

At the following terms, to wit:

\$1.75 per annum, if paid strictly in advance. \$2.00 if paid within 6 months; \$2.50 if not paid within 6 months.

No subscription taken for less than six months. No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher. It has been decided by the United States Courts that the stopping of a newspaper without the payment of arrearages, is prima facie evidence of fraud and is a criminal offense.

The courts have decided that persons are accountable for the subscription price of newspapers, if they take them from the post office, whether they subscribe for them, or not.

FREEDOM OF DEBATE.

Remarks of the Hon. D. W. Voorhees, of Indiana, in the House of Representatives, on the Resolution of Mr. Colfax, to expel the Hon. Alexander Long.

MR. SPEAKER: I had not the pleasure of hearing the gentleman from Ohio, nor have I yet read his speech. The position, therefore, which I assume to-day has no reference to the merits or demerits of his sentiments. I stand upon the naked right of an American representative in Congress to utter his own views. He is not there to utter my views. He is here to utter his own, responsible in a political sense to the people who sent him here, and in a moral sense to the God before whom we all hasten. And when I find a man seeking to become the judge of his brother in a matter of private conscience, I find one who would have burnt John Rodgers at the stake and have piteously flung around the shrieking victims at Southfield. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Schenck), who has just taken his seat, would have led the mob which petted the Saviour for the freedom of his opinion. He would have stood among the Scribes and Pharisees before the tribunal of Pilate, crying "Release Barabas," but as to the Nazarene, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" Free speech was as odious at that time on the hills of Judea as it is now in these halls, and had the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Schenck) lived then he would have been my enemy, as he is to-day.

Mr. Speaker, this is an old question. There is nothing new about it. The whole history of the world is written over in letters of blazing light with the cherished deeds of the champions of free speech. The same great record contains the eternal, withering, blasting infamy which forever clings to those who, as the champions of despotism, are to-day seeking to strangle it down. I stop not to determine whether I endorse his right to utter them here and elsewhere. The man who will not do it is himself a coward, and deserves to be a slave. Sir, such men are fit instruments to crush out liberty, and in the hands of a tyrant to make slaves of the people.

Let me read from an authority before which the pray light of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Schenck) pales like that of a rascal caught red handed to the sun at his fierce meridian. I read from Daniel Webster, whose great intellect is almost a full atonement to the country for all the faults of New England:

"When this and the other House shall lose the freedom of speech and debate; when they shall surrender the right of publicly and freely canvassing all important measures of the Executive; when they shall not be allowed to maintain their own authority and their own privileges by vote, declaration, or resolution, they will then be no longer free representatives of a free people, but slaves themselves and fit instruments to make slaves of others."

Sir, I take my stand on this doctrine. I will defend it in behalf not only of any man upon this side of the House but just as readily in behalf of a political opponent. In my opinion, I have heard from the opposite side of the chamber during my service in Congress more of treason than of treason—I withdraw the word; treason consists not in languages, but in acts; but I have heard much that was calculated to destroy and disrupt the government; much that was calculated to weaken the ties that bind us together as one people; much that tended to the extinction of liberty and the oppression of the citizen; much that I firmly believe is aimed at the destruction of the Constitution and the creation of an absolute despotism. I do not, however, propose to expel members for uttering those outrageous sentiments. They express an unquestionable right in giving their expression. And on the other hand I will allow no man to call in question my exercise of a similar right. I am alone responsible to my constituents. Who is to be my judge? Who is to be the arbiter here? Who is to say when I shall speak and when I shall be silent—what I shall say and what I shall not say? The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Schenck) little dreams of the consequences if he expects to crack his wily as the scorpion of this House, here or elsewhere. There is a million and a half of Democratic voters in this land who will be convinced with an agency of irrepressible rage when it is proposed that their Representatives shall be silent at the bidding of an insolent party, bloated with an unlawful power and steeped in the blood and tears of the nation.

