

The Globe.

WILLIAM LEWIS,

-PUBLISHER-

Editor and Proprietor.

VOL. XII.

HUNTINGDON, PA., SEPTEMBER 24, 1856.

NO. 14.

TERMS OF THE GLOBE.

Per annum in advance.....\$1 50
Six months..... 75
Three months..... 50
A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.
1 insertion. 2 do. 3 do.
Four lines or less.....\$ 25.....37 1/2.....50
One square (12 lines)..... 60.....75.....90
Two squares..... 1 00.....1 50.....2 00
Three squares..... 1 50.....2 50.....3 00
Over three weeks and less than three months, 25 cents per square for each insertion.

3 months. 6 months. 12 months.
Six lines or less.....\$1 50.....\$3 00.....\$5 00
One square..... 2 00..... 3 00..... 4 00
Two squares..... 3 00..... 4 00..... 5 00
Three squares..... 4 00..... 5 00..... 6 00
Four squares..... 5 00..... 6 00..... 7 00
Half a column.....10 00.....15 00.....20 00
One column.....15 00.....20 00.....25 00
Professional and Business Cards not exceeding four lines, one year.....25 00.....35 00.....45 00
Administrators' and Executors' Notices.....\$1 75
Advertisements not marked with the number of insertions desired, will be continued till forbid and charged according to these terms.

An Able Address.

ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—The Central Committee, appointed by the Democratic State Convention, have thought proper to address you on the questions which you must decide at the next election. In doing so, we shall be candid, frank, and fair. Apart from the principle which should bind all men to the truth in political discussions, and in every thing else, we are well aware that any attempt to mislead you would injure our cause. It is yet nearly three months before the election, and there is no reason to believe that the public mind will not use the intermediate time in calmly considering the great issue before it. We are perfectly willing that whatsoever we may say, which is not justified by fact and reason, shall be set down as so much against us, against our party, and against our candidates.

The time has passed for the discussion of Bank and Tariff questions. We hear no proposals to enact a Bankrupt law, no word of opposition to the Independent Treasury. All these questions are settled agreeably to the Democratic opinions upon them. The rise, the prosperity, and the fall of the great Whig party, are themes for the historian, and full of instructive lessons; but we will not dwell upon them now.

It is the present duty of the Democratic party to stand over the Constitution, and shield it and save it, or perish there, too. It is our task in this campaign to be its enemies, separate or combined, just as they choose to meet us, to conquer them with an overthrow which will be a warning to them for many a year. And it must be done, or else this Union is not safe for a day.

We know very well how easy it is to sneer at any suggestion of danger to the Union. But we know also that the federal relations of this Government are so delicately constructed, that they may be ruptured at any time by a serious error of the people in choosing a Chief Magistrate. The States of the Union are not held together by physical force like the dependencies of a Kingdom, nor even by political power, like different parts of the same State. They are independent sovereignties, united by the gentler law of mutual attraction. This law, operating on their own free will, made the Union; and when it ceases to operate the Union will be unmade. Let a President of the United States be elected exclusively by the votes of one section, and on a principle of avowed hostility to the men, the measures, the domestic institutions, the feelings and the interests, real or supposed, of the other section, and what must be the consequence? We do not say that it would certainly or necessarily dissolve the Union. Perhaps the good genius of the Republic, which has brought us through so many perils, might save us again. But that man must be intellectually blind who does not see that it would put us in fearful danger. For this reason the election of a sectional candidate must be regarded as in itself a great and public mischief. The party that avows opposition and hatred towards a certain class of the States as its motive and rule of action, is entitled to no aid or comfort from any man who loves his country, or desires to be faithful to its government.

