

# Clearfield



# Republican.

D. W. MOORE, G. B. GOODLANDER, Editors and Proprietors.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS:—\$1 50 Per Annum, if paid in advance.

VOL. XXXIV.—WHOLE NO. 1803.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1864.

NEW SERIES—VOL. IV.—NO. 39.

## THE "REPUBLICAN."

Terms of Subscription. If paid in advance, or within three months, \$1 50; if paid after the expiration of the year, - 2 00.

Office of the Proprietors, Clearfield, Pa. G. B. GOODLANDER, & Co. Publishers.

Terms of Advertising. Advertisements are inserted in the Republican at the following rates:

Insertion, 2 ds.	3 ds.	4 ds.	5 ds.
One square, (10 lines) 1 00	2 00	3 00	4 00
Two squares, (20 lines) 1 00	1 50	2 00	2 50
Three squares, (30 lines) 1 00	1 50	2 00	2 50
One square, 1 mo.	22 00	24 00	26 00
Two squares, 1 mo.	40 00	44 00	48 00
Three squares, 1 mo.	50 00	56 00	62 00
One square, 3 mos.	60 00	66 00	72 00
Two squares, 3 mos.	100 00	110 00	120 00
Three squares, 3 mos.	120 00	132 00	144 00
One square, 6 mos.	140 00	154 00	168 00
Two squares, 6 mos.	200 00	220 00	240 00
Three squares, 6 mos.	240 00	264 00	288 00

Business notices not exceeding 5 lines are inserted for \$2 a year.

Advertisements not exceeding the number of insertions desired, will be continued until forbid and charged according to these terms.

## CLEARFIELD CO. DIRECTORY.

TIME OF HOLDING COURT.

2d Monday in January, 13th Monday in June, 1st Monday in March, 10th Monday in Sept.

County and District Officers.

Pres. Judge—Hon. Samuel Linn, Bellefonte.	Sherriff—D. F. Ertwiler, Clearfield.
Asst. Judge—Hon. J. D. Thompson, Curwensville.	Reg. & Rec. —Josh. G. Berger, Clearfield.
Hon. James Bloom, Forrest.	Dist. Atty.—Israel Post, Clearfield.
Hon. Edward Perks, Clearfield.	Treasurer—E. B. Keator, Clearfield.
Hon. D. F. Ertwiler, Clearfield.	Co. Surveyor—H. B. Wright, Clearfield.
Hon. J. G. Berger, Clearfield.	Commissioners—Jacob Kunz, Clearfield.
Hon. Israel Post, Clearfield.	Thos. Dougherty, Clearfield.
Hon. E. B. Keator, Clearfield.	Amos Rend, Clearfield.
Hon. Glen Hope, Clearfield.	Charles Worrell, N. Washington.
Hon. Lutherburg, Clearfield.	H. Woodward, Clearfield.
Hon. Luthersburg, Clearfield.	T. P. Conner, Clearfield.
Hon. John Heberlein, Clearfield.	J. W. Patten, Clearfield.
Hon. Jas. Callahan, Clearfield.	County Supl.—C. B. Sandford, Clearfield.

## LIST OF POST OFFICES.

Townships.	Post Offices.	Postmasters.
Bellefonte	Glen Hope	Wm. S. Wright
Clearfield	Clearfield	Thos. Dougherty
Curwensville	Curwensville	Sam'l. Hegearty
Forrest	Forrest	Wm. McCracken
Northampton	Northampton	Th. A. McGee
Northumberland	Northumberland	J. W. Campbell
Shick	Shick	H. L. Henderson
Union	Union	James Bloom
Washington	Washington	James Forrest
Westmoreland	Westmoreland	William Albert
York	York	R. H. Moore
Clearfield	Clearfield	Chas. Stepp
Clearfield	Clearfield	John Heberlein
Clearfield	Clearfield	Jas. Callahan
Clearfield	Clearfield	W. C. Irwin
Clearfield	Clearfield	Jack Patchin
Clearfield	Clearfield	Jacob Hoise
Clearfield	Clearfield	G. Tozer, Jr.
Clearfield	Clearfield	Wm. Medarvey
Clearfield	Clearfield	S. A. Farber
Clearfield	Clearfield	M. A. Frank
Clearfield	Clearfield	P. A. Gault
Clearfield	Clearfield	J. E. W. Schmarra
Clearfield	Clearfield	T. W. Fleming
Clearfield	Clearfield	Centre county.
Clearfield	Clearfield	S. Radabaugh
Clearfield	Clearfield	T. F. Baugh
Clearfield	Clearfield	Ed. Williams
Clearfield	Clearfield	Jas. McClellan
Clearfield	Clearfield	C. Mignot
Clearfield	Clearfield	William Carr
Clearfield	Clearfield	A. B. Shaw
Clearfield	Clearfield	T. H. Fox
Clearfield	Clearfield	Glas. J. Faney
Clearfield	Clearfield	Dani. Taylor
Clearfield	Clearfield	Ed. Woodward
Clearfield	Clearfield	Elin. Chas.
Clearfield	Clearfield	G. Heckard
Clearfield	Clearfield	M. O. Strick
Clearfield	Clearfield	Jas. Thompson
Clearfield	Clearfield	J. C. Brenner
Clearfield	Clearfield	H. W. Spencer
Clearfield	Clearfield	A. C. Moore
Clearfield	Clearfield	T. Fleming
Clearfield	Clearfield	Beaf. V. Dale
Clearfield	Clearfield	D. E. Brubaker
Clearfield	Clearfield	James Lockett