Sir, I again ask who is to judge the principles held by a representative? Who is to be the arbiter on this great question? There can be only his constituents. He stands upon the Constitution. By it his freedom of opinion and speech is made secure. It cannot be abridged or disturbed. We can defy the world, as we here defy you, to lay the weight of your finger on this inalienable and immortal privilege. We yield to you your rights, and you shall yield to us ours, or it at once becomes a question of physical conflict. I tell you not for a moment to suppose that a gag can be placed upon the mouths of the free American people without blood running from the hills of New England to the mouth of the Columbia—all over the northern land. It is the last bulwark of liberty; it is the hope of freedom. Give us free speech; give us a free ballot-box, and we will stand all else, and respond to every call made upon us. Seek to strike these down, and the last hope of the country will go down in blood and darkness.

Sir, I desire and intend to discuss this great question in a proper temper. I have laid down the reason why I do not feel myself called upon to vote to expel any man from this House for the decorous expression of a political opinion. Neither will I vote to ensure him for such an act. Let me state this issue clearly and properly. I hold that the rules of the House protect its decorum, its personal relations, and whether men are gentlemen or not, enforce a strict

Bedford Gazette.

VOLUME 59.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

WHOLE NUMBER, 1649

EV SERIES.

BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 27, 1864.

VOL. 7, NO. 43.

Rates of Advertising.

One Square, three weeks or less	\$1.25
One Square, each additional insertion less than three months	30
Three months	3.00
6 months	5.00
1 year	8.00
Two squares	5.00
Three squares	7.00
4 columns	12.00
One Column	20.00

Administrators' and Executors' notices \$2.50, Auctioneers' notices \$1.00. If under 10 lines, \$2.00 if more than a square and less than 20 lines. Extras, \$1.25, if but one head is advertised, 25 cents for every additional head.

The space occupied by ten lines of this size of type counts one square. All fractions of a square under five lines will be measured as a half square and all over five lines as a full square. All legal advertisements will be charged to the person having them in.

regard for gentlemen in whose presence they are and with whom they associate. I hold that a man observing those rules has a right, under the Constitution, to express his political sentiments with the utmost freedom.

This is all I understand the gentleman from Ohio has done. You ask me to expel him. Is he my representative? Am I responsible for him? Are you? Another people sent him here. With that people I leave him. He is their mouthpiece. What is this Government? A representative Government means the voice of the people speaking here by every member upon this floor. The voice of your people of New York speaks through you (to Mr. Fernando Wood), and the voice of the constituents of my district from Cincinnati speaks through him. The people are here in their majesty speaking through their representatives. Ask your people to make war upon the people of my district and we will meet you at the threshold. Let any representative seek to silence the representative whom my constituents send here, and it is their insult as well as mine. The principle of representation is immediately destroyed by such a course. A large portion of the American people, perhaps a majority, are at once disfranchised. Their voice is hushed in the halls of legislation, and they are simply allowed the poor privilege of paying taxes and fighting at the bidding of a master.

Sir, I do not expect to agree with every man's sentiments, but is that a cause for me to seek to purge this House of all contrary opinion? Is that a cause for me to arraign men for the political scaffold? Is that a cause for me to follow in the wake of a modern Robespierre on a small scale of intellect and on a large scale in venom—the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Schenck)—who says men should be shot for their opinions? I know nothing in the character, nothing in the military or civil career, including his avowal on Vienna, which give him the right to assume superiority over the members on this side of the House. I listened to his low talk about Coppenhagen creeping out of their holes. It was not language becoming the place where he sits; it was becoming the precincts rather of a bar-room political gathering. Indeed, to judge from his allusions to Guiliver's travels, he would be more at home there than he is in the society of gentlemen. Sir, he volunteers this assault on this side of the House. We have not sought it. Every man who has served with me in Congress knows that I dislike and avoid personal controversy with my peers on this floor. But the tenor and tone of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio seem to invite, to challenge, to provoke unpleasant controversy. So far as I was concerned and those who sit around me, we respond with defiance.

Mr. Speaker, the general principles which I have thrown out on the subject of freedom of debate apply to every person. I am discussing now, not merely the right of a Democrat on this floor, I am discussing the right of every Republican on this floor. I go further. I am discussing the right of the humblest citizen of America, the right to escape the galling yoke of tyranny and oppression, the last right, what Mr. Webster properly called a home-bred right, a direct privilege, on the extreme boundary of which he declared he stood, and which should not be called in question anywhere. Run your mind's eye back over the history of the world; the dark spirit of bigotry and intolerance once chained down Galileo for saying that the world moved, laid him on the damp floor of a dungeon, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Schenck) would do with his political opponents. Opinion was divided. Some said that Galileo was right, some said he was wrong.

