of an indictment, duly authenticated, *charging* him with crime, he is to be delivered up. But the Senator from North Carolina, in reading this provision, comments upon the passage charged with treason, felony, or other crime, "who shall flee from justice" to another State. Fleeing from justice, says the Senator, would imply that the man must be guilty; and yet he is not permitted to show it. But, sir, this is no fair construction of the clause. The meaning of it is indicated by the previous part of the section, "any person who shall be *charged* and shall flee;"

57A

Edward A. Hannegan of Indiana was Elected a Senator from 1843. to 1849 was Chairman of the Committee on Roads and Canals and on Enrolled Bills —

in the Senate December 30. 1845. there was a debate on the Resolution introduced by Senator Hannegan relative to the Territory of Oregon. and the Substitute Mr Calhoun and Mr Crittenden offered. the debate was listened to with intence interest by a very Crowded Audience for 4. hours —

Mr Hannegan. Mr Calhoun Mr Archer Mr Haywood and Mr Clayton Allen took part in the debate

in the Senate April 1. 1846 Mr Hannegan made a Speech on the Oregon Question at the Close of and during its delivery there were repeated acclamation from the Galleries So much that Mr Webster rose and Said. this thing is So very indecorous that if it shall Occur again

MATERIAL TOO LARGE TO BE FILMED AS A WHOLE FILMED IN SECTIONS ONLY

HANNEGAN OF INDIANA

Remarkable Career of a Brilliant United States Senator.

NED HANNEGAN'S GRANDFATHER

His Part in Bringing About the War with Mexico—An English Woman's Tribute to Him—The Tragedy that Clouded His Eventful Life.

16C
58A

THE killing of young Hannegan at Fort Monroe calls to mind the brilliant but unfortunate career of his grandfather. Forty-five years ago Edward A. Hannegan, or "Ned" Hannegan, as he was familiarly known, was the most brilliant man in the United States Senate. He was not a man of great learning or of profound reasoning powers in debate, but was possessed of a weird and persuasive eloquence that none could resist. His public career was short, but from 1844 to 1849 his name was familiar to all readers of the debates of Congress. He had served a term in Congress before he was elected to the Senate, and his choice for a seat in that body was one of the strange turns the political wheel sometimes makes.

The term of Oliver H. Smith was expiring and a heated contest had been carried on in the State for the successorship, Smith being the choice of the Whigs and Gen. Tilghman A. Howard of the Democrats. The campaign was the most spirited that had ever taken place in the State, the candidates of the two parties canvassing the State as Lincoln and Douglass did Illinois a few years afterward. The result was a tie vote on joint ballot. The Democrats had one majority, but one of the Democrats, David Hoover, had been elected from a Whig county on the distinct pledge of voting for Smith. When the time came to vote he broke his pledge, and with Daniel Kelso, a Whig, voted for Hannegan. After several ballots Gen. Howard withdrew from the race and Hannegan was elected.

It is said of Kelso that he had been elected to the legislature by one vote, that of an old farmer, who refused to go to the polls until the last moment, when he was promised a new pair of boots if he would go and vote for Kelso. He arrived at the polls just as they were about to be closed. His vote decided the contest in favor of Kelso. The latter refused to stand by the party candidate for the Senate and voted for Hannegan from the beginning, notwithstanding Hannegan was a Democrat.

It is also said of Hannegan that he was in reality opposed to the war with Mexico, and fought all attempts in that direction, but finally was induced to change and go with his party, and that his vote was the one needed to bring about the war. If these are facts, it shows that a vote of an old farmer in Indiana, bought for a pair of boots, was the wedge that brought about the war with Mexico, and which made Gen. Taylor President, and gave California to the Union.

During his service in the Senate Mr. Hannegan made several speeches which attracted the attention of the country, but the most notable one was on the Oregon question. Those who are old enough to remember the contest of 1844 will remember that the shibboleth that gave to the Democratic party the victory of that year was what was known as the four "F's," "Fifty Four Forty or Fight," having reference to the boundary question between Oregon and the British possessions. The declaration of the Democratic party was that it would insist on fifty-four degrees and forty minutes as the northern boundary line if it involved a fight with Great Britaln. Hannegan had taken the stump in Indiana on that issue, and when President Polk proposed to abandon it he assailed the President from his seat in the Senate in a speech that rung throughout the country. Of Mr. Polk he said:

> So long as one human eye remains to linger on the page of history the story of his abasement will be read, sending him and his name together to an infamy so profound, a damnation so deep, that the hand of resurrection will never drag him forth. So far as the whole tone, spirit, and meaning of the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina are concerned, if they speak the language of James K. Polk, then James K. Polk has spoken words of falsehood with the tongue of a serpent.

