

Clearfield



Republican

D. W. MOORE, Editor and Proprietor.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS:—\$1.50 Per Annum, if paid in advance.

VOL. XXXVI.—WHOLE NO. 1830.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, OCT. 26, 1864.

NEW SERIES—VOL. V.—NO. 15.

ADDRESS OF THE STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

(CONCLUDED.)

To the Citizens of Pennsylvania:
On the other hand, the African race has never, anywhere, given any proof of its capacity for a self-sustained civilization. Since the sun first shone on that continent it has remained in the same state of mental gloom. Cruel, brutal, voluptuous, and indolent by nature, the African has never advanced a single step beyond his own savage original. Slavery has ever been, and to this hour continues to be, his normal condition, throughout every clime he can call his own! And yet, they have had as many opportunities of improvement as the inhabitants of Asia or of Europe. Along the shores of the Mediterranean was once concentrated the Literature and Science of the world. Carthage, the rival of imperial Rome in all the arts of civilization, existed for many years on the African border. The Saracens, the most polished race of their time, founded and maintained for centuries a contiguous empire. Still, for all this, the African has continued to prowl on through his long night of barbarism; and thus, in all human probability, he will continue forever. Tell us not that his want of progress in civilization is the result of long established bondage. So, for centuries, was our own race bound to the earth under various modifications of predial vassalage. But the white soul expanded, and mounted above all its burthens and trammels, and finally, in this country, reached the full fruition of republican freedom.
We grant this mental inferiority of the African—we forbear, in the spirit of sobriety, any physical contemplation or contrast—does not give a dominant race the right to convey him from his own enlightened land to a foreign bondage, even under the forms of a purchase from his African master. But this natural inferiority must be considered by the statesman in framing laws and adopting Constitutions for human government. In Pennsylvania we have always affirmed this inferiority in our fundamental laws; and the same has been done in almost all the free States of the Union—generally excluding the African from the right of suffrage. This necessity of duly regarding the law of races, is thus forcibly commented upon by Lamartine, (a scholar and a statesman, always in favor of man's largest liberty,) in a recent work:
"The more I have traveled, the more I am convinced that races of men form the great series of men and nations. Man is not so capable of education as philosophers imagine. The influence of government and laws has less power, radically, than is supposed, over the manners and instincts of any people. While the primitive constitution and blood of the race have always their influence, and manifest themselves thousands of years afterwards in the physical formation and habits of a particular family or tribe. Human nature flows in rivers and streams in the vast ocean of humanity; but its waters mingle but slowly—sometimes they never mingle, and it emerges again, like the Rhone from the Lake of Geneva, with its own taste and color. Here is, indeed, an abyss of thought and meditation, and at the same time a grand secret for legislators. As long as they keep the spirit of the race in view they succeed; but they fail when they strive against this natural predisposition: nature is stronger than they are."
But, why thus enlarge upon a topic which has undergone so much, and such frequent discussion? Why—because this idea of working out negro equality on the part of our opponents is the very basis of our present political struggle. Let no man be mistaken. This is really the leading issue at the present moment between the two parties. To carry out this idea has come at last to be the ruling, if not the sole purpose of the war which is now deluging the land with fraternal blood! For this, the Constitution and the reserved rights of the States and the people have been mockingly trampled under foot; for this, both imperious and imperial edicts, such as would send to the block any monarch in England, have been issued by the President, and sought to be enforced; for this, Secretary Seward's boast to Lord Lyons—"I can touch my office bell at any moment, and order to be arrested any citizen of this country"—has been all too frequently realized!
The extent to which the party supporting the President are willing to go in negro affiliation, finds a memorable illustration in the proposition made by Secretary Cameron, the first of the several occupants of the place of Secretary of War under President Lincoln. He coolly proposed, in his first and last annual communication, to free, and then to arm, the whole black population of the South, and to turn them against their white masters in a work of indiscriminate butchery! This truly infernal suggestion was not adopted by the President when first proposed, but it has since been acted on in more instances than one.
We have charged the party at present in power, fellow-citizens, with tyranny and usurpation. We now go further, and solemnly assert our belief, that there is a deliberate design to change the character, if not the form of our government. The leading papers in support of the Administration openly advocate a modification which will place greater powers in the hands of the President; and if their advice should be adopted by the people, in a short time the chains will be firmly riveted, and our liberties completely subverted. The Philadelphia Press not long since remarked:
"Another principle must certainly be embodied in our recognized form of government. The men who shape the legislation of this country when the war is over, must remember that what we want is not strength. The abolitionists will be 81,000 less than last year."

to combine the forms of Republican government with the powers of a Monarchical government.
About the same time, as if by concert, we find in the North American:
"This war has already shown the absurdity of a Government with limited powers; it has shown that the power of every Government ought to be and must be UNLIMITED."

