

Mr. speaker, my regret that the gentleman from Northumberland, Mr. Purdy, is not present, is modified by the fact that whatever may be said here to-night, or at any time during his absence, by any one, will be faithfully conveyed to him by the record of the proceedings of this body. That record, sir, of what has passed in this discussion confirms my recollection as to the correctness of the gentleman from Delaware, (Mr. Price,) when he said that anything in this discussion which has given it a party aspect arose entirely from the remarks of the gentleman from Northumberland. When the gentleman from Clearfield, (Mr. Boyer,) very properly made the inquiry how the standard of loyalty was to be ascertained, he said nothing about party, but left the question open, whether it was application of a test of loyalty referred to Republicans or Democrats. No sooner, however, had the gentleman from Northumberland stood upon his feet, than he assumed that all the resolutions of the gentleman from Washington, were a direct attack upon the Democratic party. Without being able to choose as good words as the gentleman from Washington, I will say that men who excuse themselves before they are assailed, are their own accusers.

What is there, sir, in this resolution, or this preamble:

"Whereas, there is reason to believe that the rebel invasions in Pennsylvania were, in a great measure, brought about through the connivance and by the encouragement of disloyal persons in our own State;

"And whereas, claims for damages done during those invasions are now being presented to this Legislature; therefore,

"Resolved, That the select committee to whom are referred all matters in relation to claims arising out of the losses from the rebel raids of 1862 and 1863, be instructed to report as part of their bill—if they report a bill—a clause requiring the parties presenting claims to furnish satisfactory proofs of their loyalty."

Is there anything said here about Democracy or Republicanism? The question presented is a great, a glorious question, to be put to every man, and every man ought to meet it, under any circumstances.

The gentleman from Franklin, (Mr. Sharpe,) gave as a reason why this resolution should not be adopted, that a very large proportion of the claimants would be Republicans. Where do you find, Mr. Speaker, a Republican here, in person or by his representative, claiming to be freed from this test? Where do you find any man claiming to be freed from this test who is a loyal man? There is no such man—no loyal man fears this test. No loyal man will hesitate to come up and meet the test which will establish his loyalty so far as, with propriety and consistently with the rules of law, we can establish it.

Now, sir, you find no such distinction in this resolution or this preamble. It applies to every man without reference to party. I am prepared to meet it, and I doubt not, are prepared to meet it; the gentleman from Franklin doubtless is prepared to meet it, however and whenever it comes. I have met it when I have gone down to that sad peninsula with a bleeding heart, to reach, as I supposed, the dead body of one who was dearer to me than myself—I met it there before I could reach the spot I sought, and so with hundreds of loyal men—as good men as the gentleman from Northumberland—or any whom he represents—who stood up there to take that solemn oath of allegiance, expressive of their love of their country; and their determination to stand by it. Why should we not meet it, sir? We met it when we first stood up as legislators here; we met it when we enter upon any public office; and when we propose now, seeing the perjury which has manifested itself in the halls of our National Legislature, and which has been developed throughout the whole land, through those who have taken the same oath as ourselves, as legislators, as lawyers, or in any position they may occupy in the land, when, by reason of that, we propose now to go further into detail, and to ask a man to support the Constitution of his State, and above his State, of his nation, why should we be met by gentlemen saying, "you mean us?" Let us meet the question, and let us act together as one man, throwing aside all these questions of party, when we come to consider a question paramount to all party, to life, and to everything but our accountability to Him who formed us as a nation.

Sir, one test of loyalty that I would put would be that a man should be desirous to repel the invaders from our own State. I speak of our own State just at this moment, but I say that far above the State is the nation. Yet how was it when these men who were the cause of this great loss, who inflicted this injury upon the citizens of the great Cumberland valley—how was it in this very town, and in these

The



Globe.

WILLIAM LEWIS, Editor and Proprietor.

PERSEVERE.

TERMS, \$1.50 a year in advance.

VOL. XIX.