So it will be as to the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Long). But while he lay in his fettering irons on the floor of the dungeon, he exclaimed to himself, "The world still moves." Chained to his person did not chain his thought, could not control his opinion, nor contradict the fact which he had discovered. Thought is boundless, eternal, and cannot be chained or controlled. You are making a vain attempt. You are committing a sacrilege against the divinity of human nature. You invade the holy of holies with unclean feet, the most recesses of man's nobility, the right to think for himself. You are actuated by the same fell spirit which a few years ago struck down men because they worshipped God according to the dictates of their own consciences, because they worshipped Him with a crucifix in His Saviour in their hands. It is the same murderous and prospective spirit which in Puritan New England whipped, scourged, branded, and scared men and women of the Quaker persuasion. It is the same infamous and damnable spirit which has stamped undying, conflagrant, and abhorrence for all succeeding ages, on all the names that were ever connected with an attempt to crush the freedom of thought and the freedom of speech.

But, sir, let me go a little further in this connection. I have a kind regard for the Speaker of the House (Mr. Colfax). Nothing but personal kindness and acts of personal courtesy have ever passed between him and me. I regret exceedingly, however, that he has placed himself in the attitude of public accuser on this occasion. I think on a short review of the antecedents of his own political history he will come to the conclusion that I did when I heard he had fathered this prosecution, this accusation. I thought that a little charity would well become him, a little of the kindness of his natural nature, if I may be allowed to use a tautologous expression. I remember that at a time when this country was all at peace, when it was waving on a happy, almost unruffled sea, a piratical craft was suddenly launched on the political waters by one Hinton Rowan Helper, who, if I am not mistaken, now holds office as Consul to Buenos Ayres under the Administration you so much love. His book of infamous notoriety, recommended assassination, recommended cowardly slaughter, recommended that slaveholders be killed by sycophant administrators by their slaves, recommended the torch to the roof and the knife to the throat of men,

women and children, declared total exterminating war against slave-holders in express terms.

If any body disputes this I have the book here to convince them. I lamented, I bowed my head with grief, when that incendiary book appeared with some sixty-eight names of the Republican members of this House appended, and the name of the present distinguished Speaker at the head of the entire list. It was recommended by these signers as a work of great public merit, and approved for general circulation. But I would not expel him for that. No, I would not even censure him for that, except to differ with him as one member may differ from another. I would argue the question with him. I would tell him that he gave his name in a time of profound peace for war; that when the smoke and carnage of battle were then ascending, when the sky was clear and the sun shining, he gave his voice for strife and desolation—for the war of John Brown—of servile insurrection; not an honorable war, not a civilized war, but a war of murder, of barbarism, of the slaughter of women and children in their beds. Such was the voice of the present Speaker at the House at that time.

The same gentleman now cannot tolerate the gentleman from Ohio. His virtuous, pure, unadorned patriotism, is shocked; and he rushes from his Speaker's chair, springs to the floor, before anybody else can get in a resolution, with the appearance of saying, "I come, be held any longer; this thing will not do." And yet this is the gentleman whose voice was for dishonorable war when the country was in a condition of profound peace! The gentleman, I am sure, will not complain at this little episode in his political history. Those who are swift to accuse should not complain if their own deeds make return upon them. I would be the last man to throw my colleague's record in his face but for the spirit he has shown here. Sir, let him compare faith and works upon the subject of the Union, upon the subject of peace, upon the subject of fraternity, upon the subject of the preservation of the Government, with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Long) and he will have no ground to murmur the first stone. The administration of the Saviour comes with peculiar force to an indorse of the Helper book, to an inciter of riot, blood, and confusion. Let him that is without sin cast the first stone at the gentleman from Ohio for daring to express his sentiments upon this floor. If that injunction had been obeyed, my colleague would have stayed, his hand remained in the Speaker's chair.