Go and see the New Goods at J. E. WATSON'S.

Marysville, Clearfield county, Penna. CHEAP for CASH or exchanged for Timber or Boards, Saw-Logs, or Shingles.

H. W. SMITH & CO. MERCHANTS, and dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, Queensware, and every thing usually kept by the trade.

JOSEPH R. McMURRAY, DEALER IN LUMBER, AND DEALER IN LUMBER.

WILLIAM SCHWEM, Proprietor. May 19, 1865.—ly.

CYRENIUS HOWE, JUSTICE OF THE PEACE.

J. W. THOMPSON, DEALERS IN LUMBER, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

Jas. McMurray, DEALERS IN Dry Goods, Groceries Lumber, &c., Bunnsville, Pa.

J. P. KRATZER, MERCHANT, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

W. THOMPSON, DEALERS IN LUMBER, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

Jas. McMurray, DEALERS IN Dry Goods, Groceries Lumber, &c., Bunnsville, Pa.

J. P. KRATZER, MERCHANT, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

W. THOMPSON, DEALERS IN LUMBER, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

Jas. McMurray, DEALERS IN Dry Goods, Groceries Lumber, &c., Bunnsville, Pa.

J. P. KRATZER, MERCHANT, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

W. THOMPSON, DEALERS IN LUMBER, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

Jas. McMurray, DEALERS IN Dry Goods, Groceries Lumber, &c., Bunnsville, Pa.

J. P. KRATZER, MERCHANT, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

W. THOMPSON, DEALERS IN LUMBER, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

Jas. McMurray, DEALERS IN Dry Goods, Groceries Lumber, &c., Bunnsville, Pa.

J. P. KRATZER, MERCHANT, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

W. THOMPSON, DEALERS IN LUMBER, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

Jas. McMurray, DEALERS IN Dry Goods, Groceries Lumber, &c., Bunnsville, Pa.

J. P. KRATZER, MERCHANT, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

W. THOMPSON, DEALERS IN LUMBER, and dealer in Boards and Shingles, Grain and Produce.

Jas. McMurray, DEALERS IN Dry Goods, Groceries Lumber, &c., Bunnsville, Pa.

## SPEECH OF DE. T. JEFFERSON BOYER, OF CLEARFIELD.

Delivered in the House of Representatives at Harrisburg, February 23d, 1864, on the bill to pay losses sustained by citizens in the rebel revolt into Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, if I should consult my own inclinations, I would prefer letting this resolution pass, after the discussion that has been had upon it, without saying anything further; but the character which that discussion has assumed, and the wide range which has been given to it makes it imperative that some one should notice, though briefly, many of the charges of disloyalty that have been preferred against those on this side of the floor, even after a solemn disclaimer of any political design in offering the resolution. When the resolution was offered, its author, the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Kelley,) disclaimed any political motive whatever.

