

Every affirmative vote was cast by a Democratic Senator, including that of my former colleague in the Senate from Iowa. Every Republican voted in the negative.

They oppose the restriction of the sale of the public lands to actual settlers, and thus place the pioneer on the frontier at the mercy of "land sharks," who amass fortunes out of the hard earnings of the patient sons of toil. They oppose the Homestead Bill, which proposes to give lands to the landless, for settlement and cultivation, as freely as they receive the air, the rain, and the sunshine, as the Almighty designed when he created these broad prairies and these fertile valleys. Here is the record of the vote in the Senate on this beneficial measure:

YEAS—Messrs. Allen, Bates, Bayard, Bigler, Bright, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Hammon, Houston, Hunter, Iversen, Johnson of Arkansas, Mallory, Mason, Pearce, Polk, Reid, Sebastian, Shields, Thompson of New Jersey, Toombs, Ward, Wright and Yates—30.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Bates, Bayard, Bigler, Bright, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Hammon, Houston, Hunter, Iversen, Johnson of Arkansas, Mallory, Mason, Pearce, Polk, Reid, Sebastian, Shields, Thompson of New Jersey, Toombs, Ward, Wright and Yates—30.

Every Republican voted for the measure; every negative vote was cast by a Democrat.

They propose the occupancy of several of the more feeble Mexican States and portions of Central America by the armies of the United States, at an additional cost of several millions per annum, with a view to their acquisition and conversion into slave territory; and the direct purchase of Cuba, at a cost of at least one hundred and twenty millions, to increase the number of the Slave States. This is a great southern measure, carefully matured and deliberately adopted.

It is intended by this means to strengthen and fortify their system of slave labor so as to place it beyond the power of freemen of the North ever to acquire the control of the government. The initiatory step was taken at the last session of Congress in a proposition to place thirty millions of dollars in the hands of the President to be used in facilitating the acquisition of this island, to be followed by an appropriation of from one hundred and twenty to two hundred millions of dollars, as the purchase price; to be afterward collected principally of the Northern people as the cost of their political subjugation. This monstrous proposition received the support of every northern Democrat in the Senate. On a test question to "lay on the table," the vote stood:

YEAS—Messrs. Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Doolittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, Harlan, Kennedy, King, Seward, Simmons, Trumbull, Wade and Wilson—18.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Douglas, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hunter, Iversen, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Lane, Mallory, Mason, Polk, Pugh, Reid, Rice, Shields, Sebastian, Sidel, Smith, Toombs and Ward—30. (Cong. Globe, Part 2, 2nd Session 35th Congress, page 1363.)

Of course, other reasons are advanced for the acquisition. It might be dangerous to proclaim their purpose to be to neutralize the voice of Republican Iowa in the U. S. Senate with a couple of Creole Senators from Eastern Cuba—of Wisconsin, with a couple from Western Cuba—of New York with a couple of mongrels from Sonora. It is thought better to employ a coating of sugar, to render the pill a little more palatable.

The first reason advanced (for Northern consumption) is, "The expansion of the Republic to make room for our accumulating millions of people."

2. Its alleged advantages commercially as a mart for our agricultural products.
3. Its necessity for our national defence.
4. Its utility in the suppression of the slave trade.

That these reasons are spurious, scarcely admits of an argument. If real, the proposition would be more plausible. For no one objects to the expansion of our possessions by honorable means when required by the growth of the population; nor the admission of a foreign State when requested by the voluntary act of a people in a condition to enjoy civil liberty. But no one can pretend that this is true of the people of Sonora, Chihuahua, Cuba, or any of the Central American States. The Central American Confederation was dissolved long ago by internal dissensions, and its people have never since been able to re-construct a national government. The incapacity of the Mexican people to govern themselves has become proverbial. Mexico has had many Presidents, elevated by revolution, during the last few years, as Kansas has had Governors, appointed by Democratic Presidents to carry out the democratic interpretation of "squatter sovereignty." The necessity of its absorption, as contradictory as it may seem, is defended on the ground of incapacity of the people to govern themselves. The Cubans are of the same race; their competence for self-government will hardly be pretended. Hence their admission as States, could not be desired, at present, by the real friends of this Republic. To hold them as provinces to be governed by the appointees of the Executive of the nation, would be scarcely less dangerous.

Their acquisition would furnish no outlet for our people. Sonora and Chihuahua, in consequence of sterility, are incapable of supporting a dense population; Central America, in consequence of its climate and malaria, is certainly not desirable to a people who have lived for generations in a healthy and temperate country; and Cuba is now owned and occupied by a population more dense than that of the United States. It is an old country—older than Massachusetts or Virginia. It was permanently occupied by the Spaniards in 1511, nearly 350 years ago.