But let me inquire a little further in regard to the right of my colleague to deal harshly with the political friends of his fellow members, the great Abolitionist and Dissident, George Thompson. I do not know whether the Speaker presided on that occasion, as he did upon a former occasion of a somewhat similar character, but I have no doubt he gave the light of his handsome, his amiable, and most beneficent countenance. Still he cannot endure that the gentleman from Ohio and Maryland should have utterances upon this floor from their own seats, whatever they may be. My distinguished colleague, the Speaker, says they were for disunion. For the sake of the argument, suppose they were. Let us see what kind of company the gentleman himself keeps; let us see who it was to whom he gave aid and encouragement in his work of destruction and career of infamy. I hold in my hand the resolutions of the American Anti-Slavery Society, passed some time about the year 1830, and two of them read as follows:

"Resolved, That while we would express our deep gratitude to all those earnest men and women who find time and strength amid their labors in behalf of British reform to study, understand and protest against American slavery, to give us their sympathy and aid by manifesting their benevolence, and by holding our Union up to the contempt of Europe, we feel it would not be inhonorable to mention William and Mary Howitt, Henry Vincent and George Thompson, as those to whose untiring advocacy our cause is especially indebted in this country, as well as the British people."

"Resolved, That the discriminating sense of justice, the steadfast devotedness, the generous magnanimity, the untiring zeal, the industry, skill, taste and genius with which the British Abolitionists have co-operated with us for the extinction of slavery command our gratitude. From the Abolitionists of England, Scotland and Ireland, we have received renewed and increasing assurances and proofs of their constant and enlightened zeal in behalf of the American slave. Liberal gifts from all these countries, falling behind none of the most bounteous of former years, helped to fill the scanty treasury of the slave."

Cluster round him, you men of the latter day! Your love of the Union is a modern invention. It comes to you late in life. It is a thing intended to deceive. You may as well stand by your old disunion colors. Rally, I say, round this British standard-bearer of the American Abolitionists of the American Anti-Slavery Society, who holds up our Union to the contempt and derision of Europe, and receive public thanks for it.

Oh, how would the authority and power which these men now invoke roll back upon them if they were proposed to punish them for their disunion principles! But I would not punish them for even that expression of their sentiments. Not at all. If you want disunion, say so, and discuss it like men. Truth is never afraid when left free. Error is never a dangerous element when truth is left free to combat. I say to you here, what you have to say, say it, but do not enjoy your right to say to speak your sentiments, and then meanly deny to others the same right. The Speaker, however, is doubtless satisfied with the political company he keeps, and I have no right to complain. If George Thompson, of England, or Wendell Phillips, of America, suit his tastes, he is only accountable for that sort of patriotism to those who sent him here. If he wishes to hug to his bosom those two un-

righteous monsters of disunion and civil war, it is no concern of mine. And indeed it may meet with warm approval in Northern Illinois. It may be that he is correctly representing his constituents. I differ from him widely, and in doing so I am perfectly sure that I properly represent the principles of the district in which I live.

According to the views of the Speaker, the people who sent him here are somewhat old-fashioned in their ideas. They live in a beautiful country. They are settled in one of the oldest and richest portions of our great State. The old men are familiar with Harrison and Taylor, who both fought Indians on the fertile banks of the Wabash, and both died in the mansion of Presidents. They have seen the country prosper and become great under the old Constitution and principles of the fathers. They do not think that a Mexican Lincoln can make a better government than the one which suited George Washington. They are content with what they have. You think you can do better than Jefferson, Hancock, Madison and Adams. The people I represent do not think you can. If they are to choose between two forms of government they would take that of Washington instead of that of Lincoln. Sir, I too hold, and shall to the last, to the Constitution of my fathers. Its great principles sustain me while standing here in the face of a tyrannical, insolent majority, clinging like a maniac at sea with hope almost dead, at times in despair for my country, distracted with the darkness overhead and the storm around, still clinging to and willing to perish on that Constitution, unchanged in letter and spirit, believing that it will better restore this Union, if duly administered, than any other instrument which the wisdom of man can give this down-trodden people.

