The Democratic Watchman.

VOL. 7. BELLEFONTE, THURSDAY MORNING, APRIL 3, 1862. NO. 13.

Miscellaneous.

DOUGLAS ON NEGRO EQUALITY.

SPEECH OF HON. S. A. DOUGLAS,

IN REPLY TO

Mr. Seward and Mr. Trumbull.

DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEB. 29, 1860.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I trust I shall be pardoned for a few remarks upon so much of the Senator's speech as consists in an assault on the Democratic party, and especially with regard to the Kansas Nebraska bill, of which I was the responsible author. It has become fashionable now-a-days for each gentleman making a speech against the Democratic party, to refer to the Kansas Nebraska act as the cause of all the disturbances that have since ensued. They talk about the repeal of a sacred compact that had been undisturbed for more than a quarter of a century, as if those who complained of violated faith had been faithful to the provisions of the Missouri compromise. Sir, wherein consisted the necessity for the repeal or abrogation of the act, except it was that the majority in the Northern States refused to carry out the Missouri compromise in good faith? I stood wihing to extend it to the Pacific Ocean, and abide by it forever, and the entire South, without one exception in this body, was willing thus to abide by it; but the free soil element of the Northern States was so strong as to defeat that measure, and thus open the slavery question anew. The men who now complain of the abrogation of that act were the very men who denounced all of us who were willing to abide by it, so long as it stood upon the statute book. Sir, it was the defeat in the House of Representatives of the enactment of the bill to extend the Missouri compromise to the Pacific Ocean, after it had passed the Senate on my motion, that opened the controversy of 1850, which was terminated by the adoption of the measures of that year. * * * *

Hence I am not willing to sit here and allow the Senator from New York, with all the weight of authority he has with the powerful party of which he is the head, to arraign me and the party to which I belong with the responsibility for that agitation which rests solely upon him and his associates. Sir, the Democratic party was willing to carry out the compromise in good faith.—Having been defeated in that for the want of numbers, and having established the principle of non intervention in the compromise measures of 1850, in lieu of it, the Democratic party from that day to this has been faithful to the new principle of adjustment. Whatever agitation has grown out of the question since, has been occasioned by the resistance of the party of which the Senator is the head, to this great principle which has been ratified by the American people at two Presidential elections. If he was willing to acquiesce in the solemn and repeated judgment of that American people to which he appeals there would be no agitation in this country now.

But, sir, the whole argument of that Senator goes far beyond the question of slavery, even in the Territories. His entire argument rests on the assumption that the negro and the white man were equal by Divine law, and hence that all laws and constitutions and governments in violation of the principle of negro equality are in violation of the law of God. That is the basis upon which his speech rests. He quotes the Declaration of Independence to show that the fathers of the Revolution understood that the negro was placed on an equality with the white man, by quoting the clause, "we hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Sir, the doctrine of that Senator and his party is—and I have had to meet it for eight years—that the Declaration of Independence intended to recognize the negro and the white man as equal under the Divine law, and hence that all the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which recognizes slavery are in violation of the Divine law. In other words, it is an argument against the Constitution of the United States upon the ground that it is contrary to the laws of God. The Senator from New York has often proclaimed to the world, that the Constitution of the United States was in violation of the Divine law, and that Senator will not contradict the statement. I have an extract from one of his speeches now before me, in which that proposition is distinctly put forth. In a speech made in the State of Ohio, in 1848, he said:

"Slavery is the sin of not some of the States only, but of them all; of not one nationality, but of all nations. It perverted and corrupted the moral sense of mankind deeply and universally, and this perversion became a universal habit. Habits of thought become fixed principles. No American State has yet delivered itself entirely from these habits. We in New York, are guilty of slavery still by withholding the right of suffrage from the race we have emancipated. You in Ohio, are guilty in the same way by a system of laws still more aristocratic and odious. It is written in the Constitution of the United States that five slaves shall count equal to three freemen as a basis of representation: and it is written, also, IN VIOLATION OF DIVINE LAW, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave who takes refuge at our firesides from his relentless pursuer."

