UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

Lecture by the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher at the Academy of Music—His Views upon the Great Elements of Right and Wrong—The Ballot for Negroes and Women.

[SPECIAL PHONOGRAPHIC REPORT FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.]

A large and appreciative audience assembled last evening at the Academy of Music, to listen to the remarks of the eminent lecturer. At an early hour the large hall was filled by our citizens, desirous both of hearing the distinguished orator, and of learning his views on this great and all-important subject. The Rev. Dr. Mears, of this city, in a few remarks, introduced Mr. Beecher to the assembly.

After the applause had subsided, Mr. Beecher remarked that he had been surprised with the remark once made by a gentleman from Europe, who said that in his country all their political discussions turned on questions of fundamental principles; but in America, all our public questions were those of policy, relating to business, banking, trades, etc., while in Europe the nations were battling for the essential rights of men, and for the essential principles of freemen and national life. Could he visit our land to-day, he would see that all this has changed, and that our public questions are now eminently questions not only of principle—political principle—but, to a degree unknown since the Revolutionary war, questions of political principle based on the deepest of morality, and questions containing the great elements of right or wrong. And this change which has come over the public mind since 1850 has resulted very materially from the free-lecture system, which has now spread so thoroughly throughout our land. Having been a lecturer for thirty years, he was able to speak from his own experience.

Prior to 1850 it was esteemed an impropriety for a lecturer in any public course to mingle with his subject any question of political or public interest. That seemed hard, but after the passage of the Fugitive Slave law, certain persons bargained with lecturers, when delivering their remarks, not to maintain the sanctity of that movement. Distinguished men perambulated the country justifying the measure. I remember saying that, for my own love of politics, they shall have both sides of it. From that day to this, more and more, every season, the public have demanded lecture courses that should inform them as to public questions.

Thus were these lecture courses originated, that the people should be enlightened as to questions of national importance. Exciting questions are now considered the only ones which are desired to be heard; and now, whatever men are obliged to think about, to speak or act about, whatever men are called upon in any sphere to do, they have a right to demand that the moral and practical elements of the questions thus agitated shall be discussed in public. Exciting questions are demanded as subjects for lectures, for excitement means vitality. Questions were never before discussed as they are now. Our history will go to illustrate the safety of freedom in the discussion of all questions of usefulness to the Commonwealth.

I purpose to present to you to-night, as a subject, "Universal Suffrage—Manhood Suffrage;" for I hold that the right to vote is not a right conferred, but a right inherent. I believe not that a man has this right conferred by a body who vote it as a prerogative, but I believe it is theirs as an inherent right conferred by that constitution which God gave them when they were born; and this I shall argue, carrying it out to the most logical results. This view is the natural result of the unfolding of American history from the spring of that history.

Originally only the church members could vote in our colonies. This now excites a smile. That is only a new variation of the aristocratic class; for it was held that the best men in society should govern the State, and that term is originally the very term of aristocracy. In one age and State it was determined that such and such men were the best men. In another age and condition of civilization, it was held that such and such other men were the best men. Our New England fathers undertook to put the State under the control of the best men; and they held that the best men were the most sincere Christians; and if there was to be any class, why, of course, the honest Christian men are the best fitted to be that class. Practically, it would be folly and evil. If you gave political power to church members, then we should have a revival constantly going on in every part of the land.

But there was a change, reluctant and slow. In losing power, our fathers felt as all men do. They loved it; they did not like to part with it when they had it. Notwithstanding their conscientious theories, suffrage forced itself broader and broader throughout New England, penetrating all classes of society; and from that day to this, society has been in America, everywhere, agitated with the question of suffrage. The idea of suffrage has been, and still is with many, as a measure of expediency, that it is to be a matter which the State will regulate, to be governed by the State authorities. This takes from man his natural right of manhood. Universal suffrage is the logical and fundamental principle of American society. All political power springs from the people. Governments derive their powers from the governed. Nothing can be more broad than this. The people confer all the power that a Government has. It was from the people that the Government derived its power and laws, which they have delegated to it.

From whom did the power come to vote? From the whole people who are originally the great reservoir of that, as of every other political power. To expunge, therefore, large classes of men from political power is a gross inconsistency with our fundamental principles of government. To say that they shall not vote is to say that they shall not exercise those powers which the Government derives from them—derived from them that it might care and protect them, not diminish or destroy them. We have never consistently carried out our own democratic principles. We have generally proceeded on the rule that the Government belongs to the best part of society. The exercise of political power is extended but to a small part—not probably to one-third of the population of the country. If we exclude color, the foreign element, and women, the whole political power of this country is in the hands of not much more than a third; and in a nation that derives all its power from the whole people—in such a nation the power is in the hands of one-third, and the other two-thirds derive but the benefits of a social connection with the third in power.