HUNTINGDON, PA., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1864.

NO. 37.

very halls, when this mighty army, which had ravaged its own country, proposed as it was said by the Governor of this Commonwealth but a short time since, to breathe for a while the free air of Pennsylvania, such air as they had never breathed before? All around this hall, at that time, and in this hall—I speak that which I do know—men were sneering at the efforts of the Executive of the State and the Executive of the nation to repel the invasion. I heard with my own ears men who, if in their place, would now be within the sound of my voice, members of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, sneering at these efforts to repel invasion, and speaking of it, as if no invasion existed. Had they waited but a few days they would have found that there was hardly a house in all this State without its mourners, because of those who died upon the battle-field of Gettysburg to repel that invasion. Shame upon such men and upon those who sustain them!

I am happy here to say, that one of those men, a member of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, was rebuked by a gentleman, now a member of this House—whom I do not see in his seat, but who does not belong to this side of the House. Honor be to that man wherever he is. I speak of him only. I doubt not that there are many more like him. Such, I say, is one test of a man's loyalty.

With some of the sentiments which were uttered by the gentleman from Northumberland I can agree. I can agree that true Democracy and loyalty are convertible terms. I can agree that the Democracy upon which the institutions of this country are based, the principle which is to be found in every true man, whether he calls himself Republican or Whig, or Federal, or Democrat—I can agree that that Democracy is a convertible term with loyalty. But what do you understand by Democracy? Do you understand that you shall adhere to the opinions of those whom, as an organized party, you follow—men such as those who denounced Jackson, and Jefferson and Shunk? If that is a test of Democracy, it is not the Democracy that I follow, and have followed for years.

What I take to be the true Democracy is that which recognizes the will of the people, expressed by the majority through the forms they have adopted, and carried into execution by the power of the people; through the officers who have been chosen by them according to the same forms. When you come up to that Democracy, you will not find men assailing their Government because a man has been chosen to conduct its affairs, whom they did not assist to put into authority. You will find men coming up to sustain the Government under all circumstances in which it may be placed, and especially in the putting down of such a rebellion as we are now witnessing—a rebellion which was reserved for us alone, of all the inhabitants that have dwelt upon the face of the earth to witness. This is the Democracy of Washington; this is the Democracy of Jackson, and of that old man now tottering to his grave, Lewis Cass, and of Douglas, who has gone to his grave, from this same platform of Democracy—a platform upon which he rallied so many of the true citizens of his country.

Now, I say here—and I am willing to have this brought back upon me at any time—that a man who cannot come up to this Democracy and loyalty, who cannot come up to this test has no loyalty about him. I will not make any applications; let every man make the application for himself; let me assert—and I am prepared to meet it at any time—that my Democracy and my loyalty, and the loyalty that emanates from principles like these, is that which puts the Government of the United States above every government that is formed under it, that makes it supreme, that recognizes no would lead a man to say, "My State calls upon me to do so, and I am therefore a loyal man, whilst I am obeying that State, although she may be rebelling against the Government of the nation." Out upon such loyalty! Let us never hear of that in these halls.—Oh, that we had never heard of this country! and those rivers of blood which have been pouring down over every hillside and into the beautiful streams of our country, would never have marred their beauty, and the broken hearts which are now to remain broken and worn, the weeping eyes whose tears are never to be stayed upon this earth—those tears never would have been shed, those hearts never would have been broken. And yet the gentleman from Philadelphia tonight has undertaken to say that the Administration of this great nation is

disloyal, and he has charged this blood, and these tears, and this desolation, and this sorrow, upon it, when that Administration, with those who sustain it, stood up to maintain our national existence, and begged forbearance through the inaugural—now praised, but denounced at the time it was issued—when through all that time President has done, in almost every public paper that he has issued, the same tone may be observed—in the face of all that, the gentleman charges disloyalty upon him, because, in the exercise of the power that was given him under the Constitution, and in pursuance of his oath, he has endeavored to suppress this attempt to destroy this nation and to retard the charter of freedom, Heaven only knows how long.