The question of involuntary servitude had engaged the earnest attention of the sages of the revolution. There can be no doubt that if they could have provided for its amelioration and gradual emancipation, would have done so; they found it, however, incorporated in the social system of all the States but one, and they dealt with it according to the exigencies of the times in which they lived. We all know that even at that early day it was a subject of mutual irritation and excitement; and although the wonderful uses to which the cotton plant has been applied, on account of the subsequent discoveries in the machinery of machinery, were then scarcely anticipated, it is enough to say that the republican fathers could not dispose of this slavery question until they agreed upon the basis which led to the formation of the Constitution; the recognition of the domestic institutions of the South, in the ratio of representation and in the provision for the restriction of fugitives from labor. Twelve of the thirteen States at the time that instrument was adopted, and by the quiet operation of the popular exclusive sovereignty six of those States have since become free. Throughout all the action of the framers of the Constitution, the idea which prevailed was that which regarded the negro as inferior to the white, and until abolitionism is able to convince the present generation that this idea is illegal and untrue, (and to do this they must agree to the doctrine of a perfect equality between the races,) all permanent legislation on the subject of the negro race must and will be controlled by the same sentiment. In the free States, at the present day, the negro is subject to a moral, and in many respects to a physical servitude, quite as injurious to his condition as the most fabulous pictures of Southern slavery represent his brothers' condition in the South to be. We do not call the Northern negro a slave, but in what free State is he equal to the white? In some States he is prevented from voting, in others he votes upon a property qualification; even in Massachusetts certain disqualifications are thrown in the way by those Utopian philosophers, who constantly prate of the equality of races; in others still he is met by a statute that excludes him altogether from entrance upon their soil, and nowhere is he recognized on the same level with the white. The white who intermarries with the black is everywhere regarded as a degraded being; and in schools and churches there is almost a universal bar between the two races, so that the rules of society and the laws of the States, even in the communities of the non-slaveholding region, are inexorably opposed to the negro. Why is it that Abolitionism does not begin at home and reform these things?

But again, there is no power which can prevent any State from passing whatever laws it may please under the Federal Constitution, for its own comfort and protection, and the very same theory which induces us to respect and to recognize the great doctrine of State rights in the South, under which it holds its own slaves, compels us also to recognize those laws to which we have referred in the North, in regard to the free blacks. The North regulates its colored population as it pleases, and is protected in doing so by the Constitution of the United States. All the negroes of the North are represented in the ratio of federal representation, and yet nearly all are disfranchised and alienated by the laws of the North. The South does as it pleases with its colored population, slave and free, and is protected under the Federal Constitution, but its slaves are only represented in the ratio of three-fifths in the federal representation.

In a moral point of view, it seems at least inconsistent that these abolitionists, who are entirely silent in reference to the negroes in the free States, should be so extremely vituperative when they come to treat of the condition of the negroes of the slave States. Both belong to the same inferior class, both are so regarded in all the States. The South found a legacy in slavery, transmitted to it by its English ancestors, and the Constitution respected the institution as it existed when that instrument was framed. The North, while it has rid itself of slavery, (so far as the name is concerned,) still retains the right to protect itself against contact with a race which is stamped as inferior by all classes of whites wherever they are found.

The Northern States in the exercise of their undoubted constitutional right, consulted what they deemed their own true interest, and one after another, in their own time and their own way abolished slavery. Against these proceedings in the North the South uttered not a word of complaint. But the views and opinions of the Southern States were wholly averse to abolition. They believed it to be utterly impossible, without the greatest danger, not to their prosperity only but to their very existence. This was an opinion to which they had as good a right as the North had to the opposite one. But they were not suffered to enjoy and to act upon it in quietness and peace. At the very first Congress after the government was organized, a petition from the North was presented, praying for the abolition of slavery by Congress. Treacherous attempts to deprive the South of her undoubted rights to manage her own affairs, have been constantly made. The framers of the Constitution declared in its preamble, that one of their great objects in adopting it was "to insure domestic tranquility." But the South has been assailed by Northern Abolitionists, who knew very well that they had no business whatever in the matter.

A majority of the old States made the negroes free without opposition from abroad. That it was wise for the North to do so all agreed; that it was just and proper in the South to make no complaint is equally true. Now let us see whether the South has gained any advantages, or committed any aggressions with reference to the new States.

Maine and Vermont were admitted as free States, and nobody asked them to put slavery into their constitutions. This was a matter of course, and so treated all around. But with reference to the Western States, their exemption from slavery was not a matter of course. The South might have prevented it if she had seen proper. The whole of the territory north and west of the Ohio, and east of the Mississippi, belonged to the State of Virginia. She owned the land, and had the power to control the settlement of every acre. What did she do? She magnanimously gave up not only her political jurisdiction, but also her proprietary right to the Federal Government, allowing the voters of the North to settle its destiny and all its proceeds to go into the general coffers. Connecticut had a spurious claim to a part of it—a claim precisely like that which she set up to a part of Pennsylvania, and which was decided against her. But her claim to the Western reserve was conceded to her—she kept it, sold it, and put the proceeds into her own treasury. Virginia did not protest against the Ordinance of 1787, which passed, abolishing slavery within the territory, which she had thus generously given away. Was there any aggression in all this? If there was "aggression," on either side, who committed it? If there was unwise concession, from whom did it come?