You cannot come to me with your charges about the war. I have done my duty. No dollar of money has been paid out to feed and clothe the soldiers for which I have not voted, unless detained by sickness from my seat. I did not want this war, it ought to have been avoided. I think to-day that peaceful remedies will better restore the Union than the prosecution of war under the present Administration. But while we are in war I stand by the soldiers in the field. The demagoguing gentleman from the third district of Ohio (Mr. Schenck) cannot say as much. I will now attend to him for a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, I will send to the Clerk's desk, to be read, a curious paper, which shows how the gentleman from the Dayton district gave aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war at a former period of our history. How violent was that gentleman a while ago! How ungentle upon the subject of slavery! How fiercely he sought to break the wishes that were inflaming his soul he would have waged a more dangerous war upon us here than he has ever been able to wage upon the enemy in the field. How savagely he menaced this side of the House! Aid and comfort to the enemy! I will prove the gentleman himself guilty of that crime by his own statement.

You say that speaking against war gives aid and comfort to the enemy. You say that voting against supplies gives aid and comfort to the enemy. I will send to the Clerk's desk a series of resolutions offered by the gentleman from Ohio in 1847, one month before the glorious battle of Buena Vista was fought—one month, Sir, (to Mr. Cravens) before you and other gallant gentlemen upon this floor charged the enemy through a hail of death on that field, a battle-field which gave a President to the Republic.

It will be seen that whether or not the gentleman from Ohio has a Mexican face, he had a Mexican heart at that time in his breast. He was then on the side of the enemies of the country. He offered resolutions to withdraw our army from Mexico, to be torn, harassed and scourged by the enemy hanging upon its rear. We were fighting a foreign Power then. Are the Southern people worse than a foreign people? Will you wage more relentless war upon them than upon foreigners? Are Mexicans better than the people of Virginia, Tennessee, Louisiana, and the other Southern States? At the expense of being declared disloyal, I say that I would be willing to take them back into my fraternal embrace under the terms of the old Constitution. Aye, Sir, gladly and fondly, I would rather make peace with them than with the filthy, broken, fragmentary, diluted race of Mexicans.

[The clerk then read, at the request of Mr. Voorhees, a long series of resolutions offered in the House of Representatives by Mr. Schenck during the war between the United States and the Republic of Mexico. These resolutions being too long for our space, we insert only a portion of them, as follows:]

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to terminate the war unhappily existing between the U. S. and Mexico, with due regard to the rights and national existence and independence of the two Republics, and with a view to bring about an honorable peace, the President of the United States be requested to withdraw all troops and military forces of the United States now west of the Rio Grande in Mexico to the east side of the river."

That all volunteers now in the service of the United States be discharged, taking due care in the order of discharge, that provision be made for the return of all such volunteers to their respective homes, or to the States in which they were mustered into the service of the government.

That the President be requested and advised to keep all, or such portion as he may deem necessary for that purpose, of the regular army under his command, along or near the western frontier of the U. States, prepared to rebel or prevent any encroachment or depredation by Mexican citizens or soldiers on the territory, property, or people of this Union, while any

question or controversy shall remain unsettled between the Governments of Mexico and the United States.

"That no further increase of the present Regular army of the U. S. shall be made by enlistment or otherwise; but as fast as the terms of enlistment of soldiers now in the service may expire, the army shall be reduced until it is brought to the number that was in service on the first of Jan. 1847.

"That it is against the policy and interest of this Government to wage a war for the conquest of territory, and there should not be acquired, by any treaty to be negotiated and concluded between the United States and Mexico, any territory whatever additional to the territory now lying legally and properly within the present limits of the United States, or within the boundary of any now existing state of this Union.

"That no application of any money appropriated, or to be appropriated, by act of this Congress for carrying on the existing war with Mexico, or for increasing, strengthening, or in any way supplying the military or naval defenses or forces of this government shall be made, nor is any expenditure thereof authorized, except in accordance with the declaration and provisions of these resolutions."