He closed his speech with the follow-

Hannegan was very nervous and excited during the evening, but nothing was said by either of them about their dead friend until about bedtime, when Hannegan sprang to his feet and in a very excited manner said:

"Joe Collett, has John Porter been back to you?" Mr. Collett replied in the negative, and asked the same question in return, when Hannegan replied:

"No. And now I know there is no coming back after death. John Porter never broke his word."

In his best days Mr. Hannegan had no rival on the stump in Indiana, yet there were then living such men as Joe Marshall, George G. Dunn, Ashbel P. Willard, Sam Parker, and Caleb B. Smith. In those days the platform was the great theater for disseminating political ideas, and oratory was a gift much more highly honored than now. He was not logical or argumentative, but never failed to carry his audience with him. As a lawyer he was peculiarly successful before a jury.

One incident in his life bears a very marked resemblance to one that is related of Mr. Lincoln. When Mr. Hannegan was on his way to Covington in search of a location to practice his profession, night overtook him while still in the dense forest. After wandering about for awhile he at last saw a light in a small cabin. He asked and received permission to stay all night. The next morning he offered to pay, but no charge was made, much to his delight, for he only had a few shillings in the world. Sometime afterward a rich neighbor of those who had so kindly entertained him, murdered the son of his host. Hannegan volunteered to prosecute, and despite all the money and influence of the prisoner secured a conviction.

It was Mr. Hannegan who first introduced the late Bishop Simpson to an Eastern audience. The distinguished politician and the distinguished preacher knew each other in Indiana, where Simpson was president of Asbury University. While Hannegan was in the Senate he prevailed upon Mr. Simpson to visit Washington. The Senator did his utmost to get an audience for the preacher, but the first sermon was delivered to empty benches, but the few who were there soon spread abroad the story of the wonderful eloquence of the Western preacher, and from that time on, so long as he remained, he had crowded houses to hear him.

In the spring of 1852 a great shadow fell on this brilliant man. One day he and his brother-in-law, Capt. Duncan, became involved in an altercation while both were sadly under the influence of intoxicants. Mrs. Hannegan, who was present, prevailed upon her husband to go up stairs to his room, when her brother attempted to follow him. She tried in vain to prevent him. Hannegan was lying on the bed when Duncan approached him, calling him a coward, and then slapping him in the face. A Spanish dagger, which had been presented to Mr. Hannegan, was lying on a table. Mr. Hannegan seized it and plunged it to the hilt in Duncan's body. Friends soon surrounded the wounded man, who had gone to his own room.

The captain declared that he alone was to blame. Hannegan hearing this rushed into the room and bathed his dying friend with his tears. Capt. Duncan died the next day, and was buried in the Covington cemetery, but Hannegan never entered that enclosure afterward. He was never tried for the offense, but it preyed upon him and wrecked his life. In 1857 he went to St. Louis, and died there a year or two afterward, a victim to drink and remorse.

W. H. SMITH.

SUMMER OPERA. 58A

the northern boundary line if it involved a fight with Great Britaln. Hannegan had taken the stump in Indiana on that issue, and when President Polk proposed to abandon it he assailed the President from his seat in the Senate in a speech that rung throughout the country. Of Mr. Polk he said:

So long as one human eye remains to linger on the page of history the story of his abasement will be read, sending him and his name together to an infamy so profound, a damnation so deep, that the hand of resurrection will never drag him forth. So far as the whole tone, spirit, and meaning of the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina are concerned, if they speak the language of James K. Polk, then James K. Polk has spoken words of falsehood with the tongue of a serpent.

He closed his speech with the following:

For the singleness and sincerity of my motives I appeal to Heaven. By them I am willing to be judged now and hereafter, so help me God, when, prostrated at thy feet, I falter forth my last brief prayer for mercy on an erring life.