The unfolding history in political principles leads to the apparent result that suffrage should belong to all. Manhood suffrage is intrinsically right. It would be difficult, somewhat, to say what are natural rights; and it is not now for the purpose of narrowly defining this question that I speak. For we all believe that there is such a thing as our natural right. If there are such things as natural rights, that of suffrage is one of them.

Every man must have a potential voice in whatever affects his position, his happiness, his property, his family, his reputation, and his life itself. To say that a man may be so governed that he is put out of the control of his affairs; that his family shall do as is determined upon; that his property shall be subject to division, diminution, taxation, or put to various uses, he having no potential voice in determining these things; to say that his natural happiness shall be destroyed; that his property, effects, and everything shall be at the mercy of others; to remark that these things may be done, and have such a man retain his natural rights, is an absurdity.

A man that has not the right to vote is excluded from all these. It may be that he is in direct channels of some sort equivalent, but there is no fair political division of power when a man can have no care over all his affairs, and have no voice in the matter of their disposal. And if a man has not the right to say what shall be done with his earnings, his time, his labors, he has not the right to say as to the making of the laws which hold in bond his whole welfare. I argue that it is a natural right to each man, and that he has the whole force of that reason by which you are able to define your rights on the subject. It is said that society has a self-preserving right. It has, and may punish the abuse of it. But I say that it cannot confer that inherency of right, while it has its organization in man. It is said, also, that society has a right to regulate it; yes, but it has no right to prohibit it.

It may be said that all men are already equal before the law, by the same protection, the same rights, whether they vote or not; that the laws, if ever they be made by one-third of the population, are made in such a way that the interests of the people are equally cared for. That is, practically, not so. If the whole people have no voice in this, then their welfare is ordained over their heads, and it does not follow that they are still as other citizens. Laws are continually being made, so that they advantage one part of society more than another. A law that should be made by the advice of gentlemen on Wall street would not suit any other street in New York. It would look so poorly in a financial point of view that it could not be made to suit others. As another instance, and one more clearly defined, we notice that the laws in the South are made by white men for white men.

The freedmen have been made equal before the law. But they are not equal, because theirs is a condition essentially different from that of the whites. To give a freedman the rights made under laws enacted for a class of white men is not equal. The laws of orphanage and such like institutions, made for the whites, wear a different aspect when compared between white and black. For the laws being made in the interest of one class of society, bear unequally on a different class. In common things, no class can determine for the interests of another class; each one is best acquainted with the wants and interests of its individual members; and their voices must be heard and their consent obtained before there can be a law enacted to be equal and just.

Just now, suffrage is in the hands of two-third of the population of this nation, and they hold the entire power; for we see that but one-third of the people are privileged voters; for those who do hold the franchise hold and exercise the privilege. The vote is that key that unlocks every lock in the land. It is the lever which can raise and move the nation; it is the power of powers in our society, and he who holds it holds an equal share of the power. Those who do not hold it are excluded from the participation of the power, except in a most indirect way. It is said, Is not partial suffrage better than universal suffrage? But this leads again to the ground of expediency, and assumes that those who hold the vote have the power and right to determine who shall have the elective franchise. I hold that, as the whole population are not allowed to vote, it assumes that they have no natural rights, but a portion have privileges conferred.

Manhood suffrage is the only fair ground. Can you vote impartial suffrage to one class of population, and that a minority, on the simple ground of sex? I question why one-half of the adult population is distranchised because of sex.

But manhood suffrage is still better than impartial suffrage. Everything that tends to augment the number of voters tends to liberalize the influence and opinions of society.

If I could have my own way, I would sweep my hand as the sun sweeps its effulgent and cheerful rays across the broad land, and would say to all people, to all classes, from the lowest to the highest, from the poorest to the most wealthy, not only vote, but be intelligent. (Applause.) And the question would not be whether such and such, or the best, should be designated to have these especial privileges and prerogatives.

Some will say, Do you wish the Chinaman to vote? And I will answer, I do. And would you have foreigners vote? Just as soon as they took root, I would. I would have them first naturalized, only to see that it was not deception, see that it was real, and that they entertained the honest intention of staying in our land. And now, you think that I am coming to the question as to whether woman should vote. I am.

If you are going to have a nation in which you shall represent the great truth of a Christian democracy—that is, the rights of all men in human society—you must not be expected to do that great work without a sacrifice of some kind, a payment for this labor in tribute. For if we would have an example of one who performed such good works, yet without a sacrifice, we have but to turn to Him that hath loved us, who loved the world and baptized it with His blood, leaving His legacy of love and mercy, far more precious than all earthly benefits. But we see herein that to perform a good work we will suffer in payment, mayhap pay it in drops of blood and long-suffering as tribute. He that would be educated must pay by hard work, but we are to be a civilized nation and carry that civilization down to the very bottom of society, and present to those in the lowest walks of life the glories of manhood and wisdom; and not only that, but we shall begin at the top and descend to the lowest, and then rise up, drawing all to see the great privilege and blessings of education and higher and more intellectual walks of life. But the whole sum total is that if we neglect these classes, we shall have to pay for it—pay for it in self-denial and suffering; but this cause is a glorious one, to influence all in its speedy commencement.