Mr. Voorhees continued. The House has heard the resolutions that I sent up to be read. I have simply to say in regard to them that if members upon this side of the House are traitors in consequence of their opinions antagonistic to the present war, the gentleman from Ohio was a traitor in January, 1847, when he introduced these resolutions. If there is aid and comfort to the rebels in arms in the position of any gentleman here, then there was aid and comfort twice over to the Mexicans in the resolutions just read. Every Mexican lawyer that murdered our wounded men hailed the name of the gentleman from Ohio as his friend. Every guerrilla that preyed upon our troops, struck down and murdered weak escorts, cut off supplies from our starving soldiers, hailed the gentleman from Ohio as a co-worker with him in expelling the American army from Mexico.—The Mexicans were working to get our army out of their country, and the gentleman from Ohio was working to the same end.

Sir, Ohio seems unfortunate. If the gentleman whom you seek to expel (Mr. Long) be unfaithful to his country in time of war, he has very illustrious precedents in the former history of his State. Her voice has been heard in the other branch of Congress in tones forever memorable. Aid and comfort to the enemy! Corwin stands very high with this Administration. He is very properly a Minister to Mexico. He is a very proper ally of Santa Anna to murder the soldiers of Santa Anna to murder the graves in a foreign land. To the best of his ability they obeyed his bloody instructions.—Such was the position of these distinguished friends of the Administration from Ohio during a war with a foreign foe—Mr. Corwin in the Senate, and the gentleman from the Dayton district (Mr. Schenck) in the House. They were co-operating together. By voice and vote they were encouraging the Mexicans to fight, and to fight on! And while our troops were met in front by Mexicans, they were assailed in the rear by these distinguished allies.

By the last resolution just read at the desk no money was to be paid to our troops except in accordance with the provisions of those resolutions, that is, upon condition that they should be withdrawn from the enemy's country. No pay was to be given them while they were there. The meanest vote that any man, in my judgment, ever gave a vote to stop the rations of the soldier. It matters not whether the war be right or wrong, the soldier must be paid.—To starve him is no statesmanlike plan by which to stop an unjust war. Yet that was precisely the vote given by the gentleman from Ohio, who now delivers a lecture to the House upon the subject of American patriotism. There it stands recorded. There is a Nemesis of politics which comes back to avenge injustice and iniquity. It comes now to torment and plague the gentleman from Ohio. It avenges the wrong and outrage which he seeks to inflict upon his colleague; it comes now in the face of the soldiers of this war, and tells them that the gentleman from Ohio would leave them to beggary and want if he should become satisfied with this war as he was with the war against Mexico. What man has done man will do again.

Sir, I accept no lecture upon the subject of patriotism, from such a source. But at the same time I freely admit that the gentleman from Ohio had the right, the moral, legal, and political right to introduce the resolutions in regard to the Mexican war if they embraced his sentiments. I would have neither expelled nor censured him for his action. They were wrong in my judgment, but if they were right in his, then he was right in offering them. I am for toleration in all matters of opinion. We cannot all think alike. God did not make us so. You remember the parable, sometimes thought to be taken from Scripture, but said to have been uttered by Benjamin Franklin, on this great question of freedom of opinion. Aram was sitting one evening at the door of his tent when a wayfaring man came by. Aram invited him to go in and sup with him. The wayfarer did so.—Aram asked him to bless before he broke bread. The wayfarer said no, that he was not of his way of thinking. Immediately Aram arose in wrath, took his stick and beat the stranger, wounding and bruising him, and driving him from the shelter of his roof.

In the silent watches of the night, however, the voice of God came to Aram, asking him, "Where is the stranger?"—"Why," said Aram, "I asked him to bless and return thanks before the partook of bread, and he refused, so I drove him hence."—"But," said the voice of the Almighty, "I have borne with that man, I have known his opinions, I have allowed him to live; I have never beaten him and sent him into the wilderness. Go, Aram, and find the victim of

your miserable conduct, bring him back, and pour oil in his wounds, feed him, and lay him on your best bed, and take care of him until he is well." Such is the voice of divinity in favor of freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of private conscience. I implore gentlemen, not to attempt to strike it down. Let the error, if error it be, exist so long as truth is left free to combat it. In the beginning of time these two principles were made. They have walked on the earth together ever since. They have roamed the earth for six thousand years. Truth and error have been combating on fields of reason, on battle fields, everywhere.