When we upon this side of the House undertook to inquire what should be the test of loyalty asked for in the resolution, our motive in inquiring was not that we thought the test would be applied to us, or because we felt that we were disloyal. We were actuated by a far different motive. Under the interpretation of that word "loyalty," as it has been used so indiscriminately by the party with which the gentleman from Washington now associates, we had reason to expect, although there was no real implication of the kind conveyed, that sooner or later some of our friends at least would perhaps be called upon to establish their loyalty in the face of that committee, which, perhaps, with the understanding on the other side as to the meaning of the word "loyalty," might have been a very hard thing for them to do. Under these circumstances, we object to the resolution offered. But since that time, notwithstanding the disclaimers of our friends on the other side, and particularly my friend from Chester— notwithstanding the gentleman from Washington said he had no intention to call in question the loyalty of the Democratic party—what have we witnessed? When the gentleman from Washington rose to defend his resolution before this House, throughout his entire speech, from beginning to end, you heard nothing but one continued strain of declamation and vituperation against the loyalty of the Democratic party. He said that in his own district there were Democrats who indulged in riotous conduct, shouting for Jeff. Davis and other traitors to the country. He said that he could go into the Senate chamber of this Legislature and point out men who had been preaching disloyalty to the Administration and treason to the country. Now, sir, if the gentleman had no political motive in offering this resolution, why, then, after disclaiming any such intention, does he charge in that speech that the entire Democratic party is disloyal?

Sir, the discussion upon the resolution has assumed a character purely political; it has assumed a character entirely outside of the claims to be presented here. The question has taken such a shape that we are compelled to meet it upon the broad accusations presented. Now, Mr. Speaker, we will know that this council of five or whatever it is to be, will be called into existence and controlled by the party who have been shouting charges of disloyalty and treason against the Democratic party for the last three years; no doubt a majority of that committee will be composed of men who have been ringing this into our ears. Then, sir, we have a right to be apprehensive that when these claims go before that committee, a man who has not stood by the Administration at Washington—a man who has not believed in all the dogmas of that party and the administration, will have his loyalty questioned, and will be called upon to prove that he is a "loyal" citizen of Pennsylvania and a "loyal" citizen of these United States. Now, how is he going to furnish this proof? I asked the question when the resolution was first offered, and gentlemen on the other side disclaimed to answer it. I repeat it now—how are the claimants to furnish the proof of their loyalty? Accusations will no doubt be made from motives of political animosity. Political adversaries will make charges of disloyalty against them, because forsooth they have committed the sin of voting the Democratic ticket perhaps at the last election. This charge will be made, and after it is made the duty devolves upon the man against whom the charge is made of proving that he is loyal. How is he going to do that? He may bring his friends and neighbors to swear that they do not know of his ever having led Lee's army into Franklin, Fulton or Adams county. He may bring men to swear that he has never enlisted in the rebel army. He may bring men to swear that he has never given aid and comfort to the enemies of the country. But, sir, can he bring men to say that he has not at some time condemned some of the acts of the administration in power; and if he has done that, he is, according to the interpretation of the word as used by these gentlemen, "disloyal," because condemnation of the acts of the administration is considered a "disloyal practice."

Now, sir, if there is residing within any of these counties I have named or any county to which this bill will particularly refer, men who did invite the rebels into these counties, then I say, in God's name deprive them of the privileges of this bill, and not only that, but deprive them of their existence; for they are not fit to live. But, sir, I question whether there are any such men in those counties men who had invited the rebels into the State then, after the desolation and suffering which has been witnessed there on every

hand, I question very much whether the atmosphere would not be too hot for any individual who had done an act so outrageous as this. I suppose that you might search the whole of these counties through, from one end to the other, and you would find no such person in those counties. But I doubt not, upon the other hand, that you can find—the returns of the last election show that you can find—many who do not consider the policy of the administration at Washington right, and those men, according to our intensely loyal Republican brethren on the other side, must have been guilty of some "disloyal practices" at some time or other.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the reason why we object having this resolution forced upon us at this time. Sir, if you follow out this line of policy—if you intend to pursue men—to stigmatize and ostracize them merely because they differ from you in politics, when is this thing to end? You propose to apply it now to a few counties along the border of Pennsylvania. Very soon you will apply it to the counties in the interior, and speedily you will extend it over the entire State, and say that the men who have been guilty of the high crime of opposition to the administration in power shall not enjoy the blessings of society or good government in the State of Pennsylvania—shall not have any of the offices—that they shall be ostracized, because they will not fall down and worship at the shrine of this Abolition Moloch.