It is looked upon as a perilous undertaking to allow 800,000 black men to vote and receive education. The discussion of this question has run all through the public mind. Manhood to these classes is being more and more mixed up with popular influences and opinions. Universal voting is to be the order of this continent, and we all should be prepared for it. (Applause.) I wish you to take notice as to how the Irish vote—the most mischievous vote—a people who are so fierce for their own individual liberty, and so utterly indifferent to any other persons; a people who seem to think that liberty consists in doing whatever is desired, regardless of law or order—jealous, sensitive, generous, and self-sacrificing. This good class, which is sometimes so perilous in the usage of the ballot, when this gigantic Rebellion arose went forth to fight against the treasonable enemy, and declard that they were right sometimes. Almost to a man they voted solid for the plantation. They were workmen voting against brother workmen. Poor men, and voting to put yokes on poor men. They were the lowest part of society, that shut out from their eyes, like lightning, through their ignorance, against that which was to help them.

Voting is the test of education. You see that manifest every election day—you that are observant of the manners of all classes of voters. Some have lived life-long in the same faith, never differing in the casts at the ballot-box; voting for a party, right or wrong, simply because they did not want to be disturbed, or go outside the line of their former rules of conduct. They did not wish to be disturbed. They voted as their fathers and grandfathers had voted. Literally dead men. Nothing but the resurrection could educate such men as they.

They have got to feel, to think—their hearts must swell with new impulses—not looking to the rules of the past, but to the conditions of the future. To such men, when they come out of their former apathy and drowsiness, voting is education. Take the Irishman and give him a vote. He acts as if it were some instrument unknown. Like the man with the gun, he picked it up, examined it, looked into the muzzle, managed to fire it, complained how it hurt, and finally managed, after numberless trials, to come within a rod of the mark. Thus it is with the man uneducated, when he first handles his vote. He deposits it with his mind's eye closed, not knowing anything about it, or its use. He slings his vote any way. By-and-by, he begins to find that he is firing at a mark; and although he is told by some persons in a manner that aggrandizes themselves the benefit of the ballot, yet he receives a teaching that that vote is a "means to an end"—a means in political society in gaining an end. A vote has a more significant meaning than its simple term.

The Irishman will first make many mistakes in disposing of his ballot, but the education he is constantly receiving is giving him a better and more definite insight to its great use; and in five years he will have greatly improved, and in ten years will be as well [illegible] as you. For, as their property increases, as their children begin to enter the schools, as their daughters begin to see how comely they are, and make preparations for marrying with men of other social standings, their fathers have a great care, they have a future welfare for themselves and children to prepare, and they do not vote so wild and foolish as they did.

The vote, too, is self-defense in many cases. It is an arm in their hands to protect them from outrages. A vote now to the black men is the only thing which can save them. They have a right to it for self-protection. They have a right to it, because education will follow it up. They need it now to defend themselves. But some say, Inasmuch as you exclude a great many persons, you are inconsistent with yourself. You exclude criminals, idiots, those under age, paupers, and women.

I exclude criminals, because an enmity to society forfeits the right to society. I exclude idiots, because they are utterly incapacitated from taking care of themselves, and, hence, incapable of using any judgment whatever. I exclude those under age only until a reasonable time has expired, when they come into full powers. Men, you know, in this country are not born until they have attained the age of twenty-one years—some men are not born until they have attained the age of forty years, and then only partially. It is fair that a certain limit should be set before any person can attain his majority. As to paupers, I think it wholly wrong that they are disfranchised. I cannot understand why they are not allowed to vote. Inasmuch as this is a nation which does not make a property qualification necessary for the exercise of the franchise, there is no just reason why a pauper should be excluded. It is a misfortune that a man has no property—he may have at one time been the most wealthy. Is there any clear reason why he should be deprived of his vote simply because adversity has overtaken him, and snatched from his hand all that he had?

Then some will, lastly, say, Why not allow women to vote? I believe that they ought to vote. (Loud applause.) And more, I believe that when they think so, they will vote. (Laughter.) The greatest obstacle in woman's way to-day is, that she has been taught to consider this rather as an ornamental branch, and not as a duty—a mere accomplishment, and a disagreeable one at that. There is no reason why the natural rights of women are not the same as the natural rights of men. Some say, God made a difference at the creation between woman and man. There is no argument that can stand against us. Functions may be different, but functions do not regulate the rights. If a man undertook to invent a standard of avoirdupois, and say natural rights are so many stone a man will weigh, you would smile at the idea of a man's rights being determined by the tape line, weight, or yardstick. It is no more right to say that the sex determines the right of franchise.