There find you his doctrine clearly laid down that the Constitution of the United States is "*in violation of the Divine law*," and, therefore, is not to be obeyed. You are told that the clause relating to fugitive slaves, being in violation of Divine law, is not binding on mankind. This has been the doctrine of the Senator from New York for years. I have not heard it in the Senate to-day for the first time. I have not met in my own State, for the last ten years this same doctrine that the Declaration of Independence recognized the negro and white man as equal; that the negro and white man are equals by Divine law, and that every provision of our Constitution and laws which established inequality between the negro and the white man is void, because contrary to the law of God.

The Senator from New York says, in the very speech from which I have quoted, that New York is yet a slave State. Why?—Not that she has a slave within her limits, but because the Constitution of New York does not allow a negro to vote on an equality with a white man. For that reason he says New York is still a slave State; for that reason every other State that discriminates between the negro and the white man is a slave State, leaving but a very few States in the Union that are free from his objection.—Yet, notwithstanding the Senator is committed to these doctrines, notwithstanding the leading men of his party are committed to them, he argues that they have been accused of being in favor of negro equality, and says the tendency of their doctrine is the equality of the white man. He introduces the objection, and fails to answer it. He states the proposition, and dodges it, to leave the inference that he does not endorse it. Sir, I desire to see these gentlemen carry out these principles to their logical conclusion. If they will persist in the declaration that the negro is made the equal of the white man, and that any inequality is in violation of the Divine law, then let them carry it out in their legislation by conferring on the negros all the rights of citizenship the same as on white men. For one, I never held to any such doctrine. I hold that the Declaration of Independence was only referring to the white man—to the governing race of this country, who were in conflict with Great Britain, and had no reference to the negro race at all, when it declared that all men were created equal.

Sir, if the signers of that declaration had understood the instrument then as the Senator from New York now construes it, were they not bound on that day, at that very hour, to emancipate their slaves? If Mr. Jefferson had meant that his negro slaves were created by the Almighty his equals, was he not bound to emancipate the slaves on the very day that he signed his name to the Declaration of Independence? Yet no one of the signers of that declaration emancipated their slaves. No one of the States on whose behalf the declaration was signed, emancipated its slaves until after the Revolution was over. Every one of the original colonies, every one of the thirteen original States, sanctioned and legalized slavery until after the Revolution was closed. These facts show conclusively that the Declaration of Independence was never intended to bear the construction placed upon it by the Senator from New York, and by that enormous tribe of lecturers that go through the country delivering lectures in country school houses and basements of churches to Abolitionists, in order to teach the children that the Almighty had put his seal of condemnation upon any inequality between the white man and the negro.

Mr. President, I am free to say here—what I have said over and over again at home—that, in my opinion, *that this government was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men, and by none other whatsoever.*

Mr. Doolittle—I will ask the honorable Senator why not give the Territories to white men?

Mr. Douglas—Mr. President, I am in favor of throwing the Territories open to all the white men and all the negroes, too, that choose to go, and then allow the white men to govern the Territory. I would not let one of the negroes, free or slave, either vote or hold office anywhere, where I had the right, under the Constitution, to prevent it. I am in favor of each State and Territory of this Union taking care of its own negroes, free or slave. If they want slavery let them have it; If they desire to prohibit slavery, let them do it; it is their busines not mine. We, in Illinois tried slavery while we were a Territory, and found it was not profitable; and hence we turned philanthropists and abolished it, just as our British friends across the ocean did. They established slavery in all their colonies, and when they found they could not make any more money out of it, abolished it. I hold that the question of slavery is one of political economy, governed by the laws of climate, soil, productions, and self-interest, and not by mere statutory provision. I repudiate the doctrine, that because free institutions may be best in one climate, they are, necessarily, the best everywhere; or that because slavery may be indispensable in one locality, therefore it is desirable everywhere. I hold that a wise statesman will always adapt his legislation, to the wants, interests, condition and necessities of the people to be governed by it. One people will bear different institutions from another. One climate demands different institutions from another. I repeat, then, what I have had occasion to say, that I do not think uniformity is either possible or desirable. I wish to see no two States precisely alike in their domestic institutions in this Union. Our system rests on the supposition that each State has something in her condition or climate, or her circumstances, requiring laws and institutions different from every other State of the Union. Hence I answer the question of the Senator from Wisconsin, that I am willing that a Territory settled by white men shall have negroes, free or slave, just as the white men shall determine, but not as the negroes shall prescribe.