It is said to be about 750 miles long, and, on an average, forty miles wide; and, with its dependencies, to contain about forty-seven thousand square miles, and a population of 1,586,000—or an average of over 33 to the square mile. (Report No. 35, Senate Com., 2d session, 35th Congress, p. 13.)

In 1850, the average population to the square mile, of Virginia, was 23; of all the States of the Union, excluding Territories, about 15; of all the States south of Mason and Dixon's line, less than 10; and of all the States and Territories of the United States, less than 8. Hence the average population of Cuba is more than 43 per cent. greater than that of Virginia—120 per cent. greater than of all the slave states—and more than 400 per cent. greater than the average density of the population of our whole country. Since 1850, the population of the United States has probably increased 30 per cent., occurring principally in the new states; hence the foregoing estimate is subject to this modification; but with this modification, it will be seen that Cuba furnishes no room for the expansion of our population.

But we are not now oppressed for room.—Our possessions are very great. They are sixteen hundred miles in width, and span the continent from ocean to ocean, containing an area of nearly three million square miles; of which a very large surplus is unreclaimed land. In 1850, as shown by the Census Reports, the entire area of all the farms and plantations in the United States amounted to but 113,032,614 acres of unimproved land; in all, about 458,688 square miles. Add to this 30 per cent. for the probable effect of increase of population, and we have only 596,294 square miles owned and occupied in any way within the limits of our whole country; leaving 2,367,372 square miles for future occupancy. This will afford ample scope for our vast energies in developing our resources, and multiplying our population for many years yet to come; our population must be increased to nearly one hundred millions before it will equal in density that of Cuba at the present time.

With a full knowledge of these facts, grave statesmen could not commit the folly of using thirty million dollars in negotiation, to induce Spain to sell this island, at the price suggested of one hundred and twenty, or two hundred millions of dollars, to furnish an outlet for our population, when Cuba now contains a population equal to a family of eight persons for every quarter section of land subject to its jurisdiction. Wise financiers could not agree to pay at the rate of six or seven dollars an acre for the whole of this island, every acre of which is probably owned by private holders, while selling their own land for \$1.25 per acre in the Free States, and as low as 12¢ per acre in the Slave states! The absurdity becomes glaring when it is observed that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs estimates the net proceeds of the sale of all the public land disposed of in the United States up to the present time, over and above its cost, and the cost of survey and sale, and the fulfillment of stipulations with Indian tribes, at about one hundred million dollars! You have sold the land in ten or twelve States in the Mississippi valley for about one hundred million dollars, the whole of which with one hundred millions more, if demanded, the Democracy propose to give for Cuba—an island less than the State of Iowa! But in acquiring they remind us that they propose to imitate the illustrious Jefferson, who purchased Louisiana of the great Napoleon in 1803, at a cost of fifteen millions! Because Jefferson purchased Louisiana, containing about 899,000 square miles of territory, mostly uninhabited, out of which you have carved five great States, and have land enough for ten or twelve more, at about 2½ cents an acre, therefore the Democracy propose to pay at least one hundred and twenty millions for an island out in the Gulf of Mexico, on which there is not probably one acre of land not covered by some Spanish grant! They propose to pay this enormous sum for nothing but the naked right to govern Cuba—for in its purchase of Spain you would obtain "the sovereignty"—nothing else.

But Cuba, when acquired with one and a half millions of people, must come in like Texas, as one or more States, and under our form of government must govern herself! and send Senators and Representatives to Congress to assist in governing the United States! You will therefore, have obtained for this great outlay of public treasure, two or more creole United States Senators, and ten or fifteen creole members of the House of Representatives, at an average cost of ten or twelve millions of dollars per head, to aid the Slave States by their votes in acquiring still more slave territory, to be paid for principally by the Northern people.

Nor is it probable that the people of Cuba will ever become, as alleged, large consumers of the great staples of the North West—that they will ever consume large quantities of flour, and animal food, except lean beef. It is precluded by a physical law which annexation can never change. Cuba is a tropical country, where fatty animal food is not needed in large quantities even by laborers; its office and that of starchy matter, is said, by the learned, to be chiefly to generate heat for the animal system; the rays of a tropical sun supply its place. The Esquimaux, under the Pole, lives almost exclusively on "blubber"—it is consumed by the animal economy at its internal fires, to supply the rapid loss of animal heat. Under the equator, the food of the inhabitants is chiefly vegetable—consisting mostly of fruits. Even the beef of the north-west will never be in great demand in Cuba—it is too fat and too valuable, to compete in such a market with the lean cheap beef of South

America, suited to the wants of the inhabitants. Our staples must find their principal markets in the North, where needed by the masses for daily food. Small quantities will be sold in the South, and used as a luxury—like tropical fruits at the North.