The rights of woman are as clearly and definitely defined as are those of man. None can deny it. If we should change the state of affairs, allowing women to vote and distranchising men, and suppose a proposition should come that men be allowed to vote—"What," they might say, "allow men to vote! uncultivated, unrefined animals as they are, to expect to exercise this right of determining what shall or shall not be the law in regard to our happiness!" If this were the case, you would find no doubt, about the same state of affairs in which we are now placed.

God, when He made woman, made her to be a mother, and necessarily a school mistress, and therefore a legislator; and consequently ought to be such; with a mother's foresight, and a mother's love, laboring only for the future welfare of her own children, knowing what was most needed, she would be the one to exercise law to meet the wants of the people.

In the early stages of society the law of force was the law of all. But society, like individuals who grow more refined by the companionship of woman, has stepped beyond, many degrees, to a higher intellectual and moral sentiment. Woman is peculiarly fitted to determine with man all the important questions of the time. It may be that the law of force is in greater proportion in the man, but the law of moral sentiment is certainly to a greater degree stronger in woman. As civilization unfolds, and great questions are to be settled regarding the principles of ethics, we need the woman's brain. She would be well adapted to meet the modern questions of civilization. Politics, as they now are, are coarse, selfish, and even torpid to their very bottom to all the good required for the advancement of civilization.

If woman should have the power to cast ballots and mingle in politics, strife would disappear, and the ballot-box become purified. Do you suppose that Johnny Morrissey would have been elected to Congress from New York if the women had voted? (Laughter.) Do you believe that licenses of all kind, for perpetuating evil in all its horrid shapes, giving encouragement to lust and licentiousness, dragging our sons and daughters down to certain destruction, would have been granted and peacefully settled if women had voted? Politics would rise fifty per cent. in an instant in Pennsylvania if it were known that women were to vote. It would give, also, new power and a firmer standing to morals if women were to exercise this prerogative, and instead, as some intimate, of weaking you, I know you would be strengthened. For whatever improves the mother in intelligence will also improve the children.

But I hear it is said that women should stay at home, attend to all the household duties, mend the children's apparel and the husband's clothes. There is nothing so becoming in a woman as to see her perform all the little and manifold duties of the house with cheerfulness. Duties, it matters not how mean or honorable in themselves, appear enhanced and becoming when the woman is actuated by a happy and contented spirit. I esteem the woman that performs her work gladly. I admit that it is a detestable heresy, the idea that a woman is not fit to do anything else than the menial duties of the house. The sphere of the women of America is other than that of the Greek women of ancient times. They were not permitted to meet any of their husband's companions; they were not allowed to come to the door without being veiled. In walking the streets, they dared not uncover their faces for fear of punishment. Not so with our women. They are to be the bright lights of our land, to soften the harshness of society by their moral, intellectual, and cheerful natures.

Again, some say if you insist upon all the rights of society for women, and if the women should vote, of course they would have to perform military duty. I have no objection (applause), but you know that in times of war they make a selection. Those who are not adapted to such arduous duty stay at home, and others go, and if the men think that the women are better able to stand the hard duties of such a life than they are, I have no doubt that the women would go, and if necessary, fight well.

We want this question of voting rightly adjusted, so that it shall be all right, and represent no particular class of society or individuals. Men have no more right to vote and rule an equal portion of society than a rich man to vote for a poor one, a farmer for a mechanic, a minister for his congregation, or a bishop for the ministers. But each should have his right to legislate for his wants, and be allowed a share in forming the laws which are to guard his property and his family, and protect their welfare. The voices of women roll loudly up, with petitions and supplications, to those in authority to lighten the burden of sorrow they bear. Men know not the wants of the poor, almost starving women, who live in miserable dens in all of our large cities, killing themselves day by day with painful toiling for a mere pittance to keep them from starving. They need legislation in matters of instruction and help, and they will yet be heard; for women are entering a sphere of usefulness and a line of duty which shall enable them soon to guard, help, and protect themselves.

—The claims of Charles Sumner for the next Presidency are advocated by *The Newburyport (Mass.) Herald* and *New Bedford Standard.*

THE MODERN PURITAN.

A Lecture Delivered Last Evening at National Hall, by the Hon. J. R. J. Pitkin, of Louisiana.

[SPECIAL PHONOGRAPHIC REPORT FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.]

Last evening Judge Pitkin lectured at National Hall before the Social, Civil, and Statistical Association of the Colored People of Philadelphia. The Hall was well filled. On being introduced by Mr. Isaac Weir, the orator of the evening spoke as follows:—

Two hundred and forty-six years ago a vessel, freighted with austere men and meek women, toiled through the hiss and buffet of an angry ocean on an heroic mission of self-independence. Their sails panted to the mad wind that impelled them onward, and their eyes dreamt beyond a leaden horizon of the God that awaited them on an unknown shore, until at last their knees fell in the snows of Plymouth, in gratitude for His merciful protection and deliverance. Strange brows of dusk, wrinkled with menace, lowered at them; winter with all its wild asperities assailed them; and yet with nothing over their heads but here and there a naked, writhing branch, and with the bleak white drifts about them alone for altars, they exalted their benumbed hands and rejoiced in their new American home of freedom!