There are men among us who actually think that the North has been the victim of grievous wrongs, to which we have been submitting with a disgraceful tameness of spirit. This is an artful appeal to a point of honor on which all men are sensitive, and it is not wonderful that those who are weak enough to be deceived by it should also be weak enough to break out into denunciation of the South, as a cheap and safe way of showing their courage.

Candor requires us to say that if there is truth in this the Democracy ought to be defeated. If that party has ever counselled submission to wrong, oppression, and injury, it is not worthy your confidence and support. If we have ever yielded to our Southern brethren a right which the Constitution, in its letter or spirit, did not give them—if we have made any concession to them in the way of compromise, which was not required by a fair and manly sense of justice—then we admit that Abolitionism has the right side of this argument.

But we totally deny the truth of this impudent accusation. It is false in the aggregate and false in detail; false in the sum total, and false in every one of its items. We pronounce it a libel on both sections of the Union. It could be invented only in a spirit of sheer mendacity; it can be believed only by gross ignorance or childish credulity.

The fact that the Democratic party in the North has behaved with honorable magnanimity and fairness to the weaker section—their brethren in the South—this is our crime—this is the wrong which we and our fathers have been heaping on our own heads for three quarters of a century. This is the offence which the Abolitionists would punish by bringing our Government to a violent end, and by covering our whole country with shame and ruin.

Before the formation of the Constitution it was feared that the interests, opinions and feelings of the different States, were so various and so much opposed, that no general government could possibly be established. Such was the view of the subject taken by Washington himself. But the effort was made. It owed its success simply to the fact that the right of each State to manage its own domestic concerns in its own way, was fully conceded.

It was easily foreseen that great difference of opinion and feeling would exist between the people of the several States, in regard to the treatment that ought to be bestowed upon the black race, who were among us, but not of us—who were on our soil, and yet not a part of the people, nor qualified in any way to be our equals. This race was then held in slavery, or involuntary servitude, by the laws of all the States except one. But in the North their numbers were few, and the climate unsuited to them, while in the South it was just the reverse. It was utterly out of the question to expect unanimity on a subject like this. It could be managed in one way only; and that way was by agreeing that each State should determine the whole matter for itself, and on its own responsibility. It was then solemnly agreed that the Federal Government should not interfere with Slavery; and that no State should interfere with it in any other State, either directly or indirectly. And all the people said amen! If the solemn assurances of mutual forbearance then given and sworn to so often since, have been belied and violated, it has not been done with the consent of the Democracy.

The question of involuntary servitude had engaged the earnest attention of the sages of the revolution. There can be no doubt that if they could have provided for its amelioration and gradual emancipation, would have done so; they found it, however, incorporated in the social system of all the States but one, and they dealt with it according to the exigencies of the times in which they lived. We all know that even at that early day it was a subject of mutual irritation and excitement; and although the wonderful uses to which the cotton plant has been applied, on account of the subsequent discoveries in the machinery of machinery, were then scarcely anticipated, it is enough to say that the republican fathers could not dispose of this slavery question until they agreed upon the basis which led to the formation of the Constitution; the recognition of the domestic institutions of the South, in the ratio of representation and in the provision for the restriction of fugitives from labor. Twelve of the thirteen States at the time that instrument was adopted, and by the quiet operation of the popular exclusive sovereignty six of those States have since become free. Throughout all the action of the framers of the Constitution, the idea which prevailed was that which regarded the negro as inferior to the white, and until abolitionism is able to convince the present generation that this idea is illegal and untrue, (and to do this they must agree to the doctrine of a perfect equality between the races,) all permanent legislation on the subject of the negro race must and will be controlled by the same sentiment. In the free States, at the present day, the negro is subject to a moral, and in many respects to a physical servitude, quite as injurious to his condition as the most fabulous pictures of Southern slavery represent his brothers' condition in the South to be. We do not call the Northern negro a slave, but in what free State is he equal to the white? In some States he is prevented from voting, in others he votes upon a property qualification; even in Massachusetts certain disqualifications are thrown in the way by those Utopian philosophers, who constantly prate of the equality of races; in others still he is met by a statute that excludes him altogether from entrance upon their soil, and nowhere is he recognized on the same level with the white. The white who intermarries with the black is everywhere regarded as a degraded being; and in schools and churches there is almost a universal bar between the two races, so that the rules of society and the laws of the States, even in the communities of the non-slaveholding region, are inexorably opposed to the negro. Why is it that Abolitionism does not begin at home and reform these things?