The allegation so incessantly made by all the leading Democratic members of Congress during the closing days of the last session, that Cuba is the military key to the Gulf, that it commands the mouth of the Mississippi and its vast commerce, as well as the commerce of the Atlantic, with the Pacific coast—that all of this immense trade is carried on under the guns of her castles—that we would not dare to engage in a war with England or any great maritime power without the control of this island, is mere declamation. Cuba is not a new creation: it is as old as the continent; we have never owned it; and yet, when we were in our infancy as a nation, we "dared" to fight and to *flog*, in two successive wars, the greatest nation on the globe. If Cuba belonged to the United States, lying out in the Gulf, according to the map, more than one hundred miles from the nearest point of main land on our coast, and six or seven hundred distant from any considerable port in the United States, in the event of war with a maritime power, it would cost more men and money for its protection than all our other possessions.

The idea so industriously inculcated at the North by southern statesmen, that the transfer of the island of Cuba, of which there is not the slightest probability, to another European power, would be dangerous to the United States, and should be resisted at every hazard, even at the cost of war, is so supremely ridiculous, as to be amazing that the Northern Democracy do not treat its authors with derision wherever the disgraceful and cowardly proposition is mentioned. They seem to be oblivious of the fact, that Cuba is surrounded by islands now in possession of the English, the French, the Danes, the Swedes, and the Dutch, and yet no American is trembling in his boots for the safety of the Republic.

And no one can be serious in pretending that its acquisition would secure the abolition of the African slave trade, while it is being successfully prosecuted in the Carolinas and Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana and Texas.

These reasons, when candidly examined, all fail. The cat under the meal is badly concealed. The Slave-holders of the Nation demand the strengthening of the shackles which manacle the toiling millions of their miserable people by the admission of comparatively populous countries, not as public domain for an outlet to our swelling population, but as states to hold the balance of power in the councils of the nation; (Cuba has a dense population—and Sonora and Chihuahua, each has a population equal to that of Minnesota or Oregon, and if acquired, must be admitted as States) and the Democratic party now completely under their control, is required to perform this unwelcome service. Like the patient ox, they are commanded to bend their necks to the yoke—like the stupid ass, who still knows his master's crib, they are required to submit their backs to this burthen: and their leaders, like our mother Eve beguiled by the devil in the garden of Eden, are holding the tempting fruit laden with curses, to the lips of the people, and urging them to "eat," with the subtle logic that it is desirable "to the taste and good for the eyes."

I am aware that thousands in Iowa, who still propose to vote what will be styled the Democratic ticket, condemn most heartily the policy and practices of this Administration. They strangely delude themselves with the belief that the old Jeffersonian Democratic party is still in existence, and that Mr. Buchanan, alone, is responsible for the evils and errors to which I have alluded. This induces the inquiry—

7th. In what essential principal or practice does the Douglas Democracy differ from the Buchanan Democracy?

Are they not equally responsible with the Administration Democracy for the present condition of public affairs? Having aided in the election of Franklin Pierce, did they not become the leaders of the party during his Administration? Did they not initiate the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and defend the Kansas usurpations and outrages, on the close of his official term of office? Did they not abandon old party issues and affiliate with Whigs and Americans in the defence of the *one plank platform*—the constitutional right of slaveholders to carry their slaves into all the territories of the nation? Have they not denounced the "self-evident truths" of the Declaration of Independence as "self-evident falsehoods"—as "glittering generalities," and those who cherish the principles of Thomas Jefferson, as abolitionists? Do they not denounce those who, like Presidents Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Polk, and cotemporaneous Congresses, would protect every man's right to enjoy life, liberty and property in the territories by fundamental laws, as "traitors to the Constitution and the Union"? Have they not endorsed the Dred Scott Decision as a finality, binding the conscience of the nation to acquiesce in the spread of slavery to the limits of our dominions? Have they not acquiesced in the surrender of the machinery of the Federal Government into the hands of the Southern Democracy, and aided by their official acts in imposing enormous and unequal burthens on the northern people? Have they not clamorously united with their slaveholding brethren to read every Democrat out of the party, who, like Trumbull, Doolittle, Cameron, King, Hamlin, Broderick, Thos. H. Benton, M. L. Morris and S. J. Kirkwood, dared to oppose the Kansas-Nebraska Bill?