The speech caused a great sensation throughout the country, and its bitterness stung the friends of the President almost to madness. When the war with Mexico came he sustained the President in all his actions, and Mr. Polk forgave him for his attack, or saw fit to appear to forget it, and at the close of his Senatorial career nominated him as minister to Pussia. He was promptly confirmed, but was recalled after a few months of services. His convivial habits led him into many indiscretions.

While in the Senate, in 1846, the friends of Mr. Dallas proposed to give him a banquet at Philadelphia. Mr. Hannegan was invited, but could not go. He sent, however, the following toast, which was caught up and repeated from one end of the country to the other:

Oregon—Every foot or not an inch; 54 degrees, 40 minutes, or *de lenda est Britannia.*

The committee replied:

The Hon. Edward A. Hannegan. The true hearted American statesman, who truly represents the people on the Oregon question—the whole of it or none; Oregon or war.

The effect of his speech on the Oregon question on those who were fortunate enough to hear it is shown by what Mrs. Maury, an English woman who was then traveling in this country said of it in a book she afterward wrote of what she saw and heard in her travels. She was fascinated with Hannegan and devoted a chapter of her book to him. Among other things she said:

This is a genuine son of the West—ardent, impulsive, and undaunted, thinking, acting, and daring with a most perfect freedom. His spirit is youthful and buoyant, and he is ever sanguine of success, though he feels acutely the bitterness of disappointment. Show me a gentler, more affectionate nature than Edward Hannegan you cannot, and believe me, the Western men in general resemble him. When Mr. H. made his speech on the Oregon question I was in the gallery immediately above, and in the excitement of the moment I threw down my glove to the speaker; it fell at his side. The chivalrous Hannegan immediately picked it up, pressed it to his lips, looked gratefully up to the gallery, bowed and placed it in his bosom. The fortunate glove was transmitted by the next day's post to the lady of the Senator then in Indiana. I preserve the less happy fellow to it.

Mr. Hannegan among ladies was the most courteous of gentlemen, and fascinated them by his manners as much as by his brilliant conversational powers. Usually he was the most gentle of human beings, but at times his anger would flash forth, and then his rage would be ungovernable. His home was at Covington, Ind., and for years a bitter rivalry existed between that town and Attica, in the same county. When the Wabash and Erie Canal was being constructed, water was turned in on the Attica level before it was on that of Covington.

This aroused the jealous anger of the people of the latter town, and one night about two hundred of them, armed and led by Hannegan, went to Attica and took possession of the locks, broke them open with axes, and let the water in on the Covington level. During the raid a difficulty arose with the citizens of Attica led by a man named McDonald. This caused a feud between McDonald and Hannegan that lasted for several years and often threatened to break out into bloodshed.

Mr. Hannegan had many of the superstitious notions of the Irish, from whom he was descended. He would not begin any important business on Friday or pay out money on Monday. Among his most intimate friends were Judge John R. Porter and Hon. Josephus Collett. When the cares of business permitted they were almost always together. One evening they entered into a compact that the one who first died should return to his friends, if it were possible, and give them words or token of what was going on in the other world. This covenant was renewed with clasped hands every time they met. Judge Porter was the first to die. Soon after Hannegan and Collett met one evening.

16C
58A

within this Chamber. I shall expect my right as a Senator that these galleries shall be cleared. with the exception of the ladies. (there being a gallery exclusive for ladies. when the Court, took possession of the old Senate Chamber they had it taken down)

in the Senate February 16. 1846 the Joint resolution on occupation of Oregon. being befor the Senate Senator Hannegan address the Senate in a long and well performed Speech in favor of the notice —

in the Senate May the 5. 1848 Mr Hannegan addressed the Senate on the bill to take temporary occupation of Yucatan —

in the Senate April 5 1848 Mr Hannegan made a Speech on the Joint Resolution tendering the Congratulation to the French People

in the Senate July 31. 1848 Mr Hannegan gave his reasons at som length for not introducing, the bill he gave notice of the

preceding day, he mad one of his eloquent Speeches ——

Mr Hannagan on the day that the Annocement of Senator Barrow death arose and poured forth a volume of Eloquence Such as rarely been heard (Excep Mr Clay) in the Senate Chamber Mr Hannegan was a man of fein gineing he had not been named among the Speckers on the occasion, and his display of Oratorical grace and beauty was made without premeditation, the effec was Marveloes, rarely all the Senators wear in tears and the large auditory Crouding the galleries and lobbies of the Senate was effected

in the Senate May 5. 1848 Mr Hannagan mad a Speech on the bile to key temporay occupation of Yucatan ——

