

when we are defeated, who do not, instead of walking with their heads down, stand up to the work; every man who is not ready to shoulder a musket and go and fight whenever his country needs him. Such men I call copperheads. The gentleman overlooked the point I made, that the scoundrel who hisses that slander and lie into a foreigner's ear pretends to be an American citizen, and is a native of the soil and a Northern man.

Mr. BILLINGSLEY. With the gentleman's permission, I will say that when I used the expression I am a Roman citizen, it was in regard to the charge of Cicero against Verres in his oration against his exactions, that even the exclamation "I am a Roman citizen," that had always been respected up to that time, did not save a man from the scores of the lictors. I said also, that we boasted of being American citizens; but did that save us from the desolation of our homes? I ask the gentleman whether he justifies this Government in going into Maryland and taking away by force the servants that are of no use whatever to the Government, the aged women and children.

Mr. PUGH. The gentleman will be answered hereafter. I understood perfectly well the manner in which the gentleman used the words "Roman citizen;" and I only appealed to him as having recalled the *talismanic import* of those words, to join with me in this anathema against a base American citizen.

May there never be for him in any country or in any clime, a sterile rock or blade of grass that he can call his own. May his fate be that of Arnold, who in the presence of Talleyrand, exclaimed, "I am the only man born in America who can raise his hand to Almighty God and say, I have not one friend, not one in all America." Such American citizens do not deserve to have a country or protection.

I admit the fact also, that some Northern men favored the slave trade, abhorrent as it is, and would probably do so to-day just as the leaders—the outspoken leaders of this rebellion, and in fact a large majority of all slaveholders would favor it to-day.

It has never been suppressed, never will be suppressed until slavery is abolished. Ever since the act of 1820 was passed, it has existed and been winked at, and every brute engaged in it protected by chicanery and finesse. It was placed on the statute books with all honesty doubtless, but in view of results under it, the impression must prevail that it was only placed there to look well—a soothing potion administered sideways to appease an outraged community.

What is the fact? The statute has been written, the laws enacted since 1820; during forty-one years there was not one convicted under it. The first was that of Gordon, in

November, 1861, and that happened only because it suddenly occurred to the American people and the government which they elected and were ready to sustain, that the institution of slavery was driving its fangs into the vitals of the nation and must die. It was only when the government had become at least partially anti-slavery.

And how can the slave trade be suppressed effectually as long as the system of slavery itself exists? It is a part of the *system*. You create a market more enticing, appealing more strongly to the cupidity of men than any other known. The adventurer need only dodge the law (not vigilantly guarded or promptly executed) which he knows you wink at, and he receives at your hands an immense reward. He supposing that he has the patriarchal ideas that you have, (and you would certainly encourage him to entertain them) knows, firstly, that the institution is beneficial to the African race, for you teach him so; secondly, that the whole Christian and political community with whom he associates sustain it and demand its protection and diffusion. Hence how can he be otherwise than convinced that the law which makes his act piracy is a mere matter of form, and means nothing practical.

Rest assured, gentlemen, the only enemies of the infernal slave trade, denominated piracy, are those who are also the enemies of the institution of slavery itself; that all arguments that can be made to support the one will support the other, that when you once indorse the idea that one man can absolutely own another, the limit is reached, and there is no atrocity against human nature that cannot in some manner be justified after that.

It was this infamous commerce that first roused the people in this country; but their opposition was of a mild form. The original abolitionists of the North were opposed to all governmental interference with the institution; they only claimed the right to speak and persuade people of the wrong.

The institution meantime had not become the lever of political power that it afterward became. The opposition to the admission of Missouri was rather a moral than a political opposition on the part of a large portion of its opponents in the North. Then the cotton gin was invented, and avarice shook hands with vice. The evil grew ponderous and the opposition alarmed; and such was the skill with which this lever was handled, and such the force with which it operated by appealing to the prejudices of the people, raising the cry of negro equality, &c., holding constantly the balance of power, having one watch-word that rallied the whole section to their standard, that indeed it seemed at one time as though the wrong would triumph, and the country be a slaveholding nation as a whole.

Then came the compromise measures of