But again, there is no power which can prevent any State from passing whatever laws it may please under the Federal Constitution, for its own comfort and protection, and the very same theory which induces us to respect and to recognize the great doctrine of State rights in the South, under which it holds its own slaves, compels us also to recognize those laws to which we have referred in the North, in regard to the free blacks. The North regulates its colored population as it pleases, and is protected in doing so by the Constitution of the United States. All the negroes of the North are represented in the ratio of federal representation, and yet nearly all are disfranchised and alienated by the laws of the North. The South does as it pleases with its colored population, slave and free, and is protected under the Federal Constitution, but its slaves are only represented in the ratio of three-fifths in the federal representation.

In a moral point of view, it seems at least inconsistent that these abolitionists, who are entirely silent in reference to the negroes in the free States, should be so extremely vituperative when they come to treat of the condition of the negroes of the slave States. Both belong to the same inferior class, both are so regarded in all the States. The South found a legacy in slavery, transmitted to it by its English ancestors, and the Constitution respected the institution as it existed when that instrument was framed. The North, while it has rid itself of slavery, (so far as the name is concerned,) still retains the right to protect itself against contact with a race which is stamped as inferior by all classes of whites wherever they are found.

The Northern States in the exercise of their undoubted constitutional right, consulted what they deemed their own true interest, and one after another, in their own time and their own way abolished slavery. Against these proceedings in the North the South uttered not a word of complaint. But the views and opinions of the Southern States were wholly averse to abolition. They believed it to be utterly impossible, without the greatest danger, not to their prosperity only but to their very existence. This was an opinion to which they had as good a right as the North had to the opposite one. But they were not suffered to enjoy and to act upon it in quietness and peace. At the very first Congress after the government was organized, a petition from the North was presented, praying for the abolition of slavery by Congress. Treacherous attempts to deprive the South of her undoubted rights to manage her own affairs, have been constantly made. The framers of the Constitution declared in its preamble, that one of their great objects in adopting it was "to insure domestic tranquility." But the South has been assailed by Northern Abolitionists, who knew very well that they had no business whatever in the matter.

A majority of the old States made the negroes free without opposition from abroad. That it was wise for the North to do so all agreed; that it was just and proper in the South to make no complaint is equally true. Now let us see whether the South has gained any advantages, or committed any aggressions with reference to the new States.

Maine and Vermont were admitted as free States, and nobody asked them to put slavery into their constitutions. This was a matter of course, and so treated all around. But with reference to the Western States, their exemption from slavery was not a matter of course. The South might have prevented it if she had seen proper. The whole of the territory north and west of the Ohio, and east of the Mississippi, belonged to the State of Virginia. She owned the land, and had the power to control the settlement of every acre. What did she do? She magnanimously gave up not only her political jurisdiction, but also her proprietary right to the Federal Government, allowing the voters of the North to settle its destiny and all its proceeds to go into the general coffers. Connecticut had a spurious claim to a part of it—a claim precisely like that which she set up to a part of Pennsylvania, and which was decided against her. But her claim to the Western reserve was conceded to her—she kept it, sold it, and put the proceeds into her own treasury. Virginia did not protest against the Ordinance of 1787, which passed, abolishing slavery within the territory, which she had thus generously given away. Was there any aggression in all this? If there was "aggression," on either side, who committed it? If there was unwise concession, from whom did it come?

prevent any State from passing whatever laws it may please under the Federal Constitution, for its own comfort and protection, and the very same theory which induces us to respect and to recognize the great doctrine of State rights in the South, under which it holds its own slaves, compels us also to recognize those laws to which we have referred in the North, in regard to the free blacks. The North regulates its colored population as it pleases, and is protected in doing so by the Constitution of the United States. All the negroes of the North are represented in the ratio of federal representation, and yet nearly all are disfranchised and alienated by the laws of the North. The South does as it pleases with its colored population, slave and free, and is protected under the Federal Constitution, but its slaves are only represented in the ratio of three-fifths in the federal representation.