Now, sir, who are the parties who invited the rebels into Pennsylvania? I propose to exhibit some of the individuals who constituted the inviting party. We all remember that during the memorable campaign of 1860—the campaign that inaugurated this reign of terror under which the country is to-day suffering—the Democratic party, with tears in their eyes, pleaded with the men now in power to desist from the violent and destructive schemes which they were then urging, and which threatened to force the country into civil war and rebellion. We asked them to cast off the heresies of their platform—to come up fairly and squarely upon the broad constitutional platform.—We asked them to pause and reflect—not to invite the rebellion which we have to-day. They laughed at us; they laughed at our calamities; they threatened to "mock when our fear came." What was the result? They have gone on and arrayed one section of the country against the other. By establishing their sectional heresies, and carrying them into the administration of this government, they have precipitated the revolution from which we are all suffering to-day. It is they who have virtually invited the rebel

raids. Was not the government, as we had it in 1860, good enough for them? In what respect was it inferior to the government for which you are striving to-day? The then President of the United States, the acknowledged head of the government of that day, was despised and hooted at by you. The government as we had it then did not satisfy your notions of propriety, because an Abolition President did not administer it. We were willing to resign the administration of the government to you; the force of public opinion compelled us to resign it; but when you took this sacred trust into your hands, we implored you to preserve this government. Have you done it? Have you carried out the principles on which the government was founded? No; you have not even carried out the principles of Mr. Lincoln's Inaugural Address. I think that a slight reference to the language of that address will show this to be the fact. Mr. Lincoln used this language:

"I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Again he says: "I take the official oath to-day with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution and laws by any hypocritical rule. And while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional."

Now, sir, has Mr. Lincoln kept his promise? There is no use in asking the question; there is no use in attempting to answer it. The Emancipation Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln is a sufficient answer to that question. Has he kept his promise? No, sir; he has violated it; and the truth of history will show that he has violated every other promise that he made when he assumed the Presidential chair. He has been true only to his political antecedents; he has been true only to the Abolition teachings of his earlier days; he has been true only to the doctrines which he inculcated during the early days of his political career, and which he professed to have cast aside. When he came to Washington he promised that he would administer this Government just as he found it; he said he would "run the machine just as he found it." Now, sir, has he "run the machine as he found it?" Who was the engineer of the Government when he went to Washington? James Buchanan, a man who has been stigmatized on the other side of the Hall as a traitor. He was the man from whom Abraham Lincoln took it. Mr. Lincoln said he would run it just as he found it. It must then have been good enough. Did he run it just as he found it? I think the truth will show that he did not such thing. Mr. Lincoln knew full well that if he should "run the machine just as he found it"—if he should carry out the policy and the principles of

the Constitution—if he should carry out that which he was compelled to promise to carry out in his inaugural order to secure himself place and power—he knew full well that if he should do this he could not retain the favor of his Abolition adherents.

But Mr. Lincoln has an earlier record. He, sir, believes in the right of secession. He is the man who, above all others, has, I believe, the earliest and most conclusive record in favor of this right of secession, and I have no doubt, sir, from his earlier teachings—from the language used in his political speeches—that Mr. Lincoln endeavored to hasten as much as he possibly could this revolution in which we are now so unhappily involved. He, sir, in 1848, in a speech which he made in Congress, more than justified the secession of the rebellious States, who have now taken up arms against this Government. He conceded to them the right to do so; he treated it as a natural and indefeasible right which no man dare gainsay. Now, sir, let us see what he says. In a speech made in the House of Representatives in 1848, which will be found in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for 1847-48, page 94, he said:

"Any people anywhere being inclined, and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing Government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right, a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing Government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that can may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a minority intermingled with or near about them who may oppose these movements. Such minority was precisely the case with the Tories of our Revolution. It is a quality of revolutions not to go by old lines or old laws, but to break up both, and make new ones."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote these expressions, not because I acknowledge their truth—not because any member of the Democratic party has ever acknowledged their truth. We have always denied, and we do to-day deny, heresy in 1860. We say to-day that none but a disunionist at heart could ever have uttered a sentiment so grossly inimical to the Constitution of this Government. There is no man living to-day in the North who is ready to utter such a sentiment who is not an Abolitionist. Every man in the North who has uttered sentiments of this kind is to-day an upholder of the Republican party.

Now, sir, this language of Mr. Lincoln more than justifies the secession of the rebellious States. It tells them they may revolutionize, and where in any district they may meet minorities which they are capable of overcoming, they may put them down by force—they may drive everything into confusion throughout the entire land. Now, sir, it may be pretended in Mr. Lincoln's defence, that his ideas have undergone some change. But we find that as late as 1861, when he took into his hands the reins of this Government, so far from recanting the heresy which he had previously proclaimed, he used in his Inaugural Address this language:

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it." That is Mr. Lincoln's doctrine to-day. What rebellious State has ever attempted to do more than Mr. Lincoln declares that they have the right to do? Has South Carolina or Alabama or any of the seceded States attempted to do more than revolutionize and overthrow this government? No, sir; not one of them. When you deny this right, they tell you that Abraham Lincoln, the head of the government of this nation, told them they might carry it into practice.