16C 60

William H. Haywood of North Carolina was Elected a United State Senator from 1843. to 1846. when he resiend his Seat —

March 4. 1846 Senator Haywood mad a Loung Speech on the Oregon question not Concluedy he gave way for a motion to adjourn, — March 5 — he resumed and Concluded the Speech which he Commenced yesterday the was quite an Excitement throughout the entire Secne. his remarks may be found in the National Intelligencer of March 24. 1846

In the Senate July 27 1846. Senator Haywood resign. his Seat as one of the Senator from North Carolina, on the 28. Quite an interesting debate Accoured upon his resignation

James T. Morehead of Kentucky was Elected, United State Senator in 1841. he Served for the term of Six Years

in the Senate February 13. 1845 the Joint resolution from the House the annexation of Texas Coming up as the Order of the day — Mr Archer Moved that it be indefinitely postponed. Mr Morehead rose to address the Senate in Support of the Motion he proceeded to State the grounds on which he thought that the Joint resolution ought not to pass he Made an Able argument and was listen to with grate attention by the Senate and Galleys. it was of great force and Ability against the proposed Measure

16 C 62

Thomas Corwin.

with the exception of Henry Clay Daniel Webster. and John C. Calhoun. - no other Senator attracted the attention of the audience. as did Senator Corwin. I speak of him as I saw him (in the Senate) he was a remarkable Man. as a Speaker. he Stood among the first he infused into his Speches by his looks. and gestures a Comic element that gave point to his argument and kept his hearers Completly under his Controul he always abounded in anecdotes of the right Kind if he. if he Spoke three or five hours. his Speches was always too Short for his audience

in person he was Straight and erect five feet eight inches high. well built. large round head. Coal black hair and eyes full face. broad Chest. rather darke Complexion —

Thomas Corwin of Ohio
was Elected United States Senator
in 1845. he held tele he was
appointed Secretary of the Treasury
under President Fillmore. in 1850
his Eloquence was Singerlarly effective
perhapes nothing Contributes more to the
effect of his well Chosen Words than
his face that Swarthy face. was a
noble one. and there was no passion
or feeling in his heart, but is proclaimed
by his Countenance. befor Word Can
utter it, it is a Magic Mirror,
reflecting Upon his auditors. When
Speaking his fun Speaking Eye
was glancing from one Countenance
to another and his Whole face
radiant with inexhaustible
quiernesse While Speaking
I have Seen the hole Senate in
a roar of laughter and the

16C64

United States Senate,

WASHINGTON, D. C., , 189 .

Senator Corwin of Ohio
he was full of Wit and
Sarcasm. and used them
without Mercy — when an
opportunity offered

16C 65

United States Senate,

WASHINGTON, D. C., , 189 .

Senator Corwin of Ohio
he was a remarkable Senator
as a Speaker he. Stood among
the Senators as the bearing first
he was full of anecdotes and
knew how and When to use them
in person erect five feet six inches
high large round head, coal black
hair, and eyes full face
dark Complexion

16 C 666

galleys Clapping the hands and feet. While he was Speaking — entirly imposibed to keep order the Presiding officer. would order him to stop untill order was Mantained he was Coming Could Form the Wagon Dog

there was Simpthy pecliar in Senator Corwin Speeches in the Senate. When he had any thing particulary good. to say he told it in a Confidentle Manner ale most inaudible in the Gallerys as if it was only for his fellow Senators

in the Sen July 24. 1848 the Corwin adressed the Senate for three hours against the bill to Give a Territorial Government to oregon

Senator Corwin. Whenever he made a Speech in the Senate. he allway, indulged in witticism. and

Sarcastic remarks, he could tele an anecdote, with finer effect than any other Senator that ever held a Seat in that body, during my recletion. his Wit was Spontanious, and Woundersfuely telling

in the Senate July 24. 1848 Mr Corwin mad a Witt Speech which was listen to with great attention on the bile Establish Territorial Governmt in Oregon ——

in the Senate January 23. 1849 Senator Corwin mad a pirsonal explanation in answer to Senator Foot