Two centuries and a half have elapsed. The wind that so rudely smote that desolate craft has since swayed from mast and spire many a standard of our new republic, and though the exiles of our proudest American tradition have long since returned to dust, the same solemn print of their knees in the snow, and the same God to whom they bowed, remain to-day and forever. Plymouth Rock, by a silent and impellent moral force beneath, has leapt up from the level of a past age, and towers an august alp in our national history. Over it has dawned a wondrous liberty, in the light of which stands the old Puritan, whose mighty shadow lengthens down to our own eventful present.

To-day, my friends, thousands of keels are ploughing the surges from the east and south towards the great ports of our nation. They are laden with an untold tonnage of merchandise, or with vengeful armaments, whose black muzzles peer out over the sea to snuff danger in the air; but all of them combined bring us not the moral and the material wealth that stood upon the deck of the little Mayflower as she slipped into Cape Cod Bay. That wealth was in the devout hearts and democratic purpose of those noble exiles. A wealth to them of glorious aspiration—a wealth to us of glorious consummation. To them the germ of a great, undefined future; to us the fact of a grand, ripened present.

The speaker then concluded his defense of the early Puritan in these words:—We have no right to charge the errors of the head upon the heart. The cruel, selfish censorship of a court and clergy had measurably educated him into the morbid censor, without doubt, but if the head was hard with its many buffets, the heart was still true, earnest, and honest. Look at the pilgrim band before they had disembarked.

There they were, beyond tribunal and bishop; theirs was a broad tabernacle, spanned but by a sky. They were alone with heaven—a free, sanguine Church, exultant in their religious guarantees, received not from a King James, but from the King of Kings! Could they now rest content? Had they achieved the all of their desperate mission? No. They forthwith signed a compact, pledging themselves to submit to such "just and equal laws and ordinances" as the common good should warrant from time to time. Thus walked ashore the first freemen upon our American soil, combined for a Government based on general consent—and there, houseless, starving, but undaunted, stood not only a Puritan church but an infant State of 101 men, women, and children?

The speaker then briefly sketched New Plymouth, concluding this portion of his address as follows:—

We are told by the historian that so little were political honors coveted at New Plymouth, that it became necessary to inflict a fine upon such, as being chosen, declined to serve as Governor or assistant. Our State Treasuries will never be enriched by such penalties upon modesty.

Years advanced, each contributing its measure of immigration to the colony. New England at last became a vast filter, through which her people have been distributed over the land. The needs of successive epochs in our history have expanded the Puritan mind, summoned it to more catholic purposes, stimulated and made more robust its faith, and confirmed it far beyond the mission of those old exiles, as the very instrument of God.

It has not yet received its full tuition, but I do not hesitate to declare that whatever of principle is true and great in our land to-day—whatever constitutes our best defenses as a people, as freemen, and as men—whatever we crave for our own credit to be historic, is in essence indubitably Puritan.

With the Pilgrims the resolve for liberty was the ore in its bed; colonial history was the spade that delved down towards it; the Revolution was the strong arm that lifted it out, and melted and moulded it to a fact; while our own war has been the firm hand that grappled the cold bar, heated it red-hot once more in battle-fire, and smote it on the anvil of a people's will, from iron into lasting steel. God be thanked for it!

The speaker then sketched the Puritan from the record made by him, as one who gainsays not only at heart, but by unrelenting practical protest, all tyranny or restriction which forbids the full enjoyment of the rights of his manhood—*id est*, through both his civil and religious relations—who insists that be the despot king, prelate, or President, not one nor all can impair these inherent prerogatives. In other words, and with greater justice now than in the seventeenth century, the Puritan is a liberal.

A parallel followed between our loyal men in 1860 and the sturdy Scotch Presbyterians of 1637, and concluded thus:—Royalty quailed before the plain Scotchman Leslie, and made terms with him even in its old England, on the margin of the river, past which it had been hurled back; and I doubt not that Jefferson Davis to-day hears an accusing murmur in the stream that speeds by his cell, less of the river James than of the sad English river Tyne?

You may recall an old military evolution, wherein the front rank kneel and the rear rank remain erect, both ranks firing simultaneously. As to our late struggle, I believe it will be shown to us in that final day, that the regiments upon regiments of loyal Puritan women, upon lowly knees, all over the North, were as vital a reinforcement to the army of Liberty as they were the *front* rank in the service of God!

The speaker then averred that our late victory in the field was simply a brilliant blunder, not a triumph such as we could dedicate to Liberty. We failed to utilize the military result, cast off our glove of mail, and left Rebellion as defiant as ever, and far more venomous in its hostility, because of its disastrous experiment at arms. What was our error? This; we had chastised rebels against the might of the Government, simply to become rebels against its spirit ourselves.