So much then for the charges with regard to secession. My friend from Philadelphia (Mr. SMITH) remarked the other night (I do not remember his precise language, but I quote the substance) that the vilest rebel among them all—the man who sympathized most deeply in every effort that was made by the traitors of the South to destroy the government—the man who gave them aid and comfort was James Buchanan, at that time President of the United States. Now, sir, did James Buchanan ever hold a doctrine so subversive of the principles of the Constitution and the laws of this country as to advocate the right of secession? Did Mr. Buchanan ever announce a doctrine so outrageously subversive of our Government and our Union? He never held any such doctrine. I have here a part of the message of Mr. Buchanan in 1860 in regard to the subject of secession, and I will read it:

"In order to justify secession as a constitutional remedy, it must be on the principle that the Federal Government is a mere voluntary association of States, to be dissolved at pleasure by any one of the contracting parties. If this be so, the confederacy is a rope of sand, to be penetrated and dissolved by the first adverse wave of public opinion in any of the States. In this manner our thirty-three States may resolve themselves into as many petty jarring and hostile republics, each one retiring from the Union without responsibility, whenever any sudden excitement impel them to such a course. By this course a Union might be entirely broken up into fragments in a few weeks, which cost our fathers many years of toil, privation and blood to establish."

"It is not pretended that any clause in

the Constitution give countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded on inference, not from any language contained in the instrument itself, but from the sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified. But is it beyond the power of a State, like an individual, to yield a portion of its sovereign rights to secure the remainder? In the language of Madison, who has been called the father of the Constitution, it was formed by the States—that is, by the people in each of the States acting in their highest sovereign capacity; and formed, consequently, by the authority which formed the State Constitutions.

"Nor is this Government of the United States created by the Constitution less a Government in the strict sense of the term within the sphere of its powers, than the government created by the Constitutions of the States are within their several spheres."

Now, Mr. Speaker, does this sound like secession? Could there possibly be a stronger argument against that iniquitous heresy? The Democratic party to-day, with one unanimous voice, denounce the doctrine. They all deny any such right, as they have, ever since it was broached, condemned and abhorred it and its consequences. The Democratic party never gave countenance to such a doctrine. But, sir, your President of the United States did so. He conceded to the Southern rebels the largest possible right in this respect that they could claim. He told them that they might at any time secede—they might at any time revolutionize—throw off the existing government and establish a new one that would suit them better. I have no doubt that our form of government did not suit the rebels, or they would not have attempted to throw it off and establish a new confederacy.

Now, sir, with what grace comes this charge of disloyalty against the Democratic party from members on the other side of this House, who are to-day cheek by jowl with those who never breathed a syllable of loyalty or love for the Union anterior to the period when the policy of their party drove the entering wedge for its total dissolution and destruction. Not one single man of them, I venture to say, ever breathed one loyal sentiment (employing the term "loyal" in the sense in which they now use it) anterior to the time when the Union-destroying tendencies and their policy became manifest, and it was necessary for them to shield themselves from public condemnation by professions of love for the Union. In 1850 and in 1860 they called us in derision "Union savers" "Union shriekers." They urged that we were too much in love with this Union. To-day when they have driven this Union to the brink of destruction, and when they are pierced by the computations of their guilty consciences, they feel the necessity of professing devotion to the Union. But, sir, the leaders of their party tell them again and again that they must not be too excessively "loyal." They ring into our ears the declaration which the gentleman from Washington has repeated upon this floor, that they are not in favor of the Union as it was. They do not want the Union as it was. What then do they want? To what new feast do they invite us to-day? Is there to be inaugurated a new doctrine of which we know nothing? Are we to fall down and worship as a destiny some black image which they may choose to erect? Let them tell us what is the new Union which they wish to erect upon the ruins of the old one.

As I understand, they want a Union without slavery, because, as they maintain, slavery has brought on this war. In the name of God what have we to do with slavery? Whose fault is it that they have slaves in the South? Is it the fault of the Republican party, of to-day? No, it is not the fault of the Republican party, and they are not responsible for the matter. They did not take slavery there. Pennsylvania did not force slavery upon the South; Pennsylvania emancipated her slaves after a certain length of time, and when she made all of the money out of the system that she could; she was very patriotic. So it was with all the other States that emancipated the slaves from time to time. I suppose that the State which had most to do with the freeing slavery in the Southern States, is to-day the most "loyal" State in this Union—Massachusetts—a State whose Governor announced that the roads should swarm with troops in response to the calls of the President provided he would adopt the policy which that State dictated.