In a moral point of view, it seems at least inconsistent that these abolitionists, who are entirely silent in reference to the negroes in the free States, should be so extremely vituperative when they come to treat of the condition of the negroes of the slave States. Both belong to the same inferior class, both are so regarded in all the States. The South found a legacy in slavery, transmitted to it by its English ancestors, and the Constitution respected the institution as it existed when that instrument was framed. The North, while it has rid itself of slavery, (so far as the name is concerned,) still retains the right to protect itself against contact with a race which is stamped as inferior by all classes of whites wherever they are found.

The Northern States in the exercise of their undoubted constitutional right, consulted what they deemed their own true interest, and one after another, in their own time and their own way abolished slavery. Against these proceedings in the North the South uttered not a word of complaint. But the views and opinions of the Southern States were wholly averse to abolition. They believed it to be utterly impossible, without the greatest danger, not to their prosperity only but to their very existence. This was an opinion to which they had as good a right as the North had to the opposite one. But they were not suffered to enjoy and to act upon it in quietness and peace. At the very first Congress after the government was organized, a petition from the North was presented, praying for the abolition of slavery by Congress. Treacherous attempts to deprive the South of her undoubted rights to manage her own affairs, have been constantly made. The framers of the Constitution declared in its preamble, that one of their great objects in adopting it was "to insure domestic tranquility." But the South has been assailed by Northern Abolitionists, who knew very well that they had no business whatever in the matter.

A majority of the old States made the negroes free without opposition from abroad. That it was wise for the North to do so all agreed; that it was just and proper in the South to make no complaint is equally true. Now let us see whether the South has gained any advantages, or committed any aggressions with reference to the new States.

Maine and Vermont were admitted as free States, and nobody asked them to put slavery into their constitutions. This was a matter of course, and so treated all around. But with reference to the Western States, their exemption from slavery was not a matter of course. The South might have prevented it if she had seen proper. The whole of the territory north and west of the Ohio, and east of the Mississippi, belonged to the State of Virginia. She owned the land, and had the power to control the settlement of every acre. What did she do? She magnanimously gave up not only her political jurisdiction, but also her proprietary right to the Federal Government, allowing the voters of the North to settle its destiny and all its proceeds to go into the general coffers. Connecticut had a spurious claim to a part of it—a claim precisely like that which she set up to a part of Pennsylvania, and which was decided against her. But her claim to the Western reserve was conceded to her—she kept it, sold it, and put the proceeds into her own treasury. Virginia did not protest against the Ordinance of 1787, which passed, abolishing slavery within the territory, which she had thus generously given away. Was there any aggression in all this? If there was "aggression," on either side, who committed it? If there was unwise concession, from whom did it come?

The territory of Louisiana, including what is now Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and the unoccupied wilderness beyond, was purchased from France in 1803. It was all slave Territory. We took it with a French law upon it legalizing slavery. It could not be made free without repealing that law. Missouri had been settled long before by persons who had owned slaves and who had held them there upon the faith of the law. They were not disturbed during her whole existence as an organized territory. When she proposed to come into the Union as a State, her people, in the exercise of as plain a right as any people ever possessed, made a constitution for themselves, in which, with almost entire unanimity, they recognized the rights of the slaveholders to retain the property acquired under previous laws. Then arose the wildest yells of fanaticism. Large masses of the people in the North, and especially in New England, led on and excited by the inflammatory appeals of their leaders, grew almost frantic with rage. The sole cause of this outcry was that the people of Missouri had made their own constitution to suit their own views, and had not permitted it to be made for them by anti-slavery men residing in the Northern States. This was the head and front of their offending. Nothing else was charged against them. Yet every Southern member of Congress who expressed his opinion that Missouri had a right to make her own constitution was called an aggressor, a slave driver and a tyrant, while every Northern man who assented to the same simple proposition was denounced and abused as a coward, a dough-face, and as a recreant to his own section. So fiercely did

this storm of calumny blow that the whole government recoiled to it. There seemed no way left to avoid a civil war but to compromise. And such a compromise! It consisted in an agreement that Missouri might exercise her undoubted right, and have her own constitution if Congress would abolish the law legalizing slavery in all the territory outside of that State and lying north of a certain line. That Congress had any power to do this is now almost universally doubted, and by a large majority of the people it is totally denied that slavery can be forced, either in or out of the Territory, by the legislation of the General Government. Thus by mere clamor and abuse the North got an unconstitutional advantage, in return for yielding to a Southern State a privilege which no fair man can deny was plainly her own. But even this did not satisfy the Abolitionists. They continued to insult the South for not giving up everything, and vented their abusive and slanderous epithets as vigorously as ever upon the North because it had not insisted on more. Was this Northern or Southern aggression?