We inaugurated the war with the axiom, "Freedom is the inalienable right of all;" we closed it with the convenient qualifying supplement, "particularly of our white selves." We were intrepid to confront the red, white, and red, but quailed before the black. We even *borrowed* the sinew, the valor, nay, the very blood and life of the negro, and we have scarcely yet been a magnanimous people enough to pay back the loan. Heroes before our worst enemies, and yet ingrates and cowards to our best friends! *Here* was the danger of forfeiting a claim to the better Puritan graces forever.

Here, the old discharity, the denial to others of what we claimed for ourselves, an old, crude 1620 prejudice, jutted out; and it was then, my friends, I felt that, despite a then closing four years' struggle, God's great battle for genuine catholic freedom was yet to ensue! It has. It began when the other failed, has been raging ever since, unmindful of it as many of us may have been, and its results to-day indicate a triumph to which a score of Grants and Shermans could not have conducted their columns. The negro, with all his humility of station, has proved as much a victor in this new strife as when he rushed up into the frown and flash of Port Hudson! It is in the war of prejudices that he has nobly avenged your desertion of him, and you now capitulate by tendering him the chief weapon from the arsenal of a republic—the ballot.

The speaker adverted to the negro at considerable length in combating a position taken by Mr. Boutwell before the same lyceum not long since, and subsequently assailed universal amnesty with great vehemence, stating that its popular disavowal North spoke well for the staid, moral, and patriotic sense of this brave Puritan people. The self-disfranchisement of the Rebels being held good for a period of say twenty years, and the suffrage and education of the negro, were each the vital parts of the great essential whole, the task of reconstruction. The speaker then said:—It is worthy of note that Tyro, the first master of stenography, was a freedman, who, sixty years before Christ, caught the classic periods that burst from the lips of a Cicero, and fixed them in mystic characters on a page over which the student will delight to linger forever.

Freedom, too, with a greater than Roman eloquence, has now spoken from a summit of nineteen Christian centuries; and again the alert freedman awakens to his office, his ear opens to her speech, and traces its inspiration upon the pages of our country's future! One made illustrious the brain of a man; the other glorifies an eternal principle!

Upon the subject of freedmen's education, the speaker said:—

There can be no complete reconstruction of the South until intelligence is made the very brain of loyalty. There is no complete emancipation of the negro until he is disciplined to his full claims upon himself as a man, and to the nation's full claim upon him as a citizen. The American people have grasped these two terms of emancipation and reconstruction, but have failed as yet fully to define them. Their meaning is, by clear inference, first to be found by the negro in that rudimental interpretation of the Constitution—the little democratic school book! The temple of Christian liberty, my friends, however it may have been smirched by the filth of selfish politics—however it may have been made a den of thieves—is, nevertheless, the House of God, and its portal is the humble school-house. Take this simple tale:—A father gave his two sons the option of two gifts, one of which was a Bible, the other its purchase price in money. One son chose the money, the other the Bible, on opening which he found a much larger sum than had his brother. So with the negro. You give the vote, he clamors for the primer. Assure him that, and let him find the ballot between its leaves! Thus will the South receive its essential, its Puritan restoration.

A sharp analogy was then drawn between Englishman Wentworth, the "President of the North" under King Charles, and Andrew Johnson, "the Colporteur of Constitutions and Moral Flags." The former lost his head at the dictation of the indignant Commons of England. Macauley's epitaph may serve yet again! Mr. Johnson's ambition has been insatiate, daring, rash, and fatal. He has anointed the Rebel into a patriot with his new letters-patent; cried "pooh-pooh" in the face of the loyal North, and declared his magnanimity would live on the lips of our children. Washington first commends himself to the young through the hatchet-and-tree story. Let Mr. Johnson likewise boast his remembrance. I know of no better vehicle to commemorate his futile scheme for the Rebel than the merry old trill of Guy Fawkes, familiar to every child. May it be the first intelligent lisp of our babes!

"Remember, remember,
The Fifth of November,
Gunpowder, treason, and plot;
I see no reason
Why gunpowder treason
Should *ever* be *forgot!*"

Congress was compared with the Parliament of 1640. The speaker eulogized our lower House, but stigmatized the Senate, and dwelt with considerable bitterness on various members, chiefly Vice-President Foster, among others. He added:—Congress must turn over the sad leaf of 1866, blotted with the chicane of a President, and smeared with the blood of Memphis, La Platte, and New Orleans; and on the new page of our annals, with the firm, determined hand of a John Hancock, engross its peremptory caption of Justice and Equal Rights! Let that body take up the words of the stout-hearted Puritan Pym, "We must not only make the house clean, but pull down the cobwebs!"