Such doctrines as these would have met with rebuke even at the hands of the elder Adams; but they were the natural precursors of the "war power" which has been made to override the most explicit doctrines of the Constitution. The very wrongs, in fact, complained of by our fathers, and enumerated in their declaration against the English monarch, have been revived upon their sons. This Administration has willfully violated its own oath-bound pledges, and sought "pretexits of innovation upon the established principles of the Government;" it has fostered a "spirit of encroachment which tends to consolidate all the departments of the Government in one, and thus create, whatever the forms may be, a real despotism." It has rendered "the military superior to the civil power." It has subjected to a reign of lawless force the security prescribed by law against seizure and imprisonment "without due process of law." It has verily "created a multitude of new offices, and sent among us swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." By an iniquitous Conscriptio law, it has distributed its agents among the people, backed by bayonets and clothed with discretionary powers over the liberties, if not the lives of our citizens. It "has quartered large armies of troops among us." It has "imposed taxes upon us without our consent." Finally, its chosen and purchased advocates are now clamorous for a stronger Government, that "our charters may be taken away, our most valuable laws abolished, and the powers of the Government altered fundamentally." These, we submit, fellow-citizens, are all of them features fairly exhibited of that "stronger Government" which our forefathers, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world, eighty years ago, pledged "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to put aside forever.

We have before spoken, fellow-citizens, of the depressed condition of the country. The mountain of debt which has been piled up so recklessly, cannot be less than three thousand millions of dollars, when all is fairly counted. Of this, Pennsylvania's share will be at least one tenth of the whole, or \$300,000,000. The annual interest upon this sum (more exactly estimated than paid) will be about eighteen millions of dollars. This, added to the annual interest of our former debt, makes an aggregate of interest now, and henceforth, to be borne by the people of this Commonwealth, stated in round numbers, of twenty millions of dollars! We cannot heighten this picture of the stern reality, which an inexorable arithmetic calculation gives. Some make even a deeper debt and a darker prospect of the future.

Taxation always falls heaviest upon labor; it will now grind the poor to the very earth. And yet the moek philanthropists of the day are increasing the taxation, and urging on a system of measures, which, under the pretense of ameliorating the condition of the African, will, it carried on much longer, practically enslave the laboring white man, and starve his family. And besides this, if the forcible abolition of bondage at the South should succeed, it will only be to bring the white working men and women of the North into competition in the same paths of labor with the African they have been taxed and begged to bring here and support amongst us!

The favored capitalists, who has money to lend to the Administration, gets his bonds, upon which there is no taxation; and thus is increased the burdens of the laboring and middle classes. But we forbear to pursue this melancholy train of facts and reasoning, and turn to the more grateful consideration of low we can do something for the correction of these evils.
It must be plain, fellow-citizens, that the only hope that conservative men can have of saving the country from impending anarchy and ultimate ruin, is by uniting with the Democratic party—the only party now left that is truly national in its character and conservative in its aims; the only party in the country that has ever been able to govern it, for any length of time, to the satisfaction of the people at large.

This party has now presented for the Presidency and Vice Presidency two men of the most unspotted lives and unblemished reputations—every way unassailable and unassailable, except by the corrupt and mercenary creatures to the pay and promise of the existing Administration.
In regard to George B. McClellan, we shall not pause here to write his history. That is already engraved on the hearts and consciences of a grateful people. We feel confident, also, that his admitted ability, integrity, and independence, the manly firmness he has always exhibited, and especially, and above all, his heroic devotion in the darkest hours to the true principles of the Constitution, will draw around him now the nation's confidence. This confidence, reposed in such hands, would never be betrayed.

He stands at the present, as he has always stood, wholly aloof from intrigue. He is allied by no ties or contracts with mercenary adventurers in political life. He seeks not the office for which he has been named; but has all along held "the noisless tenor of his way," free from the embarrassments which trammel the active and ambitious candidate for office. Even if defeat should fall to his lot in this contest, (which we cannot believe,) he will be consoled with the consciousness of

having implored no man's aid; pledged in advance no places that would be in his gift, if elected; and that those who had espoused his cause even from the beginning, acted from sympathy with a brave, persecuted, and patriotic man; acting from principle and love of country, seeking no reward or future favors. No one who has been named for the Presidency desires it less; no one, certainly, has courted it less, and this is an additional reason why he should be, and will be, preferred by the thoughtful and the upright.