In 1850, this cry of Southern aggression on Northern rights again rose to a pitch which seemed to put the Union in extreme danger. Again the trouble was allayed by a compromise. The nature, character and terms of the Compromise will show how much aggression had been committed then.

There were five measures included in it. 1. The admission of California as a free State. 2. The territorial organization of New Mexico on the principle of non-intervention, which is it known would exclude slavery. 3. The purchase of a large portion of Texas, taking it away from the jurisdiction of the slave State. 4. The abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. 5. The fugitive slave law.

The first four of these measures were anti-slavery, and were demanded by the North. The fifth one (the fugitive slave law) was a concession, not to the South, but to the Constitution. It was required by its plain and unequivocal mandate, and had been admitted by every President and every Congress, from the foundation of the Government, to be an imperative Constitutional obligation. For this, the same infamous assaults were again made on the eminent men who supported it. The only measure which the South got was opposed and resisted, even after its enactment, and in many places its execution was wholly prevented. We demand, again, where was the aggression?

It is on these facts we base the assertion that in every contest where the rights of the North have been entrusted to Democratic protection, they have been guarded faithfully and well. We have not resisted any just claim which the South ever made; we have meant to treat them fairly, and to carry out in good faith the obligations imposed upon us by the Constitution. But if there has been any instance in which the South has got more than its due, the history of the transaction has escaped our notice. On the contrary, we submit to you, fellow citizens, whether the South has not got the scantiest measure of justice that could possibly be dealt out to her.—Has not the North had all the proponderance? Has not our section had the advantage of all the important concessions that were ever made?

The States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin were slave Territory. They were presented to us by Virginia as a gracious gift, and we excluded slavery. The State of Iowa, the territories of Minnesota and Nebraska, were slave territory under the law of Louisiana. We took them because we were strong, and we made them Free Soil. Slavery once covered the whole Union. Its Representatives in the National Government are now in a minority. Could anything but the grossest malice, the most stupid folly, or the most unmitigated knavery have suggested the idea that slavery was encroaching upon us while these things were going on?

Our limited space will not permit us to recount the many unjustifiable injuries which the Abolitionists have perpetrated and attempted to perpetrate upon the people of the South, upon those in the North who do not unite with them, and upon all the institutions of the country. They have sought every occasion and taken advantage of every event which could give them an excuse, for pouring out their venomous slanders upon the fathers of the Constitution, upon the Constitution itself, and upon all who support it.

This agitation began in England among persons whose gross ignorance of America was the only excuse for their insane hostility to our Union. They sent over to this country one Thompson, a member of the British Parliament, a man of ability, but reckless like his employers. Under his influence and direction, societies, modelled after the old English form, were established in New England. The avowed object of these societies was to excite insurrection among the Southern negroes. For this purpose they distributed among the negroes by every means in their power, pictures representing the scenes of violence, murder and arson, through which the slaves, if they would adopt them, might be free.—These things were accompanied by promises of aid and support from British and American leaders. Long subsequent to the time we speak of, Joshua R. Giddings, a member of Congress, and now the leading friend of Col. Fremont, admitted the accomplishment of this object, (a servile insurrection led by British officers,) to be the dearest wish of his heart. No doubt he spoke the general sentiments of his party.

Think, fellow-citizens, of the situation in which this must have placed the Southern people. They found the institution of negro slavery fastened upon them without any fault of their own. Many of them believed it to be an evil, but they could not help it. They had the wolf by the ears, and they could neither hold on with comfort nor let go with safety. A general emancipation would have been a virtual surrender of the whole Southern country to the black race, probably the extinction of the whites in their own blood. The fate of St. Domingo and the British West Indies forbade such a thought. It was in this condition that they were as-

sailed by every means which malice and cunning could devise, in order to increase the danger and difficulty of their situation. Have they not a good right to complain bitterly of a party which was doing all it could to murder them, their wives and their children?