The Senator from New York has coined a new definition of the States of the Union—Labor States and Capital States. The capital States, I believe, are the slaveholding States; the labor States are the non-slaveholding States. It has taken that Senator a good many years to coin that phrase and bring it into use. I have heard him discuss these favorite theories of his for the last ten years, I think, and I never heard of capital States and labor States before. It strikes me that something has recently occurred up in New England that makes it politic to get up a question between capital and labor, and take the side of the numbers against the few. We have seen some accounts in the newspapers of combinations and strikes among the journeymen shoemakers in the towns, there—labor against capital. The Senator has a new word ready coined to suit their case, and make laborers believe that he is on the side of the most numerous class of voters.

What produced that striking among the journeymen shoemakers? Why are the mechanics of New England, the laborers and employees now reduced to the starvation point? Simply because, *by your treason, by your sectional agitation, you have created a strife between the North and the South* have driven away your southern customers, and thus deprived the laborers of the means of support. This is the fruit of your Republican dogmas. It is another step, following John Brown, of the "irrepressible conflict." Therefore, we now get this new coinage of "labor States"—he is on the one side of the shoemakers, (laughter) and "capital States"—he is against those that furnish the hides. (Laughter,) I think those shoemakers will understand this business. They know why it is that they do not get so many orders as they did a few months ago. It is not confined to the shoemakers; it reaches every mechanic's shop and factory. All the large laboring establishments of the North feel the pressure produced by the doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict."—This new coinage of words will not save them from the just responsibility that follows the doctrines they have been inculcating. If they had abandoned the doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict," and proclaimed the true doctrine of the Constitution, that each State is entirely free to do just as it pleases, have slavery as long as it chooses, and abolish it when it wishes, there would be no conflict; the northern and southern States would be brethren, there would be fraternity between us, and your shoemakers would not strike for higher prices.

* * * * * * * *

But, sir, if the Senator from New York, in the event that he is made President, intends to carry out his principles to their logical conclusions, let us see where they will lead him. In the same speech that I read from a few minutes ago, I find the following. Addressing the people of Ohio, he said:

"You blush not at these things, because they have become as familiar as household words; and your pretended Free Soil allies claim peculiar merit for maintaining these miscalled guarantees of slavery, which they find in the national compact. Does not all this prove that the Whig party have kept up with the spirit of the age; that is as true and faithful to human freedom as the inert conscience of the American people will permit it to be? What then you say, can nothing be done for freedom, because the public conscience remains inert? Yes much can be done, everything can be done. *Slavery can be limited to its present bounds.*

That is the first thing that can be done—slavery can be limited to its present bounds. What else?

"IT CAN BE AMELIORATED. IT CAN AND MUST BE ABOLISHED, AND YOU AND I CAN AND MUST DO IT"

There you find are two propositions: first, slavery was to be limited to the States in which it was then situated. It did not then exist in any Territory. Slavery was confined to the States. The first proposition was that slavery must be restricted and confined to those States. The second was that he, as a New Yorker, and they, the people of Ohio, must and would abolish it; that is to say, abolish it in the States. They could abolish it no where else. Every appeal they make to northern prejudice and passion, is against the institution of slavery every where, and would not be able to retain their abolition allies, the rank and file, unless they hold out the hope that it was the mission of the Republican party, if successful, to abolish slavery in the States as well as in the territories of the Union.