Let us have right views upon this subject. Let us not test our loyalty by any such scheme as that of those men who have arisen in the South, and have poisoned the minds as well as the hearts of many in the North with the belief that this great nation, formed by the people, was a mere compact of States. Why, when as boys we read our Constitution, those of us whose heads are now gray, we never looked upon the government of the United States as a compact of States. We read it there, as plain as A, B, C, that "we, the people," form this great government; and we read there, too, that we gave to this great government, as a people, certain rights and powers for its preservation; and that in the exercise of those powers and the maintenance of those rights this government of the United States was supreme; that when the government enacted laws, through our constituted authorities and through the forms that the people had deputed, those laws were supreme, and the man who was a traitor and a scoundrel—(those were our sentiments then, and they are mine now)—who deliberately says that any State has rights which will put it above the government of the United States, and that we, as citizens of this State or any other State, should obey the behests of our State to the overturning of the government of the United States.

Now, sir, I say, as a result of these principles, that, coming up to this standard in such a time as this no loyal man will stop to inquire what are the causes of the war. There is a war; there is an effort to destroy the country; there is an effort to bring men who have had no heart for freedom as long as they have been men, to reign over us. You! I use the word reign, for they look to a monarchy, if not to despotism. I say that they look to bringing men of that kind to reign over us under those circumstances. I say a man has no loyalty who betrays his heartlessness to his country, by acting as an excuse for that heartlessness and disloyalty, that sectionalism brought on this war. Suppose it did.

Why, there has been sectionalism in this country since 1820, and we at the North then, under the protest of the same base hearts and base minds in the country, yielded to that sectionalism. We met it again about 1832, '33 or '4, and we yielded again. And the gentleman who says that that sectionalism was developed by the free States has not read history aright; he has read it with a worse than jaundiced eye, with a perverted judgment. It is not for me here to say what other principles might have been operating upon him when he thus interpreted history as saying that sectionalism arose at the North, or was carried into effect there. Nor will a man who has any loyalty, when we are standing up here against all the power of rebellion, dishonest, thieving rebellion, sneer at the efforts that our Government in her wonderful throes is using for the purpose of sustaining herself.

The gentleman from Northumberland indulged in a great deal of wit, I suppose—I do not know that it was not wit—about the taxes and the licenses which are laid upon us. Why, is that not constitutional? Is it not constitutional for the Government to impose such a tax? It may be hard that a tax should be imposed for the purpose of raising money to support the armies, to repel invasion, and to crush the rebellion. I can understand that a man who desires that this rebellion may succeed should feel very much annoyed, and expend his sarcasms and all his wit upon the action of the Government in raising revenue in this way; but a man who was loyal at heart, who heartily desired to put down this rebellion, would not I think sneer at the means which have been used—constitutional means, too, it cannot be denied—to crush the treason.

Loyalty will not throw discredit on the currency of the country. Why,

what a sight have we here! A nation dragged into a war when she had to give one dollar for fifty cents at the outset, having carried on this war with hundreds of thousands of men—fighting directly hundreds of thousands of traitors, and indirectly the great nations of France and England—and at this day having gone to work and raised money upon such a system that she has brought her six per centum loans up to seven or eight per centum in advance of their par value; and still we find men who sneer at the currency of the country, and say that we will be bankrupt! Why, a man that can get seven or eight per cent above par for his obligations is not yet esteemed to be bankrupt. But, supposing it were so—supposing that this currency was as alleged by the men who have been referred to by my friend from Washington, and who traversed the State inferior to the election and denounced it—what is that to the salvation of the country? How was it with our revolutionary ancestors? They resisted to the death the payment of one cent imposed upon them by a Legislature in which they had no representation, and they took joyfully the spoiling of their goods by their own people, and for the defence of their own liberties. How many beautiful farms in the eastern part of this State have been swept away from their owners, who gave them up cheerfully, and who had nothing to support themselves but the Continental currency! And yet we hear of a gentleman upon this floor, the floor where sits the chair once occupied by the great leader of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, venturing, without a blush to boast, yea, to boast of his Democracy and his loyalty; and with a sneer endeavoring, so far as he has it in his power, individually and from his official position, to bring discredit upon the very means by which the rebellion is to be put down. Now, I do not say that the gentleman does not want to have the rebellion put down, but I do say that I cannot interpret his language in any other way. He may be able to do it, but I cannot.