The varnished reports of rivals in command; the suppressed and distorted facts of a partisan committee of Congress; the constant jealousy and malignant opposition at every step of those who feared his success and dreaded his popularity, have all failed in blasting his military reputation. Intelligent men everywhere, in every land, have read the libels upon this accomplished soldier, only with a sickening sense of their injustice and venality. In this country they have penetrated the hearts of our soldiery and the people at large, only to kindle there a broader and brighter flame of devotion to their intended victim; and the world, ere long, will witness with approbation the reward which they will mete out to a national benefactor.

The eminent statesman who has been nominated for the second place on our ticket, has long been conspicuous in the legislative branch of the Government. Remembering his years few men in our country have ever reached a higher position in the respect and confidence of the public. No man in the present Congress possesses to a greater extent these gifts of nature and accomplishment of statesmanship, that amply justify the wide popularity and esteem with which he is everywhere regarded in the section of the Union that gave him birth. He, like our Presidential candidate, emphatically belongs to the YOUNG MEN of this country.

These nominations are essentially their own. The fact of youth should give a deeper interest, if possible, to this in the struggle now at hand. The whole of active life is before them, with all its pursuits, hopes, and enjoyments. Let them weigh well recent and passing events, and mark the rapid closing of despotic power; let them resolutely see to it, that the wise and beneficent institutions of the free world, of freedom, shall become their own sure heritage, and that of their children.

Finally, fellow-citizens of Pennsylvania, of all classes and conditions, it is in your power to dissolve the clouds which now threaten to overwhelm all our brightest hopes, and bring upon our country a long night of storm and darkness. Against the usurpations and evils, which we are conscious of having but too imperfectly depicted, let us array ourselves in combined strength.

Let our watchwords be WAR (if we must have it) for the true, legitimate objects of such a war, and NONE OTHER; for PEACE the first moment that peace can restore to us the common heritage of a united country; for the imperishable glory of the old Union and the Constitution unimpairing; with sympathy for our soldiers in the field under their trials and dangers—ready ever to aid and to honor them—who cannot possibly be better done, than in giving our best efforts in endeavoring to so modify the grounds of the struggle they are maintaining as that it shall appear purely just before men, and in the sight of God!

We implore, then, all who love peace and order; all who wish to see industry successful and property secure; all who are willing to support wise legislation, public virtue, and constitutional liberty; all who wish to lead prosperous lives themselves, and enjoy in quiet the fruits of their own industry; all who wish to transmit their property and the blessings of free institutions to their children, we implore all these to unite with us. We go for the country, the whole country—for UNION, LIBERTY, and LAW. If a majority of the people will thus be true to themselves, we may hope soon to see our country resuming with renewed vigor her glorious career—FREE, PROSPEROUS, and happy—the pride of her own citizens, and the admiration of the world!

By order of the Democratic State Central Committee.
C. L. WARD, Chairman.
R. J. HEMPHILL Secretary.

DEPRECIATION OF RAIDERS IN MARYLAND.
Baltimore, Oct. 18.—A letter from Poolesville, Maryland, says: "Medley district has not lost less than 2,000 cattle and 100 horses during the invasion and frequent raids, while those who came in contact with the raiders were compelled to contribute their hats shoes and pocket books. There is no security for property, but little tranquility of mind, and constant apprehension of danger. The consequences following from these raids are that the merchants will be necessitated either to suspend or restrict the business here, and the farmers to reduce their business to a mere livelihood."

The soldier with whom Mr. Cox left some tickets at Tod barracks, A. J. Danscomb, of the 100 Ohio, from Williams county, and who was there on detailed service, has been peremptorily ordered, with many others who were Democrats, to report at Atlanta, instantly, and join their regiments. The meanness of this business is irreclaimably outrageous.—Ohio Statesman.

A soldier was shot by the provost guard in Washington, on Monday last, and killed. When they examined his pockets, it was found that he had already been discharged from service.

Something of a wipe out in Ohio—81,000 Abolitionists less than last year.

THE CRITTENDEN COMPROMISE.

Ex-Gov. Bigler's Reply to Gen. Cameron.

PHILADELPHIA, October 5th, 1864.
Hon. Simon Cameron.—DEAR SIR: I have just perused, for the first time, and with the utmost surprise, so much of your late address, as Chairman of the Republican State Committee, as relates to the rejection of the Crittenden Compromise, and which I am aware that the Hon. C. L. Ward, as Chairman of our Committee, has already answered your allegation conclusively on the main points. I must be indulged whilst I call your attention to the subject a little more in detail.