And again in the same speech, the Senator from New York advised the people to disregard constitutional obligations in these words:

"But we must begin deeper and lower than the composition and combination of factions or parties, wherein the strength and security of slavery lie. You answer that it lies in the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions and laws of slaveholding States. Not at all. It is the erroneous sentiment of the American people. Constitutions and laws can no more rise above the virtue of the people than the limpid stream can climb above its native spring. Inculcate the love of freedom and *equal rights of man under the parental roof; see to it that they are taught in the schools and in the churches reform your own code, extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and defend him as you would your parental gods, correct your own error, that slavery is an unconstitutional guarrantee which may not be released, and ought not to be relinquished.*"

I know they tell us that all this is to be done according to the Constitution except so far as the Constitution violates the law of God—that is all—and they are to be the judges of how far the Constitution does violate the law of God. They say that every clause of the Constitution that recognizes property in slaves, is in violation of the divine law, and hence should not be obeyed; and with that interpretation of the Constitution, they turn to the South and say, We will give you all your rights as *we explain it!*

Then the Senator devoted about one third of his speech to a very beautiful homily on the glories of our Union. All that he has said, all that any other man has ever said, all that the most eloquent tongue can ever utter in behalf of the blessings and the advantages of this glorious Union, I fully indorse. But still, sir, I am prepared to say, that the Union is glorious only when the *Constitution is preserved inviolate.* He eulogized the Union. I, too, am for the Union; I endorse the eulogies; but still, what is the Union worth, unless the Constitution is preserved and maintained inviolate in all its provisions?

Sir, I have no faith in the Union-loving sentiments of those who will not carry out the Constitution in good faith, as our fathers made it. Professions of fidelity to the Union will be taken for naught, unless they are accompanied by obedience to the Constitution upon which the Union rests. I have a right to insist that the Constitution shall be maintained inviolate in all its parts, not only that which suits the temper of the North but every clause of that Constitution, whether you like it or dislike it. Your oath to support the Constitution binds you to every line, word, and syllable of the instrument.—You have no right to say that any given clause is in violation of Divine law, and that, therefore, you will not observe it. *The man who disobeys any one clause, on the pretext that it violates the Divine law, or any pretext violates his oath of office.*

But sir, what a commentary is the pretext that the Constitution is a violation of the Divine law upon those revolutionary fathers whose eulogies we have heard here to day. Did the framer of that instrument make a Constitution in violation of the law of God? If the Senator from New York stills holds to his declaration that the clause in the Constitution relative to fugutive slaves is a violation of the Divine law, how dare he, as an honest man, take an oath to support the instrument? Did he understand that he was defying the authority of Heaven when he took the oath to support that instrument?

Thus, we see the radical difference between the republican party and the Democratic party, is this: we stand by the Constitution as our fathers made it, and by the decisions of the constituted authorities as they are pronounced in obedience to the Constitution.—They repudiate the instrument, substitute their own will for that of the constituted authorities as they are pronounced in obedience to the Constitution, They repudiate the instrument, substitute their own will for that of the constituted authorities, annul such provisions as their fanaticism or prejudice, or policy may declare to be in violation of God's law, and then say, "We will protect all your rights under the Constitution as expounded *by ourselves; but not as expounded by the tribunal created for that purpose.*"

Original Poetry.

A Devil Still.

BY T. WEAVER.

Written for the Watchman.]

If any one hath inklings queer,
Then hear how Hell's antiquities
Turn up in novels 'round us near,
When in frail man's obliquities,
A Devil still is honored here!

For once, I chanced a form to meet,
Which had the christening of man;
But in his manhood's dark retreat,
Presentiment would read and scan,
"A Devil still,—a human cheat!"

Again and yet again, I met
And to my sorrow, on life's way,
This medium, spirit alphabet,
Yet every reading read this way—
"A Devil still—to wrath in debt."

Art conjured up his style benign;
No cloven foot—nor branchy head,—
No roaring voice—nor eyes malign,
Nor any sign had he of dread;—
"A Devil still," vague fears opine!