There are other points in this question, sir, which I have not touched upon, but I cannot enlarge upon them at this time. Loyal men will not discourage enlistments. I do not say that this has been done by the gentleman from Northumberland, but I do say that you will find such men—men who are talking about their desire to support the Constitution—about their loyalty, and at the same time discouraging and disheartening those heroes who are now shedding their blood for their country. You will find them prating about the Constitution, when every act shows that they are in sympathy, if not in co-operation, with those who are assailing it with armed bands. You will find them glorying in the defeat of our armies, and you will find them rejoicing when our adversary succeeds, mourning when he fails.

Now, sir, I wish to put a question just here, and I want to call the attention of every gentleman in this House to it, and I ask members to answer it, and to meet the facts upon which the question is based. How is it, I ask, that you look in vain in the class of papers which the gentleman from Northumberland enumerated here the other day, for any commendation of loyal men whose praise is in the mouth of the whole country? You do not find it there. You can find plenty of strong articles upon the subject of the maintenance of the Constitution. If we do not understand what the Constitution means according to these teachings, we are very dull indeed, because we have had lectures and lectures upon it, both up on the hustings and in these papers; but when you find any praise of men who have stood before the nation and before the world as the defenders of the Constitution, you do not find it in those papers or in those speeches.

It has been said somewhere—I think by Blackstone—that you can judge the character of a people by their poetry. Now, in the Revolution we had the good old song of "Yankee Doodle," as part of the national poetry, and our hearts thrill to-day when we hear it. When the drum goes along with the sound of "Yankee Doodle," it brings tears to my eyes, when I see that drum before a band marching on to the battle field to defend my fireside, or when I find them returning with their thinned ranks, and see the widows of those who have been left behind—standing and looking in vain, and knowing they are looking in vain for their husbands, and the mother coming and looking for her dear boy, knowing that she shall never see him again on this side of the Jordan. "Yankee Doodle" then goes to my heart.

In the war of 1812, loyal men had the glorious "Star Spangled Banner," and we rejoice in it again. Now the loyal men have introduced another song, to an old nursery rhyme. It was copied, I believe, from that loyal paper, the New York Day Book; and that it might not be lost to us benighted

Pennsylvanians, it is found to-day in that loyal paper, the Patriot and Union. *Lucas a non tucendo.* I will read it:

"Sing a song of greenbacks,
Pockets full of trash;
Over head and ears in debt,
And out of ready cash.
Heaps of tax-collectors—
I think the gentleman from Northumberland must have read this before he made his speech.
"Hoops of tax-collectors,
As busy as a bee,
Ain't we in a pretty fix,
With gold at fifty three?
Abe in the White House,
Proclamations writing,
Meado on the Rapidan,
Afraid to do the fighting."

Meado afraid to do the fighting! Publish that within fifty miles of Gettysburg! Send it throughout this town and perhaps to Gettysburg itself, and call men out upon Cemetery Hill to read that Meado was afraid to do the fighting! God have mercy upon us if Meado had been afraid to do the fighting! Where would have been your capital this day if Meado had been afraid to do the fighting? And yet is not this confirming what I said a moment ago, that you will look in vain in the papers of which I have spoken to find praise of our great men? Meado afraid to do the fighting! Why, it could only have been worse if it had been said that our Reynolds was afraid to do the fighting—that great man who fell at the first onslaught and saved the State, Meado, who commanded that great army put into his hands the very hour almost that he was called into the fight—Meado afraid to do the fighting!