Now, let us see what Thaddeus Stevens says. He is one of the leaders of the Republican party; and he does not wish the Union restored. Mr. Stevens said, not very long ago, in Congress: "I will not stultify myself by supposing that we have any warrant in the Constitution for this proceeding."

"This talk of restoring the Union as it was, under the Constitution as it is, is one of the absurdities which I have heard repeated until I have become about sick of it. The Union can never be restored as it was."

We are aware of it. The revolutionary party of the North, when they created a new State, down in Virginia established that fact conclusively, that you never can restore the Union as it was.

"There are many things which render such an event impossible. The Union never shall, with my consent, be restored under the Constitution as it is, with slavery to be protected by it."

Now, sir, it thus appears that the Union will never be restored with the consent of Mr. Stevens, and I believe he is the acknowledged leader of the Abolition party in Congress to-day.

This party are fond in their professions of love for the Union; the gentleman from Washington and my friend from Chester use warm language on this subject; but

Mr. Thaddeus Stevens lays down the line of policy for them, which they are bound to pursue. He is the leader of the party. Mr. Lincoln dictates to him what he wants him to say; and the members of the party wants him to bow down, just as they have done for the last year or two; and the only thing they can do with us is to threaten us with hostilities, and all sorts of terrible inflictions; if we do not do the same thing. I have no doubt, if they could command the power, they would compel us to the same thing; but I had rather be accused, and I intend to be excused.

Mr. Francis E. Spinner, who, I have no doubt, is a very loyal man because we find his name on all the greenbacks that circulate through, he being a present Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, used this language during the campaign of 1856:

"Should this (the election of Fremont) fail, no true man would any longer be safe from the assaults of the arrogant slave oligarchy, who then would rule with an iron hand. For the free North would be left the choice of a peaceful dissolution of the Union, or a civil war which would end in the same."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it appears that it did not make much difference who succeeded in this fight. There was to be a dissolution of the Union. If the party who as the Republicans charged, was controlled by the slave power, had succeeded, then, as a matter of course, this Abolition element would take incipient steps for the dissolution of the Union. If the other party succeeded—the party that did succeed—then the dissolution of the Union was to come in some shape or other.—What did it signify to Mr. Spinner and the party whom he represented, whether they gained the control of the Government at the time or not? They could not be content to carry on the Government, unless they could abolish slavery. They knew that they could not abolish slavery peaceably and legally without an amendment to the Constitution; they knew that an amendment to the Constitution could not be obtained, because it would require the ratification of three-fourths of the States; therefore, they knew that it was confessedly out of the question. They knew, therefore, that they were compelled to accomplish their object by unconstitutional intervention—by intervention either forcible or fraudulent—by encroachments upon the domestic concerns of fifteen States of the Union, and to do this thing they must resort to a violation of the Constitution; they could do it in no other way.

What is going to be the result of the present struggle? After the bitter experience which we have had—after three years of civil war and bloodshed, who can venture to forestall the issue of this struggle to-day for the abolition of slavery?—Who will say that invasions and disasters in their train, will be confined hereafter to the South? I ask you, sir, and I ask our Republican friends, by what means will the Union, or any of its shattered fragments, carry on this war? I confess, sir, that I know but one way, and I think that every candid man will bear me out in the assertion that there is but one way, and that is by the substitution of a military monarchy in the place of a republican form of government—which will be the destruction of these United States.—You may look at the subject just as you please; you may threaten us; you may force us to plunge into all the errors and crimes to which you are espoused, for the sake of carrying out your darling projects; you may ask us, as you have done, to engage in riot, and outrage, and murder, if you please. You may insist that it is necessary to break the Constitution and dissolve the Union, and embark the land in civil war, in obedience to that law which you have preached so long and earnestly—that higher law than the Constitution. Where is the record of that mighty law? Where do you find it? Will some Abolitionist tell me where you will find the record of this higher law? The doctrine seems to be that this standard of the higher law is to be found in the conscience of each individual who may assume to be its expounder. How absurd and destructive such a doctrine? If that be true, then every member of this House, however perverted his judgement, however limited his knowledge and experience, however flighty, passionate, unbalanced and vindictive may be his general character, is to set up the absurd conclusions of his own mind—may, the corrupt impulses of his own had passions—against the law of the land and the order of society. If this doctrine be admitted all obligations between man and man, or man and woman, all that is dear in right