In alluding to the present sad condition of the country and to the grave responsibilities resting upon those who neglected or refused to avert these calamities by fair and honorable compromise, you say:
"The question hinges upon the responsibility of the rejection of the Crittenden Compromise. It was rejected. By whom? Reference to page 409, of the Congressional Globe of the second session of the Thirty-sixth Congress, will place the responsibility for the rejection of that compromise where it properly belongs. It will be seen that the Crittenden Compromise was defeated by the substitution (in effect) of what is known as the 'Clark Amendment.' The record shows that the vote on the motion to substitute was: yeas, 25, nays 30. The vote on the adoption of the Clark proposition, taken directly afterwards, would be, naturally, that if the South had votes enough to reject the substitute, it would also have had enough to reject the proposition when offered independently. There was a falling off in the negative vote on the proposition, as compared with that on the first motion to substitute, of seven votes. This is accounted for by the fact that Senators Benjamin and Slidell, of Louisiana; Wigfall and Hemphill, of Texas; Iverson, of Georgia, and Johnson, of Arkansas—six Southern Senators—sat in their seats and refused to vote. Had these six Southern men voted 'no,' the Clark proposition would have been defeated by a majority of four votes, and the Crittenden Compromise could have been taken up and carried by the same majority. It appears of record, then, that the Crittenden Compromise was rejected because six of the leading Senators from the South virtually refused to vote for it. A motion to reconsider was carried some weeks later, and a direct vote upon the compromise was taken. The proposition was lost by a single vote. But one of the six Senators referred to voted on that occasion, nearly all of them having withdrawn on the secession of their respective States. Had they remained to vote for the compromise it would have been adopted.

The chief object in alluding to this matter is to show that when, before the overt act of war was committed, the South had the election of compromise or war, she, through her highest dignitaries deliberately chose war.
You must pardon me for the remark, that of the versions and perversions of this item of grave legislative history which have fallen under my notice, yours is the most illogical and untruthful. It looks very like one of your best efforts to conceal rather than exhibit the truth.
I am right glad, however, that you seem willing to stake the claims of your party for continued confidence. I support, to some extent, upon their efforts to avert dissolution and civil war by honorable concession and settlement, for you thereby invite full and free inquiry into the subject.

Yoursay "the question hinges upon the responsibility of the rejection of the Crittenden Compromise." In a subsequent part of your address you define the question to be peace or war. I am much indebted to you for this occasion, had equal candor and fairness marked the remainder of the address, I should have had no occasion to notice it. Mr. Greeley, and others of your friends have sought to escape the responsibility by alleging that the proposed compromise would not have been effective. But you have assumed that it would, and you proceed to inquire who defeated it.
You say the proceedings of Congress, as recorded on page 409 of the Congressional Globe for that session, "will place the responsibility for the rejection of that compromise where it belongs." But you have fallen into grave errors about the vote. The vote of 25 to 30 was on a motion to postpone, and there is no such vote as 45 to 23; but that is not essential as I shall give the vote correctly, and it shows that, on the motion of Mr. Clark of New Hampshire, to strike out the compromise and insert certain propositions of his own, every Republican Senator present voted to strike out the compromise, and every Southern Senator who voted on the subject, and every Democratic Senator from the North voted to sustain it, as follows: In favor of striking it out, Messrs. Anthony, Baker, Bingham, CAMERON, Chandler, Clark, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Forster, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, King, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson and Wilson—25.
Against striking out the compromise: Bayard, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Clingman, Crittenden, Fitch, Greely, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Saulsbury and Sebastian—23.

But you proceed to show with seeming exultation, that "six Southern Senators sat in their seats and refused to vote," and hence, the defeat of the compromise. That is true, General; but it would have been quite as easy for you to have shown, that twenty-five Republican Senators sat in their seats and refused to vote, and hence its rejection. With them it was no half-way business;—they were against it unconditionally, and on all occasions.