"Sward in the cabinet,
Surrounded by his spies,
Hallick with the telegraph
Busy forging lies.
Chase in the Treasury,
Making worthless notes;
Curtin at Harrisburg,
Making shoddy coats.
Gilmore at Charloty,
Lost in a fog."

If Gilmore is hidden in a fog, it is the fog that he has made himself, by those cannon whose bullets he has poured upon Sumter, shooting down the dirty rag that so many men even here in Pennsylvania love better than the stars and stripes. But is it down, and they may run it up once more, and it will go down again. Gilmore, who took Fort Wagner, lost in a fog? No, there is no fog about Gilmore. We see him plainly here, though we have never set our eyes upon him. We know him here, standing up for the country and those of the brave men that have been under him. Neither he nor they have been lost in a fog; and the day will come when they will stand out in the sheen of a clear sun, when the great firmament of this nation is cleared of the fog of rebellion.

But that is not all:
"Forney under Abe's chair,
Barking like a dog.
Schenck dead at Baltimore,
Doing dirty work,
Butler at Norfolk,
As savage as a Turk."

Well, now, upon this Turk question, I suppose they would use the language of their friends South of Mason and Dixon's line, who are endeavoring to overthrow our government, and would call Butler a beast, only it would not make rhyme; but I suppose Turk will do as well as beast. I want just such Turks as Butler—the kind of Turks who, when a man pulls down the flag of my country, will hang him. [Applause.] And if a man is a Turk for that, let us have a few more Turks and let those Turks go to work, not merely at New Orleans, or at Fortress Monroe, or at Newbern, but let them go to work in Pennsylvania, mayhap at Harrisburg.

There is a little more yet.
"Sprague in Rhode Island,
Eating apple sauce;
Now, I must say that this shows a great deal of venom, though perhaps it was made to fill up the rhyme. Why out of his own pocket Sprague defrayed the expenses of an entire regiment, and started them off in April, 1864, to protect the Capital; therefore he ought to be sneered at by men who desired its fall. What has he done? His State, which, according to their theory, is above the government, has sent him there to represent her in the Congress of the United States; and what has he ever done that should call down the sneers of any man, unless it was that he defended his country? I agree that in their eyes that is sufficient cause.

Error: at Gettysburg,
Talking like an ass;
Banks out in Texas,
Trying to cut a figure.

He is cutting a pretty handsome figure, unless I am mistaken. He has got into Texas, and he has cut a piece out of territory formerly held by the rebels; he has put there the army of the United States, which in due time will march through Texas, and that State will belong to the Union again. I doubt not we shall soon hear that he is cutting a figure at Mobile also.

Beecher in Brooklyn,
Howling for the nigger.
Lots of abolitionists,
Kicking up a yell;
In comes Parson Brownlow,
And sends them all to Hell.
Burnside at Knoxville,
In a kind of a fix;
Is not Burnside in a fix? I reckon he fixed Longstreet. I reckon he, and Grant, and Thomas, and Hooker, did some little fixing out there a short time ago; and that fixing I want you to bear in mind, is the occasion of all this kind of poetry, and of all such speeches as we have heard in the House from the gentleman from Northumberland.

Now, they have left the last, great man for the last. We will see what they sung about him.
"Dalgreen at Sumter,
Pounding at the bricks;
Grant at Chattanooga,
Trying Bragg to thrash;
Is it any wonder?
The Union's gone to smash?"
Grant! Oh! could they not have spared that great man? Could they not have felt that they were trespassing too much upon the patience of the people of this country assailing Grant in this way? Did they know that one half of them are anxious that Grant should be their candidate for the Presidency? And will they say that Grant's great victory of Chattanooga is a step toward bringing the Union to smash?