They did complain. But their complaints were uttered in vain. General Jackson called the attention of Congress to the subject, and a bill was brought in to prohibit the transmission of incendiary documents through the mail, but the South was in the minority and the bill was lost. It was not only lost, but the proposition to prevent the United States mail from being prostituted to the purposes of assassination and murder, was made the occasion for a new cry of Southern aggression, and every Northern man who favored it was again called a dough-face, coward and traitor.

In the present canvass, the Abolition party has a strength which it never had before. The dissolution of the Whig party has left many men without political connections, and some of them have a causeless feeling against the Democracy which makes them embrace any doctrine, and risk disunion itself, rather than join us. Many of the adhering Know Nothings were led over bodily, with their eyes shut, into the pit-fall of Abolitionism. They have, out of these materials, formed a party which they dare call Republican. Yes, a combination of men, acting under the influence of opinions formed and developed in England—propagated by British emissaries—advocated by the British press, and aiming a direct blow at the only strong republic on earth—such a party adds to other sins the base hypocrisy of calling itself by the sacred name of Republican.

Their only battle cry at this moment, and for some time past, has been Kansas! Kansas! Kansas! Mr. Buchanan will be elected President, and this Kansas question, with all its incidentals, will pass away among the things that were. When that happens, the people of this country will look back with wonder at the scenes now enacting, and think with amazement of the storm which a few fanatics and traitors could raise on a question so simple and so easily adjusted.

The Territorial government of Kansas was organized on a principle which permitted the men who might inhabit the new State to determine what should be its laws and institutions. Thus it expressly declared: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

That, too, was the very principle of the Compromise of 1850, with reference to California and New Mexico, and advocated by Clay, and Cass, and Webster, Let Whigs, Democrats, and Americans,—all men who love the Union,—listen to the language of the patriot Clay in his celebrated report introducing the Compromise bill: "It is high time that the wounds which it [the *Winnick proviso*] has inflicted should be healed up and closed, and that to avoid in all future time, the agitation which must be produced by the conflict of opinion on the slavery question—existing, as this institution does, in some of the States, and prohibited, as it is, in others—the true principle which ought to regulate the action of Congress in forming territorial governments for each newly acquired domain, is to refrain from all legislation on the subject in the territory acquired, so long as it retains the territorial form of government,—leaving it to the people of such territory, when they have attained to a condition which entitles them to admission as a State to decide for themselves the question of the allowance or prohibition of domestic slavery."—(See Congressional Globe, May 10, 1850, page 945.)

Certainly no man of ordinary foresight could have believed that honest men in the North, after contending for this doctrine five or six years ago, would turn around and repudiate it now. But these hypocritical preachers complain of the repeal of the law known as the Missouri Compromise, by which Congress legislated slavery out of Territory north of 36 deg. 30 min., and permitted it to exist in all Territory south of that line; and yet, in the platform they have made for their candidate and party, they solemnly resolve, "that we deny the authority of Congress, or Territorial Legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States, while the present Constitution shall be maintained." [Res. 2d, Republican Platform, 1856.]

Thus the very Compromise, which the Abolitionists at one moment pretend should not have been repealed, because, as they allege, it was a binding law and compact, they in the next solemnly resolve was no law—no compact; nay more, that it was beyond the power of Congress or of any human power to make such a law, while the Constitution shall last! But we pass from this to another topic.

Some disorders have occurred in the contest of opinion which has been going on in Kansas for two or three years between the pro-slavery men and the Abolitionists. Whatever they amounted to, it is fit that those who committed these disorders should take the responsibility and bear the consequences. But no one can fail to see that abolitionism has exaggerated and perverted every incident connected with them in this way which in their opinion was best calculated to create prejudice and hatred against the South.—Their own share in provoking these quarrels they have tried all they could to conceal. Instead of proposing some mode of settling the disputes in Kansas amicably and peacefully, they have artfully fanned the flame and shown by their whole conduct, that they would willingly spread civil war from Kansas all over the Union.

Even an assault and battery, committed at Washington city, has been used as a means of stirring up the bitter waters of sectional strife. When riots have been raised in the North to prevent the execution of the fugi-

tive slave law, a law approved by Washington, voted for by Clay and Webster, and signed by President Fillmore, and murders committed for the same purpose like those at Carlisle and Christiansburg, these same abolitionists clapped their hands in exultation, and cried well done! When the South complained that her best citizens had been thus slaughtered for no offence but demanding their lawful rights, the abolitionists answered with insult and ribaldry. And now, when a Northern Senator is named by the Representative of a slaveholding State, the whole Abolition party is thrown into a wild commotion of excitement. We do not justify or excuse Mr. Brooks, but we think that those men who had no sympathy for Kennedy and Gorsuch might as well be quiet about Summer.