Having extolled General Butler as a signal Puritan, and with some severity criticized Wendell Phillips, Wilson, Sumner, and several others, the speaker thus adverted to the well-remembered American names—Abraham Lincoln and John Brown:—

It may not be amiss to advert for a moment to two other Puritans, now gone from us forever. One, a lineal descendant of a Plymouth exile, exhibited all the rugged and severe traits of those early pilgrims. A later ancestor served in the Revolution. The rancor of liberty towards tyranny, and the heat of its open challenge of tyranny, tingled, therefore, with good reason, in his blood.

The other was a poor Western youth, whose hands grasped the axe by day, and the text of his country's history by night; who grew robust in mind and body, through the wild liberty of the pioneer. Each of these men studied well his Bible. To one, it was the warmth and cheer of the sunlight; to the other, the weird, chill, and comfortless glare of the stars. For one, it made the precise poise between the true man and the true citizen; for the other, it outweighed the devout man in one giddy scale by the desperate citizen in the other.

Years ripened the men. One grew to the heroism of the calm, generous, and prescient patriot; the other to the heroism of the mad, impatient anarch. Each was vehement against slavery, but one maintained and the other forgot his loyalty in assailing that cruel curse. One sought by crime to rear a grand democracy of colors; the other, with the sense of a liberal Christian statesman, saw God already shaping a new and better republic.

One, tramping through the night, with a petty army of seventeen whites and five blacks, seizing a national arsenal "by the authority of God Almighty," and erect between his dying sons, defying a strong hostile array, was an indubitable Puritan, but of the remote seventeenth century.

The other, gentle of heart but stalwart for liberty, lifting high his old pioneer's axe, and smiting at one grand stroke the gyves from off every slave in our broad land, was the truer and the nobler Puritan of the nineteenth century. If one was the stern Cotton Mather of our time, the other was our brave, sweet-spirited Roger Williams. Side by side they rest beneath the sward of a people's memory, and thither the thoughts of freemen will often stray, now that the day of tumult is past. Upon the mound of one, gleaming with dew, rests the calm and mellow moonlight; upon the other frowns the stern shadow of the gallows! It may be that with that passionate love we bear him who was the pride of our Republic, we, my friends, may lack the composure to carve the marbles of these two great men; but the chisel of a later day will record upon the one "Abraham Lincoln, the Puritan gentleman, citizen, and statesman," and upon the other the kind yet sorry words, "Alas, disloyal John Brown!" But never can this American nation dare to attempt this critical office till the stealthy shadow of that gallows has moved on and crept athwart the prison-bars of Fortress Monroe!

The speaker concluded as follows:—Let Congress accept and act upon the terms of the President in '65. The time has arrived, my countrymen, when the American people shall be educated and taught what is *crime*, and that *treason* is the *highest* crime known to the Constitution; let them add, as a supplement thereto, the memorable words of Solon, "The *most perfect popular government* is that where an injury done to the meanest subject is an insult upon the whole Constitution;" and upon these two grand texts let them base their vindication of American freedom.

In debating this topic of reconstruction, we err in this—we fail to date back beyond 1861. Do we pluck out every thorn in the national side by a mere Constitutional amendment? No! And here let me say, that, in the name of justice, I thank God that the Southern heart has been hardened, like Pharaoh's, against that amendment; that the compact which the Thirty-ninth Congress blindly proffered has been indignantly repudiated. It stands an audacious insult to the section that can alone legally pass upon it. The Southern temper in disclaiming it, despite its license, has affirmed itself anew. It was a paltry sham to supersede the stern function of the bayonet.

That amendment should have contemplated a past not merely of four years, during which sedition was toying and plashing its hands in loyal blood, but a past stretching back to the hour when that sedition first felt its brain throb with the mad dream of anarchy. The present amendment decides nothing, secures nothing vital. It is an apology, not a behest. The war, my friends, was an auspicious evil, for through it the long pent animosity broke. The bad rheum, the old prejudices, the sectional conceit, the fierce jealousy of caste, the overt and latent errors against principles of government, all these had long been the tuition of the South; they were the nerves of their war—the very sights on the insurgent rifles. It was these, in their brief, wicked mastery over the Southern territory, that fell with the armed horde of Lee.

In other words, John C. Calhoun is as much a felon in Fortress Monroe as is his modern interpreter, Jeff. Davis. Open the gates of that dungeon to-morrow, and it is Calhoun, not Davis, that walks back into the popular heart Southern Calhoun was the grand incarnation of an error—Davis simply its bungling exponent.

"Liberty is to the collective body what health is to the individual body," says Bolingbroke. The absence of this rich health had prostrated that section. We have now purged it with cannon-ball and shot, but our medical treatment must not end there, else it will relapse into its old chronic mishabit.

We must watch it long, and administer to it not such palatable remedies as the patient might prefer, but such as its case demands, till at last, cleared of an old factious bile that has for years wakened wild fevers in its frame, it convalesces to a Puritan health!