Did they not labor for the election of James Buchanan to the Presidency? Have they not endorsed his Utah, Cuban, Mexican, and Central American policy? Did they not vote in both branches of Congress to place armies and navies of the nation at the absolute control of the President, to be used at discretion in foreign countries? Did they not speak, and vote, and brow beat the Republicans of the Senate in a persistent struggle to secure the passage of a bill giving to the President the unrestrained disposal of thirty million of dollars "to facilitate the acquisition of Cuba?" Did they not oppose the Homestead Bill whenever its consideration conflicted with the success of this monster? On Mr. Doolittle's motion to postpone the thirty million Bill and take up the Homestead Bill, the yeas were:

Messrs. Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Doolittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, Harlin, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Seward, Simmons, Trumbull, Wade and Wilson—19.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Douglas, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hunter, Iversen, Johnson of Arkansas, Lane, Mallory, Mason, Polk, Pugh, Reid, Rice, Sebastian, Shields, Sidel, Toombs, Ward and Wright—20.—[Globe, p. 1362, Pt. 2, 2d Ses. 35th Con.]

But one Democrat, Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, voted with the Republicans in the affirmative. Every Northern Democrat voted against postponing the Cuba Bill, to take up the Homestead Bill which had passed the House of Representatives, and was awaiting the action of the Senate. Even Mr. Douglas abandoned the interests of the laboring man of the north, for the purpose of extending the area of slavery. That I may do him no injustice, I quote from his Baltimore speech of last January:

"Permit me here to remark that the slavery question rests upon laws higher than those of legislative enactments. It depends upon the laws of climate, of production and of self-interest. Wherever cotton and sugar and rice and indigo are the staples and the climate is such as to exclude white labor, the negro must take the place of the white man on the plantation. When you get into those hot climates, it is not a struggle between the negro and the white man, but a struggle between the negro and the crocodile, which shall occupy the Delta line. In those Delta lands slavery must exist—negro labor must be employed, otherwise their cultivation must be abandoned; while in those high northern latitudes, where the earth is covered with deep snows, and where there is a severe climate, ill adapted to the constitution of the negro, and better suited to the white man, slavery can never exist, because it is not the interest of the people to have it."

Here is the Southern reason for the acquisition of Cuba, and Mexican and Central American States; "in these Delta lands slavery must exist;" they are down South under a burning sun; they produce "sugar and cotton," "indigo and rice;" from a necessity of climate, according to Mr. Douglas, their acquisition must add Slave States to the Confederacy.—The establishment of Homesteads for the millions of the landless would build up the North West—it would fill up Iowa and the new States with an industrious and independent yeomanry; it would give stability to civil society, remove want and beggary from our doors, and give resistless strength to the nation in times of foreign danger. But its consideration comes in direct conflict with a Bill to facilitate the acquisition of slave territory, and the Douglas Democracy, true to their Southern instincts, vote with the South. Mr. Douglas has laid up treasure for his children in the South, in slaves and "Delta lands"—and "where his treasure is, there is his heart also." Mr. Douglas has never joined issue with the South on any measure vital to their interests. He inaugurated the Kansas policy by his own act, and in its defence, he has stood firmly with the South, denouncing every effort of the people of the territory to shake off the incubus of slavery, as *revolutionary*, and every attempt of the Freemen of the North to aid them by voluntary contributions or congressional legislation, as *treasonable*, until the battle between slavery and freedom had been fought and won.

He then voted with the Republicans to prevent the imposition of a constitution on the people which they loathed. But even the Le-compton issue the Douglas Democracy now declare to be "dead and buried." So, according to the showing of the leaders of the Douglas Democracy, there is no longer any distinction between them and the Administration Democracy. They have never differed except on a single point which does not now exist.

Hence you have nothing to hope from the elevation of this wing of the Democracy to power, but a continuation of the policy which has controlled the government since 1854, when Mr. Douglas inaugurated the only plank now remaining in the Democratic platform—"the constitutional right of the slaveholder to remove, and hold his slaves as property in all the territories of the nation."

Had he been elected to the Presidency in 1852, he would have done substantially as Mr. Pierce, whose policy he sustained and defended throughout; had he been elected in 1856, surrounded by the southern influences that overwhelm the Democratic party, he would have done substantially as Mr. Buchanan has done; and were it possible—and I praise God that it is not—to elect him in 1860, the consummation of the policy of the Administration would become unavoidable.

The enactment of a slave code for the territories, the repeal of the laws prohibiting the African Slave Trade, the dismemberment of the Republic of Mexico, and the purchase of slave territory with northern gold, for the creation of other Slave States to secure the continuance of slavery in the Republic forever, and the continued increase of the expenses of the government, millions and millions per annum, would follow, as legitimate and inevitable consequences.

The Douglas doctrine, that the great fund-