His double tongue had sing'lar power;
His outer parts were *debonair;*
Was heir to wealth and mental dower,
But conscience was not present there.
A Devil still that man might cower!

The inner, holier lineaments
Were counterfeit, yet o'er them shone
A light that blanched the soul's intents,
As though an angel filled its throne;
A Devil still the voice comments!

Religion's robes adorned his frame;—
The masque of perfidy within;
Beneficence proclaimed his fame,
And lib'ral sums absolved his sin;
A Devil still in virtue's name!

The Orphan's guardian he was styled,
The widow's friend—then robbed their store,
The stranger he "took in," and smiled
That such "take ins" lead out no more!
A Devil still from hope exiled!

The tenderest ties of unity
Were severed by a hand unseen;
These three—Faith, Hope, Charity,
Died a mysterious death—I ween
A Devil still the cause might be!

Communities discordant grew,
Where'e'r this night-shade's presence fell;
Broils, suits, strifes, wars—all came to view,
But *whence* they came scarce one could tell;
A Devil still unshipped the crew!

Years went—years came—and I once more
Returned, a pilgrim on life's way;
I sat me down on Time's lone shore,
And, by strange traces traced this lay;
A Devil still sat there before!

Around my feet sad relics lay; [goal;
Life's harp—Man's armor—Youth's bright
And broken hearts—and idols grey—
Mementoes which repelled the soul;
A Devil still might love to stay!

But he had gone, the Lord knows where,
And left those wrecks upon the shore:
Anon, another race comes there,
Whom, too, for want of wisdom's lore,
A Devil still might vanquish there!

In haste retreating, thought thus ran:
"Of all the subtlest shapes of Hell,
The fellest fills the form of man!
In Glory's robes invested well,
A Devil still may work his plan!

But Gabriel's trump shall stir the mould
Where rests the dross of life's spent dame;
When its long heat hath tried the gold,
Then shall appear, in whose black name,
A Devil still may claim a hold!!"

BELLEFONTE,
March 27th'62.

I Do Love Thee.

BY THE MAN IN GREY.

Written for the Watchman.]

By each sweet and fond revealing
Of a love which o'er my heart is stealing,
By each impulse so sweetly thrilling,
By that love which now my soul is filling,
I do love thee.

By my every hope of future bliss,
By my soul's deep wretchedness,
By my all—my life—my love;
By all that's holy in Heaven above,
I do love thee.

By thy own dear, gentle nature,
By every sweet and kindly feature,
By my every hope and fear,
By thy love,—home so dear,
I do love thee.

BELLEFONTE,
March 29th '62.

The Secession Plot and the Late President.

A correspondent of the New York *Times*, who accompanied the expedition which lately took possession of Fernandina, Florida, picked up, after the hasty flight of the inhabitants, a number of interesting letters and documents, some of which throw considerable light upon the secret history of secession. Among these letters was one written on the 7th of January, 1861, by Mr. Yulee, then United States Senator from Florida:

WASHINGTON, Jan. 7, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR:—On the other side is a copy of resolutions adopted at a consultation of the Senators from the seceding States—in which Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, Mississippi and Florida were present.

The idea of the meeting was that the States should go out at once, and provide for the early organization of a Confederate Government—not later than the 15th of February. This time is allowed to enable Louisiana and Texas to participate

It seemed to be the opinion that if we left here, *force, loan and volunteer bills might be passed*, which would put Mr. Lincoln in immediate condition for hostilities—whereas, by remaining in our places until the 4th of March, *it is thought we can keep the hands of Mr. Buchanan tied, and disable the Republicans from effecting any legislation which will strengthen the hands of the incoming Administration.*

The resolutions will be sent by the delegation to the President of the Convention.—I have not been able to find Mr. Mallory this morning. Hawkins (the Representative from Florida) is in Connecticut. I have therefore thought it best to send you this copy of the resolutions.

In haste, yours truly,

D. L. YULEE.

JOSEPH FINNEGAN, Esq.,
"Sovereignty Convention," Tallahassee, Florida.