You of the Abolition party, go back thirty years to the beginning of your own organization. What was it then your most warmly contended for? What but the right, the immortal right to speak your sentiments, to denounce your political accusers, and to stand before the world as freemen? Suppose this gag law, this instrument of tyrants, this odious relic of barbarism, again revived in this Hall, had been applied to some men now sitting around me! I protest before the living God that I never knew a man wearing the shape of man whom I would not stand and protect in his right of free speech, were he to utter his sentiments in a decorous and becoming manner. Your party inscribed everywhere on their banners,—"Free speech." Deny it to-day if you dare. Trample it in the dust. Spit upon it and despise it if you will. The world will despise you when you do the act. History will rake up the deed and preserve it, and the historian will despise you as he writes it down. Post-erity will despise this day in all the calendar of time as the one on which liberty was murdered in the Capitol.

The heart and judgment of the world will execrate you for the deed, just as it to-day execrates the memory of the bloody monster Robespierre; just as it recalls the memory of Mirat to curse it; just as it recalls the form of St. Just to loathe him. There are your models. Go back further. Nero was an early founder of your school of politics. Some one man, I suppose, is to do all the thinking here. So Nero thought. So the blood-stained monsters of the French Revolution thought. So the odious tyrannical bigots of the English Revolution of 1640 thought. These are your examples.—I implore you to discard them. Walk out in the light of liberty, and appeal to the people. Tell them they will trust them.—What a commentary on the intelligence of the people!

You will not allow the gentleman from Ohio to speak. Perhaps next you will not allow me to speak, other gentlemen from Ohio, the gentlemen from New York, and others around me. Why? Are you afraid you cannot meet us in argument? Are you afraid the people will not be virtuous enough to follow you, afraid they have heard the wrong? You must believe that they have not that intelligence, or that they will not be true to their own judgment, or you would be willing to trust them to discriminate between right and wrong. Sir, I trust the people. I challenge you before that great tribunal, I am willing to stand or fall by its decision, and always have been. If you crush me before the American people, before that tribunal where free speech has full sway, I will go down without a murmur. If I can drive you from place and power in the same arena by the same means, if you are honest men you will submit also without complaint. But if you think because you have the power to-day that you can gag me, that you can tie my tongue, that you can deny to me the right to speak, then woe to this nation. When you and I make to carry that purpose into effect, the day of doom will be upon us. It cannot be done; you know it cannot be done without a conflagration that shall light up the very arches of the sky from ocean to ocean. Are you ready for this issue? Do you want it? If you do, it can be made by the expulsion of the gentleman from Ohio. This will no longer be an American Congress. We will be chained slaves, and the next question to determine will be whether as men of honor or we can remain and wear the yoke.

Sir, this is a painful theme to me. I feel more of sorrow than of anger over such an issue. Let me appeal to the sense of justice which I know animates some breasts on the other side of the chamber. Let us not misunderstand each other. Let us deal with each other as honest men, striving for a common purpose—the restoration of our unhappy country. You may have your views of what policy is most conducive to that end; you have the right to your opinions; I have the right to mine; but because of this indifference of opinion in regard to accomplishing the same object, by all that we hold dear in the present, and by all our hopes in the future, let us not cut each other's throats and precipitate strife and violence here and all over the land. The civilized world would cry shame upon such a scene, and the latest generations of our posterity will heap reproaches on our memory.

The fable of the man who killed the goose that daily laid him a golden egg is exemplified by the attempt of the Abolitionists to abolish slavery. These fanatics fail to see that the blow which kills slavery will also give the quietus to the abolition party. Slavery has been the meat and drink upon which they have grown to fatness. It has been the stepping stone by which they have been elevated to power. When slavery and the slavery agitation die, the abolition party dies with them.

SPOTTSYLVANIA COURT HOUSE, alluded to so frequently by the telegraphic dispatches, is the county seat of Spotsylvania county. It is a village of less than two hundred resident inhabitants, situated on the Potomac River, a branch of the Mattaponi. It is twenty or twenty-two miles east of Orange Court House, about fourteen miles southeast of Fredericksburg, and by the course of the roads sixty-five miles northwest of Richmond.