Had the gentleman from Philadelphia read this before he made his speech to-night, and talked about the Government of this country continuing this war for the sake of continuing themselves in power? Are Grant's actions like the continuance of the war? Keep Grant there, and I tell you that the war is soon to close.

I have dwelt upon this longer than I expected, but I wished to show just what is the sentiment of those people who stand up here in this and other States of the North, and accuse those who are sustaining the Government of disloyalty, whilst every day that they are speaking they issue for their accredited organs, such trashy articles and doggerel rhymes as this. I agree again with my friend from Washington in saying that, this does not belong to the mass of the people of this country. The hearts of the mass of those who belong to the great Democratic organization, as they now term it, are with their country. But they have fallen, I know not how; they have fallen into the hands of the Philistines; and men who have been assailing them for years and years, now assume to lead them, and they lead them to their destruction.

The gentleman from Northumberland, when he referred to the destruction of his newspaper, asked who disapproved of that. Well, now, I will ask a question before answering that. Who disapproved of running the Tories away in the times of the Revolution? Who disapproved of the Committee of Safety that our fathers got into the Revolution? It was not the loyal men of that day; it was not the men who went out and fought for their country; but it was the men whose sympathies were with Great Britain that disapproved of it. Who disapproved of the hanging of Andre? Just the men who wanted Arnold's treason carried out. I do not say that this newspaper office ought to have been mobbed. I know not the ground upon which it was done, nor anything of it except the fact that it was done; but I do say that it is impossible for a free people, for a loyal community, to stand by and see and hear the denunciations which are made from mouths and from papers, and not feel as if those things ought to be suppressed, and that it is dangerous to the welfare of the country that they should not be suppressed. It is only a wonder to me that this kind of mobbing has not been done in this country, which the heart of its best citizens would desire.

[Applause.] I believe that in any of the hotels or in any of the palaces, of which the gentleman from Philadelphia has spoken and into which desolation has entered, you will not find from any mother or any father, in any of these houses, a denunciation of Abraham Lincoln. I say will not find that mother in the quiet of the night, when she can do nothing but meditate upon her brave boy, whose foolishness is made the brighter to her vision by the dark clouds that have come over in his death, and then ask her to denounce Abraham Lincoln for having led out the spirits into the world, and went. She will rather say she will say, "My boy went into the service of his country, and for him, as I did, I love my country more." No widow will denounce this war, though it has taken her to stray from her, and no father will say that Abraham Lincoln did wrong in calling out seventy thousand men for the service of the country—yet in calling out those hundred thousand more, although they rank one back without the soil that he loved best upon earth. [Applause.]

any man being imprisoned or papers suppressed for approving of the hanging of traitors for tearing down the flag of their country? Or have you ever heard of any paper being suppressed—and I will ask this of the Senator from Philadelphia, for refusing to negotiate with Jeff Davis? You never have, and you never will in this country. The idea of negotiating with Jeff Davis! The idea of making peace by going down upon our knees and saying to Jeff Davis, "What terms do you want us to submit to?" The idea of recognizing that man as at the head of any organized government, which ought to be recognized by honest men, loyal men, civilized men, or any class of men but barbarians!

And then we are met here to-night—and I confess that I was astonished by the remark that we are disloyal because we sustain a President who refuses to stop—what? "An inhuman war!"—And the implication of that remark is, if I understand it, that this war should never have been commenced; the implication of that remark is, if I understand it, (it was said in connection with remarks upon the language,) that this war might have been stopped if we had negotiated with those traitors in the beginning; and that we were wrong in rushing to arms for the suppression of this rebellion.

I have heard of no paper being torn out in 1832—33 which sustained General Jackson in suppressing John C. Calhoun, and there would have been none torn out at that day if General Jackson had had his way and been permitted to hang John C. Calhoun at that day. I was willing then, I wanted then John C. Calhoun should be hung; and I want now that the blood, which has sprung from him North and South, be hung.