Manco Capac sought, by prudent admonition and virtuous example, rather than by force, to win over the wild natives of South America. Where mild, persuasive methods failed, he reduced them to straits and necessities, represented to them the happiness of those who submitted to his government; and these means being followed by his successors, no native repented of adhering to such a dominion, where nothing but virtue appeared in both rulers and people. If the National Government prescribe rigors, let it be understood wherever they are imposed that they will be continued just long enough to crush down a dangerous sentiment—that when the Rebels disavow that sentiment and respond to the nobler claims upon freemen, the burden will gladly at once and forever be lifted.

The reconstruction, to be prompt and healthful, must be direct upon, and responsive from, the South. To repeat, then:—The exclusion of the disloyal from participating in this task, and the suffrage universal and education universal of the black loyal element, constitute a republican method of reconstruction the imperative one.

The speaker having here expressed his dissent to Mr. Douglass' advocacy the week previous of abolishing the veto power and the Vice-Presidency, said:—

Our armies, ladies and gentlemen, simply drove their weapon-points through the scales of the armor of treason. We, as a people, must lock down its visor, and thus slowly but surely stifle its pleas, its breath, and its life together. Then our duty to liberty will have been *well* accomplished!

A word more, and I have done. In 1620 a prow bearing the Colombuses of American liberty pointed due west—a new Mayflower to-day is seeking her Southern Plymouth! One nobly fulfilled its mission, so will the other. One was laden with prayers and trusts, so is the other. There may be calms, head-winds, a transient blot of storm, perhaps, upon the sky, but the vessel will cleave on to its haven.

Thank God! we can truly forecast. The ship is turned to the shore—a *white* hand grasps the helm, *black* hands at the ropes trim the sails, to the breeze, while erect upon the deck, his broad-brimmed peaked hat doffed from a brow calmly turned to heaven, stands the ancient, liberty-loving Puritan!

[We are apprised that Judge Pitkin will speak at Norristown, in connection with Rev. Phillips Brooks, on Thursday evening, the 17th instant, upon invitation of the Pennsylvania Branch of the Freedmen's Union Commission, in promotion of the noble objects of that society.]

PROPOSALS.

GOVERNMENT SALE.—The property known as the GOVERNMENT TANNERY AND STEAM SAW MILL, with seventy-five acres of land, near SAN ANTONIO, Texas.

Sealed proposals, in duplicate, will be received up to the first day of March, 1867, for the purchase of 75 acres of land, more or less, together with the buildings erected thereon, and the appurtenances appertaining, that is to say:—

One Tannery, containing twelve stone lime vats, fifty-two wooden vats, seven stone pools, and capable of tanning 15,000 hides per annum.

One Steam Saw Mill, capable of sawing 3000 feet of lumber daily.

One small Stone Building.

The above property is situated about two miles above San Antonio, on the San Antonio river, and the water is conducted to the establishment by a race of hewn stone, laid in cement.

The land was purchased and improvements made by the late so-called Confederate Government, and are estimated to have cost $150,000 in gold.

The property has been under lease for the year 1866, at a monthly rent of $500, payable in advance. A secured title in fee simple will be given by the United States Government.

Proposals will be marked, "Proposals for Government Tannery and Saw Mill," and addressed to

J. B. KIDDOO,
Bv't Maj.-Gen. Asst Com'n, Bureau R. F. and A. L., Galveston, Texas. 1 11 7w

PROPOSALS FOR CAVALRY HORSES.—

DEPOT QUARTERMASTER'S OFFICE,
BALTIMORE, Maryland,
January 9, 1867.

Sealed Proposals are invited and will be received at this Office until THURSDAY, 12 o'clock M., January 24, 1867, for the delivery in the City of Baltimore of forty-eight (48) Cavalry Horses.

The horses will be subjected to careful inspection before being accepted. They must be sound in all respects, well broken, in full flesh and good condition, from fifteen to sixteen hands high, from five to nine years old, well adapted in every way for cavalry purposes.

The ability of the bidder to fulfil his agreement must be guaranteed by two responsible persons, which guarantee must accompany the proposal.

The horses must be delivered within twenty (20) days from the date of acceptance of any proposal.

The Government reserves the right to reject any or all bids. Payment to be made on completion of contract.

Bids will be endorsed "Proposals for Cavalry Horses," and addressed to the undersigned, Baltimore, Md.

By order of the Quartermaster-General.

A. S. KIMBALL,
Captain and A. Q. M., U. S. A.,
Depot Quartermaster.
1 11 11t

GEO. A. COOKE'S
COAL EMPORIUM
1314 WASHINGTON AV.

THE GENUINE EAGLE VEIN, THE CELEBRATED PRESTON, and the pure hard GREENWOOD COAL, Egg and Stove, sent to all parts of the city at $6·50 per ton; superior LEHIGH at $6·75.

Each of the above articles are warranted to give perfect satisfaction in every respect. Orders received at No. 114 South THIRD Street; Emporium, No 1314 WASHINGTON Avenue. 4 44