CLEARFIELD REPUBLICAN.

GEO. B. GOODLANDER, Proprietor. PRINCIPLES—NOT MEN. TERMS—$2 per annum, in Advance.

VOL. 38—WHOLE NO. 2028. CLEARFIELD, PA., THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1867. NEW SERIES—VOL. 8, NO. 1.

...ction--but Destruction.

SPEECH OF HON. JAS. BROOKS, OF NEW YORK,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, July 9, 1867.

The House resumed the consideration of bill of the House (No. 128) supplementary to an act entitled "An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States," passed on the 2d day of March, 1867, and the act supplementary thereto, passed on the 23d day of March, 1867.

Mr. BROOKS said: I have no desire to address the House, and I do not flatter myself that anything which anybody can say will change anybody's vote; but it appears to me that, as the minority member of the committee reporting the bill, I ought to say something at least in the way of protest. But before I proceed further I crave the protection of the Speaker to enforce the rules of debate, so as to save me from those points of interrogation or exclamation that so often crop out or pop out from gentlemen skilled in dialectics, who inter-ject speeches within speeches, and thus destroy all unity of argument or thought. I crave this also because of the very serious subject matter before us, because of the brief time allowed us, (only an hour and a half,) and I need all of my little portion of that time without rejoinder or surrejoinder, rebutter or surrebutter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York gives notice that he will not be interrupted in his remarks, and he will proceed.

Mr. BROOKS. Twenty-four years ago there assembled in Faneuil Hall, Boston, a little convention of men, one of whom has recently received the thanks of the Duke of Argyle and other noble lords of England for the destruction they have perpetrated upon the Constitution and institutions of the United States—thanks naturally enough flowing from such an oligarchy who see that success with us is death to them, and thanks, therefore, easily to be accounted for from such a high-born, aristocratic quarter. This little Faneuil Hall convention then founded a great party, which, spreading beyond Massachusetts, embraced at last both the middle and the western States; and the platform upon which they established their party was the following:

"*Resolved*, That the Constitution of the United States is a covenant with death and an agreement with hell, which ought to be immediately annulled."

Our Peter, the Hermit, the great fanatical Crusader, having accomplished his object—the forcible emancipation of four million slaves at a cost of at least four billion dollars to his country, the legacy of a most oppressive and apparently inextinguishable debt, which not only grinds the laborer to the dust, but in every way cripples all working capital—having witnessed the slaughter of half a million of his countrymen, and heard the cries of widows and orphans almost innumerable, naturally enough deemed his mission accomplished, and went over to England to be feted, there to repose among dukes and duchesses, grateful to him for his great work of destruction. The party, however, which he then and there formed in Faneuil Hall, we now see entering upon a new mission, into fresh crusades, not now for the emancipation of four million blacks, but for the enslavement of eight million whites—men of their own kith, kin, and color, and physical organization. And we have here in the bill before us, in substance soon to become a law, a bill of destruction, which will entitle these new crusaders, if they ever go over the sea, to like honors from fresh dukes of Argyle, or other noble lords of England. The work to be accomplished by this bill is the complete annulment of the Federal Constitution, that covenant with death, that agreement with hell, to bring about the end of what Garrison began twenty-four years ago in Boston.

What is first worthy of note in the bill before us is, that in a time of profound peace, when all war has been over, two years and more, save from the yell of the Sioux or Cheyenne, we have introduced a martial bill, full of martial pains and penalties, as if, *flagrante bello*, we were amid the very roar of cannon or in the clash of squadrons of infantry and cavalry. Peace everywhere, save on the prairies or plains, blesses our great country. But now, long after the Temple of Janus is closed, we have martial law, military commissions, the destruction of courts and of all civil law proposed. The only other war existing is one of those hitherto peaceful wars between the Democratic and some other ever opposing party, when now the anti-Democratic party, in order to keep itself in office, and to keep us out, overrides, obliterates, tramples under foot ten States of our Union and the twelve million people that dwell in them.