You charge the responsibility for the failure of the compromise on six Senators who did not vote at all, rather than on twenty-five Senators who voted directly against it. I know you pride yourself on being a man of courage; but I had not supposed that you had nerve enough to go before an intelligent public with such logic as that.
But you do not give the whole history, and, by the omission, men are made to believe that which may not be true. Why did you not inform the public that within a few hours after the defeat of the compromise, on the 10th of January, you, yourself, as though alarmed at the weight of responsibility assumed by your party, moved a re-consideration of the vote by which the compromise fell; that the vote on your motion was taken—not as you say, some weeks afterwards, but on the 18th, two days thereafter, and that whilst Messrs. Hemphill, Johnson, of Arkansas, and Slidell, who had withheld their votes from the compromise on the 10th, repented the wrong, and voted for the re-consideration, you, to the amazement of the Senate, voted against your own motion to re-consider and was joined by every Republican Senator present; and further, that by this vote the compromise was placed in precisely the position it occupied before the Clark amendment, and so it stood to the close of the session, ready at all times for favorable action. On this vote, which can be found on page 443 of the 1st volume of the Globe, Messrs. Bayard, Bragg, Clingman, Crittenden, Green, Hunter, Johnson, of Arkansas;—Johnson, of Tennessee; Kennedy, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Saulsbury, Sebastian, and Slidell, on the part of the South, sustained the compromise, whilst Messrs. Seward, Sumner, Wade, yourself and every other Republican voted against it. How preposterous it is then for you to pretend that the compromise was finally lost because six Southern Senators withheld their votes on one indirect question, which they helped to reverse forty-eight hours thereafter. But, General, if it were a great wrong in the Cotton State Senators, against whom you complain so much, to withhold their votes for yourself and the remainder of the Republicans who voted invariably against it? The truth is, General, and you know it as well as I do, you and your party friends defeated the Crittenden Compromise, as you did all other efforts for settlement, if the responsibility of peace or war hinges on the rejection of the compromise as you concede, then you may as well call for the rocks and the mountains to fall on you and hide you from the indignation of an outraged people, now as at any other time, for the responsibility of the war, with all its attendant horrors and afflictions, will be laid at your door by the impartial historian.

You filled the Fence Conference with impracticable men, for the avowed purpose of defeating the patriotic and humane purpose for which it had been called; and when the proceedings of that body came to the Senate, Mr. Seward moved to strike out the entire series of propositions and insert others of his own production, for no other purpose, than to avoid the responsibility of manifesting his contempt for every effort at compromise and adjustment. He seemed to imagine himself equal in dignity and power, to a convention of States, and was, evidently, beside, exulting in the delusion of a sixty-day wrangle, and nobody hurt.
I don't mean, by anything I say, to mitigate the folly and wickedness of the secessionists in this or any other matter, far I denounced their doctrines and consequences at the time in the strongest terms I could command; but Mr. Slidell told me the only object of withholding their votes was to bring up the crisis—to discredit what was intended on your side, for he said, what was very true, that we could continue to debate and vote down amendments to the end of the session; and when three of the six voted to reconsider, I saw no reason to doubt the sincerity of what he said. But I know in addition, that Mr. Hemphill, one of the Senators who withheld his vote, was an open advocate of the compromise.

In referring to the final vote which was taken on the third of March, you say the proposition was lost by a single vote. How absurd! It is true one vote more would have given it a majority, but it would have required twelve or fifteen to have given it two-thirds, the constitutional vote.
Speaking of the Cotton States men, you say, "had they remained and voted for the compromise it would have been adopted." It tries one's patience, General, to seriously notice such flagrant perversions. There is not a man, of either party, who served with you in the Senate at that time who will sanction their assertion. You know perfectly well that the Constitution requires a vote of two-thirds in both houses of Congress to submit amendments for the ratification of the States, as you also do, that the vote of every Senator from the South, of whatever party, uniting with the vote of every Democratic Senator from the North, it would still have required eight or nine Republican votes to have passed it by the constitutional majority, and as no Republican Senator ever voted for it, or declared his intention to do so, with what show of fairness or truth can you say that it would have been adopted had the Southern Senators voted for it? In other words, as the Republican Senators numbered more than one-third of a full Senate, how could a vote of two-thirds be cast against their consent?
But suppose the Constitution did not require a vote of two-thirds, and the Southern Senators, uniting with the Northern Democratic Senators, had adopted it, of what service could such a measure have been? That would, truly, have been the play of Hamlet with Hamlet out. It was a compromise and settlement between the two sections, and the radical men of the two sections, which

was necessary. Any measure sanctioned by one side only, would have been a failure as Mr. Lincoln's proclamation freeing the slaves in the rear of the rebel army. The Republican was a dominant party, and it would have been worse than folly to attempt any adjustment that did not command their active support before the country. The simple truth is, the proposition was fairly tendered to the Republicans, as a basis of peace and Union, and by them rejected.