Senator Corwin of Ohio made a Speech on the Three Million Bill, it being known that he was to adress the Senate long before the tem for the Senate to Meet the galleries were crowded with ladies and allway outnumbereing the gentlemen and jest befor the Senator commenced his Speech permission of the Senate was given for the ladies to occupie the floor, the was a greate rushing in to the Chamber and filling it so that it was impossibel for the Page or Senator to moove, he was a vary attractive Speaker he was unlike any other Senator in his extraordinary powers. Pathos, Irony and Sarcasm. he had a peculiar expression of face and of eye, as no other Senator had, he had a quick perception of whatever was Comic, I have often seen him throw the Senate into a fit of laughter

16C69

Garrit Davis of Kentucky
was Elected a United States Senator
in 1861. Served on the Committee
on Foreign Relations and on Territories
he was a man of honorable bearing
as well as vigorous talents.
Senator Davis of Kentucky never feared
to speak his sentiments upon any and all
questions befor the Senate or about
men who were likely in or desired
to be in office — Several of the Pages
of the Senate have told me they did
not like to wate on him. I ask them
why they said that he was cross. and
if they did not goe to him Quick
that he would Cuffe them I told
them that he was old and they must
not take any thing of it —

In Senate April 22. 1861. Mr Davis addressed the Senate on the Confiscation Bill also on the 23. Same Subject

PROPOSED EXPULSION OF A SENATOR.

The resolution proposing to expel Mr. DAVIS, of Kentucky, coming up as the special order for this day—

Mr. DAVIS, prior to the resumption of debate upon it, caused the following letter from himself to the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, to be read from the Secretary's desk:

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 20, 1864.

SIR: I was taken wholly by surprise at the presentation of the resolution to expel me from the Senate. I had not expected or even thought of any resolution which was made the ground of that proceeding, or any one, or the whole of the series producing any such movement. I therefore avowed, in substance, distinctly that the mover of the resolution for my expulsion interpreted the resolution on which he based his erroneously and injuriously to me; that in offering those resolutions I had no purpose to invite the army to mutiny, or the people to sedition, or any violence whatever; but it was to exhort the whole people, North and South, to terminate the war by a constitutional settlement of their difficulties and reconstruction of the Union; and that the series of resolutions would not fairly admit of any other construction; all of which I now reaffirm.

I am prompted to make this disavowal again, in this form, to place it upon the records of the Senate, it having as yet only appeared in the report of its debates. And with this note, which I request you to lay before the committee, I submit the case on my part to its action

Yours, &c. 16C 71A GARRETT DAVIS.

on one occasion I was in the barber Shop of the Senate. Senator Reveles, of Mississippi was setting in the Chair getting Shaved. Senator Davis Came in to get Shaved and saw Reveles in the Chair, he turned around and left the Room. Says he wanted not Seen there any More — and he did not.

(continued)

16C 71

Jabez W. Huntington

Senator Huntington of Connecticut to my Recolection. the State of Connecticut. has never at any time had a more promenent Senator he was what I Could a Working Senator When ever he Spoke he was fully prepard. and was always ready. as a Speaker he was Clear distinct plain and went directly to the question. without any flourish. he was listened to with interest by the hole Senate, in person. he was under the Common height large head, Roman Nose. wide Mouth dark brown hair blue eyes, his voice was Clear Shrill. he took part in most of the debates in the Senate

16 C 72

Jabez W. Huntington of Connecticut
was Elected United States Senator in 1840 -
and Served Untile his death Which Occurred
at Norwich Connecticut November 1. 1847 -
in the Senate on the 12. of Febuary 1844 - Mr
Huntington Maed a Speech on the Resolution from
the Committee on Finance to reduce the duties on
Foreign Imports he Spok in tel 4. Oclock - and
then gave way for a Motion to adjorn -
Febuary 13. Mr Huntington Concluded his remarks
and his Speech attracted grate ~~atracten~~ attention from
the Senatin and the Gallerys
in the Senate December 22. 1845 Mr Huntington
Made a Speech on the Resolution for the addmission
of Texas in to the Union
Mr Huntington Spoke for two days Febuary
21. and 22. 1845 on the Resolution for the
annexation of Texas
in the Senate April 13. 1846 he maed a
Speech on the Oregon Question,

16 C 73