That such a bill, which I shall proceed to analyze, has never before been contemplated by the leaders of the majority party in this House, nay, not until this late period, when it sees party power constitutionally departing, is not only evident from its hitherto recorded history in the journals of Congress, but clear also from the decision of their own Chief Justice, who, prior to these military bills, in the Indiana military commission case, though of the Republican party, expressed his judicial condemnation of all such military bills in time of peace. "We by no means assert that Congress can establish and apply the laws of war where no war has been declared or exists," said Chief Justice Chase from the minority in the Indiana military tribunal case. "Where peace exists the laws of peace must prevail." "Where peace exists," expressly says the Chief Justice, "the laws of peace must prevail." But here, in a time of profound peace, there is embodied in this bill, in the most objectionable form, almost every article of the laws of war. Here, too, is a bill which subverts from top to bottom, in its very foundations, the Constitution of the United States, and which, amid its many iniquities, one of the least though, violates that guarantee of the Constitution, (article four, section four) that secures to every State of this Union a republican form of government, for no republican form of government, nor the shadow of one, can exist under the outrageous provisions of this bill.

This bill itself in its grand outlines is a Pentarchy—a bill creating five monarchs—a bill subverting Magna Charta—a bill ignoring the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and over ten States of this Union installing the pentarchy, or five monarchies, more fearful, more odious, more damnable even than any that reign over Europe or Asia, or even Africa. Let us analyze this bill, then, and see whether I exaggerate its character. What is its first section? It subverts the Governments in four of the old States of this Union and in six other States not of the original thirteen. It goes further than the two bills which have preceded it, making worse what seemed as bad as possible before, in not only declaring those State governments "illegal," but by going further and declaring them "void." Hitherto we have heard of "dead States"—an idea first started, I think, in the Senate of the United States—States whose corpses only were existing. But here for the first time it is proposed to put into the form of law the solemn declaration that the Governments of ten States are void; that those States are dead, their governments not only illegal, but void; and these ten States of our Union, four of them of the original thirteen that formed the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in framing this bill no regard has been paid to the history of the past, not even to a sentiment nor a recollection. When the name of Greece or Rome or any classic land or classic institution is tingled in our ears, whenever we read of them in history, there is associated with the Parthenon, or with Marathon, or with the Pantheon, the Capitoline Hill, or Tarperan rock, something that touches the heart and makes the blood run warmly through all our veins. But here is a State across the Potomac whose history is ours, that did more for the creation of this government than any other State whatever; a State more classic and glorious in its history than the Parthenon of Greece or the Pantheon of Rome; a State struck out of existence by the first section of this infamous bill. Sir, I have been upon the plains of Marathon and by the passes of Thermopylæ, and my heart has warmed as I reflected upon the history of the noble Greeks that there saved their native land; but never, never, amid all such classic scenes have I ever felt the enthusiasm which inspired me upon the rising grounds of Mount Vernon, before the Tomb of Washington, or upon the plains of Montpelier, or upon the heights of Monticello, or when I have fallen upon my knees before the tomb of Marshall. In no part of the earth wherever an American may go, in no place where history makes a a record of life, is there ground so classic and so glorious as that within a fifty miles' radius around the city of Richmond, in Virginia. There, within that radius, was born the father of his country; there flashed out the fiery and electric eloquence of Patrick Henry; there was born the President of the First Congress; there the homes of the Randolphs and Harrisons; there the illustrious Jefferson and Madison and Monroe; there was born our Winfield Scott, and there have been nursed into existence some of the most illustrious commanders of our own Federal Army.

And yet this State whose record is thus bright all over in history, a deformed Congress, a mutilated Congress, a Congress born from the blood and genius of Virginia, strikes out from the Union that glorious star, the star of Virginia, a lost pleiad in in our own history; a pleiad that will return back with some returning orb to shine brighter and more beautiful in the constellation of our country, brighter than Orion or the Pleiades ever shone in the astronomical history of the geographer.