In conclusion, you say "the chief object in alluding to this matter, is to show that when, before the overt act of war was committed, the South had the election of compromise or war, she, through her highest dignitaries, deliberately chose war."
I am again indebted to you for the admission that the adoption of the compromise would have averted war. But to concede the truth of what you allege against the Southern members, you tell us what the Republican members did to avert dissolution and war by a just and honorable settlement and settlement of the sectional controversy which they had helped to create. When did they vote for the Crittenden Compromise, or advocate it, or any other effective measure. In what way did they attempt to assuage popular passion and prejudice? If what you allege against the Southern members be true, it only proves what often happened, that the radicals of both sections acted in concert together to prevent concession and compromise—it would only show that the secession members acted as bad as you and your party. But how is that argument to avail you in a contest with the Northern Democracy whose representatives in both branches exerted themselves to the utmost to avert dissolution and war, by proper adjustment, in the same spirit in which the Union had been formed. But you know as well as I do that your allegation, as against the Southern members generally, is unjust. You know that Messrs. Crittenden, Hunter and Powell, of the South, voted for the compromise in the committee of thirteen, and I know that Mr. Davis and Mr. Toombs proposed to go for it, if Messrs. Seward and Wade, and their followers, on the other side, would unite with them. I know this, for I heard them make the proposition. You were present, in the Senate, on the 2d of March, when Mr. Davis stated that if the members of the House, every member from the South, including those from the Cotton States, (Messrs. Davis and Toombs) expressed their readiness to accept the proposition of my venerable friend from Kentucky, as a final settlement of the controversy, if tendered and sustained by the Republican members

Hence the sole responsibility of our disagreement, and the only dignity in the way of amicable adjustment, is on the Republican party. Now, General, if these allegations were untrue, why did you not rise in your place and contradict them? Why was it that the Republican member of the Committee of Thirteen did not? Why was not the Republican party promptly vindicated against these sweeping allegations? The answer is, that no defences could be made. Mr. Pugh subsequently stated to the Senate floor, that Mr. Davis had told him that he was willing to "maintain the Union if that proposition could receive the vote it ought to receive from the other side of the chamber." Why did you neglect to deny that statement and maintain that it was the Republican, and not the Southern members who were willing to compromise and settle? Mr. Davis said the same thing in substance to me as did Messrs. Hunter, Bragg, Mallory and others; indeed, they all seemed willing to accept it from the dominant party, except Iverson, Wigfall, and Johnson of Arkansas, and many of them were its daily advocates. It was endorsed by the State of Virginia and was the basis on which she invited the assembling of a peace Conference. It was endorsed by the Legislature of Kentucky and Maryland, and I think by that of Tennessee also. It was petitioned for by a larger number of citizens, from all sections of the country and of all parties, than any proposition ever before Congress.

It is not necessary to my present purpose to discuss the proposition itself, as you concede to it all the virtue I could claim for it; but the reason the Southern members preferred it to any other of the many pending propositions, was because it took the common territory from under the operation of the edicts on which Mr. Lincoln had been elected, excluding all adherers from the common territory unless they left slaves behind. The Supreme Court had decided against the right of Congress, to interdict slavery from the common territory; but the incoming party were pledged to exercise the authority, notwithstanding. Mr. Lincoln had repeatedly made known his determination to stand by that position. The South held that such a decree of doctrine rendered the Southern States less than equals in the Union, and that they could submit to no such humiliation. One of the great merits of the Crittenden propositions was that it waived the force of that decree by an equitable partition of the territory on the line of 36 deg. 30 min. North latitude, giving us about 900,000 square miles of the territory, and the South about 300,000, our share being more than any impartial umpire could have awarded us, and it thus applied your principles to three-fourths of the territory acquired by a common blood and treasure, but you were not content.

But you know we went father and proposed to take a vote of the people for the direction of the members of Congress in submitting the propositions for the ratification of the States. But the Republicans would not accept the compromise

But you know we went father and proposed to take a vote of the people for the direction of the members of Congress in submitting the propositions for the ratification of the States. But the Republicans would not accept the compromise

But you know we went father and proposed to take a vote of the people for the direction of the members of Congress in submitting the propositions for the ratification of the States. But the Republicans would not accept the compromise

But you know we went father and proposed to take a vote of the people for the direction of the members of Congress in submitting the propositions for the ratification of the States. But the Republicans would not accept the compromise

But you know we went father and proposed to take a vote of the people for the direction of the members of Congress in submitting the propositions for the ratification of the States. But the Republicans would not accept the compromise