In conclusion, we will briefly refer to one important fact, which ought to consign the leaders of the so-called Republican party to their political graves.

You are all aware that the Senate of the United States is largely Democratic. That body, some time ago, passed a bill for the re-organization of Kansas, so just and so equitable, that no fair objection can be made against it. It provides for the admission of Kansas as a State, with such a Constitution as the people themselves shall choose to have; and that the vote upon it may be taken fairly, the most stringent regulations are made to prevent any man from putting in a ballot who is not a resident. It provides that any one who has left the Territory on account of the previous troubles, may return and vote as if he had not gone away. It abrogates all the laws passed by the Territorial Legislature complained of by the Abolitionists. No man can deny (and so far as we know it never has been denied,) that this bill, if passed by the other House of Congress, would at once settle the whole difficulty in a manner perfectly fair.—Even one of the Abolition Senators—Mr. Hale—admitted this, for upon the introduction of the bill he said, in the Senate:—

"But, sir, I do not want to dwell on that subject, but to speak a very few words in reference to this bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Georgia. I take this occasion to say that this bill, as a whole, does great credit to the magnanimity, to the patriotism, and to the sense of justice of the honorable Senator who introduced it. It is a much fairer bill than I expected from that latitude. I say so because I am always willing and determined, when I have occasion to speak any thing, to do ample justice. I think the bill is almost unexceptionable."

Yet the Republican leaders, in and out of Congress, are doing their best to prevent the passage of this bill. They do not want the question settled. They prefer civil war, disunion, and all their frightful consequences. We solemnly trust that these heartless demagogues will receive such a lesson at the next election from the people, and especially from the people of Pennsylvania, as will settle them and the Kansas question both together.

By order of the State Central Committee.
JOHN W. FORNEY, Chairman.

The Kansas Bill.
[From the Lancaster Intelligencer.]

What is this bill that the Black Republicans keep up such an undefined and senseless howl about, for the purpose of misleading and prejudicing the minds of honest and unsuspecting voters? The getters up of this cry are so regardless of fact, and so presuming of the ignorance and inattention of the people, that they start out with the false declaration, that in endorsing the Kansas bill the Democratic party has committed itself to the extension of slavery! Never did any party set out on an electioneering campaign with a more false declaration—and that, too, their whole stock in trade. To show these Black Republican falsifiers up in their true colors to the scorn and detestation of every sensible man, we quote the clause of the bill upon which the base lie is predicated.

Section 32. That the Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not local or inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said territory of Kansas as elsewhere, except the 8th Section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6th, 1820, which being inconsistent with the principles of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the "Compromise Measures," is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.

Now this is the organic law of Kansas.—It is the same as that of Nebraska, but is never spoken of in connection with it, because, under precisely the same clause, this latter Territory has organized with free institutions! The provision distinctly is, "every intelligent reader will admit, that the people shall regulate their own domestic concerns in their own way. This provision is founded on a principle as old as Democracy itself.—The justice of the principle is as apparent as the right of self-government—indeed, it is self-government under the name of "popular sovereignty." It is what every town and township, what every County and State, in their capacities ask for. Lancaster city has no right to join a part of the citizens of Mannheim township and control their system of roads or schools: nor has a County or State any right to dictate a policy to any other County or State, or any State or combination of States to any Territory. The separate and independent powers of our Municipal, State and National governments, are peculiar to this country alone, and constitute the greatest safeguards of the rights and liberties of the people.

We suppose every intelligent person will admit that the people of Pennsylvania have a perfect constitutional right to either establish slavery, which they have done, or abolish it, if they think proper. The right to do so, pre-supposes the capability of the people to do so intelligently. Well, then, if here, in the heart of the old Keystone State, we have the constitutional right to decide the slavery question for ourselves, and are capable of so doing—does it not follow that if we emigrate to Kansas or any other of the Territories of the United States, we have the same constitutional right and possess the same qualifications for deciding the question for ourselves that we did whilst residents of Pennsylvania? Does the mere transfer of our citizenship from Pennsylvania to Kansas make us less men, or less capable of deciding for ourselves what is best for us?