Then this glorious old Democratic party existed in its man and in its principles. Its principles being that the country was above everything else, and its men refusing to calculate the value of the Union. Now, they calculate the value of this great Union by a penny stamp upon the plaster placed upon a sick man's back. That is the way that the gentleman from Northumberland meets this great question. I will say, in conclusion, that this old Democratic party, and this old Democratic principle, found in whatever party they may be, will sustain the country; but I have said when we called ourselves Democrats and Whigs or Democrats and Republicans, or Democratic and People's Party, there was nothing between us that went down to the root of Democracy and found us there differing. It need not this rebellion to bring out that all Democracy was the same thing, whether it might be called Whig or a Republican; and that all the principles of loyalty and patriotism spring from the Democracy, of which I speak.

The Democracy which will put the country above everything else is the Democracy that we are now talking about. I do not know whether the man calls himself Democrat or a Republican; if he places his party above his country—if he desires to grind out of the groans and tears of the people that which will make him rich—he is disloyal; according to the test which I think ought to be applied—according to the test which I am willing to be applied to myself.

This is not the time to denounce Abraham Lincoln; but I must be permitted to say here, that having done all that I could as an honorable partisan to prevent his obtaining the position which he now occupies, feeling that I was sustaining principles which I had always sustained by voting for and endeavoring to secure the election of another man, I am prepared now to say—not that I esteem him to be a perfect man—not that he has done everything that I would have desired—but that, looking at Abraham Lincoln disinterestedly as the head of the nation, I think he has pursued the course which he has followed, with an eye single to the best interests of the country. I do not say that better means than those which he has used might not have been adopted; but I do say—and I firmly and solemnly believe and am willing to meet the expression of opinion at a higher bar than the tribunal before which I am now speaking—I do say, that I believe that to the best of his ability and with the desire to save bloodshed, with the desire to bring back to us who had grievously wronged our country, with the desire to secure peace to the country, which we had already intervened, and following up his desire to prevent war, his single object has been the welfare of the country. I believe him to be a true patriot; and I believe that if his power was equal to his wish, and if his wisdom was equal to his wish, (and I do not say that it is not,) that everything would be done in this country, which the heart of its best citizens would desire.

[Applause.] I believe that in any of the hotels or in any of the palaces, of which the gentleman from Philadelphia has spoken and into which desolation has entered, you will not find from any mother or any father, in any of these houses, a denunciation of Abraham Lincoln. I say will not find that mother in the quiet of the night, when she can do nothing but meditate upon her brave boy, whose foolishness is made the brighter to her vision by the dark clouds that have come over in his death, and then ask her to denounce Abraham Lincoln for having led out the spirits into the world, and went. She will rather say she will say, "My boy went into the service of his country, and for him, as I did, I love my country more." No widow will denounce this war, though it has taken her to stray from her, and no father will say that Abraham Lincoln did wrong in calling out seventy thousand men for the service of the country—yet in calling out those hundred thousand more, although they rank one back without the soil that he loved best upon earth. [Applause.]

any man being imprisoned or papers suppressed for approving of the hanging of traitors for tearing down the flag of their country? Or have you ever heard of any paper being suppressed—and I will ask this of the Senator from Philadelphia, for refusing to negotiate with Jeff Davis? You never have, and you never will in this country. The idea of negotiating with Jeff Davis! The idea of making peace by going down upon our knees and saying to Jeff Davis, "What terms do you want us to submit to?" The idea of recognizing that man as at the head of any organized government, which ought to be recognized by honest men, loyal men, civilized men, or any class of men but barbarians!

And then we are met here to-night—and I confess that I was astonished by the remark that we are disloyal because we sustain a President who refuses to stop—what? "An inhuman war!"—And the implication of that remark is, if I understand it, that this war should never have been commenced; the implication of that remark is, if I understand it, (it was said in connection with remarks upon the language,) that this war might have been stopped if we had negotiated with those traitors in the beginning; and that we were wrong in rushing to arms for the suppression of this rebellion.