The following are the resolutions referred to in the above letter:

Resolved, That in our opinion each of the Southern States should, as soon as may be, secede from the Union.

Resolved, That provision should be made for a Convention to organize a Confederacy of the seceding States, the Convention to meet not later than the 15th of February, at the city of Montgomery, in the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That in view of the hostile legislation that is threatened against the seceding States, and which may be consummated before the 4th of March, we ask instructions whether the delegations are to remain in Congress until that date for the purpose of defeating such legislation.

Resolved, That a committee be and are hereby appointed, consisting of Messrs. Davis, Slidell and Mallory, to carry out the objects of this meeting.

The perusal of this letter brings to mind some facts with reference to the course pursued by Mr. Buchanan about the time this letter was written, to which we desire to direct public attention.

The commissioners appointed by South Carolina to induce the Administration to withdraw the garrison from Fort Sumter as the preliminary to the recognition of their independence, made several attempts to induce Mr. Buchanan to accede to their demands. On the 30th of December he replied in peremptory language "This I cannot do; "this I will not do. Such an idea was never thought of by me *in any possible contingency.*" On the 2d of January, 1861, President Buchanan returned to these commissioners their insolent letter in reply to his peremtory refusal to withdraw the troops from ehe Harbor of Charleston. Three days thereafter on the 5th of January, 1861, an expedition got up by the Secretaries of War and the Navy, under the direction of Gen. Scott, sailed from New York with reinforcements for Fort Sumter. On the next day the 6th, it now appears that the rebel Senators from the seven cotton States, by resolution, expressed the opinion to their constituents that "each of the Southern States should, "as soon as may be, secede from the Union."

The President, alive to the danger, made a most earnest appeal to Congress by his message of the Eighth of January (which seems to have been forgoten) to meet the crisis. In this he informs them that "in several of the States "which have not yet seceded, the forts, arsenals, and magazines "of the United States have been seized.—"This is by far the most serious step which "has been taken since the commencement "of the troubles. This public property has "long been left without garrisons and troops "for its protection, because no person doubted its security under the flag of the country in any State of the Union. Besides "our small army has scarcely been sufficient "to guard our remote frontiers against Indian incursions."

"The dangerous and hostile attitude of the "States towards each other has already far "transcended and put in the shade the ordinary executive duties already provided for "by law, and has assumed such vast and "alarming proportions as to place the subject entirely above and beyond control.—"*The fact cannot be disguised that we are "in the midst of a great revolution.* In all "its various bearings, I commend the question to Congress as the only human tribunal under Providence possessing the power to meet the emergency. To them exclusively belongs the power to declare war "or to authorize the employment of military force in all cases contemplated by the "Constitution; and they alone possess the "power to remove grievances which might "lead to war and to secure peace and union "to this distracted country. On them and "on them alone rests the responsibility."—

On the day when this message was received in Congress (January 9, 1861) Jeff. Davis made a violent and abusive attack on President Buchanan and he was followed in the same strain by several of his confederates.

In what manner did Congress respond to this solemn appeal of the President? They did nothing. They refused to do anything looking either to conciliation or to force.—The Thirty-sixth Congress came to an end on the third of March 1861, leaving the law just as they had found it, having deliberately refused to grant either men or money for the suppression of the rebellion. They would pass no law to enable either Mr. Buchanan or his successor even to prepare for such an emergency. It was their refusal to do this which induced the present Administration not to attempt to coerce the rebel States into obedience, and rendered it indispensable for President Lincoln to convene Congress in special session after the attack had been made on Fort Sumter.

We make no comments on these facts at this time. Our present purpose is merely to present the truth of history. From this it appears that Congress "kept the hands of Mr. Buchanan tied" and refused to pass "Force, Loan and Volunteer bills" which would put Mr. Lincoln in immediate condition for hostilities, throughout their entire session and long after the conspiring Senators had retired from their places.—*Patriot and Union.*