South Carolina, too, is struck out, the land of Rutledge and of Pickney, and of Marion and of Sumter; Georgia, also, that gave the country the two great States of Mississippi and Alabama. Sir, whatever may have been the errors of those States of the original Thirteen, whatever wrongs in the misjudgment of the Constitution they may have inflicted upon the country, whatever crimes they may have committed, in the warmth of your hearts, if you were but men in your feelings and sympathies, you would feel now as you feel for struggling Greece or for the Cretans in their contest with the Turks, who are not inflicting upon those people barbarities in principle greater than those you propose to inflict in the act before you.

Now, sir, two of these ten States, Louisiana and Arkansas, obliterated by your bill, are part of the great Louisiana purchase. The faith of treaties in the most solemn of obligations is violated here in the act which you propose to pass into a law by depriving them of all protection for their liberty and property. Arkansas, you will remember, or you all know, is a part of the Louisiana purchase. Arkansas and Louisiana were parts of that territory of France, and which under the treaty of that purchase (1803,) article three has the following solemn compact:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the mean time they shall be maintained and protected in the enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess."

This bill violates that treaty, that solemn treaty; and France, with all her power, will have the right, the legal right, if this bill becomes a law, to appear before us, and to claim that all the civil institutions, all the rights—the rights of liberty and property—which we have shall also be theirs as citizens of the United States. We are solemnly pledged to a foreign Power to govern the people of these States according to the Federal Constitution, not by military commissions nor by martial laws; and hence what we are doing is not only in violation of high moral principles, but in violation of a most solemn treaty we have made with France for the purchase of Louisiana.

The last words of the first section of the bill are as follows:

"And that thereafter said governments, if continued, were to be continued subject in all respects to the military commanders of the respective districts and to the authority of Congress."

No broader words can be used in a grant of power. "Subject in all respects to the military commanders." If human genius had exerted its greatest ingenuity to devise to rob the people of their rights and privileges, to degrade and dishonor a people, to trample twelve millions under foot, it would have used these very words, "subject in all respects to the military commanders."

In the second section, Mr. Speaker, these military commanders are given the power—

"To remove or suspend from office any municipal or State officer or person exercising authority under or by virtue of any so-called State government existing in his district; and that the said officer so assigned to command as aforesaid is hereby empowered to appoint another person in the stead of an officer or person so removed, if he shall deem proper to do so; and whenever he shall deem it necessary as aforesaid to prohibit, suspend, or set aside any act or proceeding of any such State or municipal government, or any act or thing done under or by virtue of its authority; and all acts heretofore done by any such officer in accordance herewith shall be deemed valid."

All acts heretofore done shall be valid! Here are embodied the most violent principles of legislation, against which we have attempted to be guarded in the Constitution of the United States. It is a law to be not only "retrospective," which might in some cases be justified, but a law "retrospective," which is unjustifiable, and a law "*ex post facto*," which is in defiance of the Constitution of the United States. It affirms and legalizes all acts done heretofore by any such officers. It is declared that they shall be deemed valid.

Now, have the members of this House given any attention to what we are legalizing, what it is that is to be deemed valid? Before we enter into that species of legislation I would ask the honorable gentlemen on the other side if they know how many military laws or edicts they render valid? I beg them before they proceed to the passage of this act to have before them some military "Little & Brown" codification of the laws which they are to render valid. Sir, I have read the Pandects of Justinian, and I revere those Pandects as a monument of human wisdom. But here are the edicts of Sickles and Sheridan, and no man knows how many there are, and they are all declared to be valid. Whoever before heard of such blind, such fatal legislation? All that Sickles has done, all that Sheridan has done, is "valid:" and yet I defy any Republican member on this floor to tell me the twentieth part of the things done and now proposed to be enacted into law.

The genius of Sickles has been prolific of edicts. I hold in my hands a batch of them almost as voluminous as the Pandects of Justinian. He institutes edicts for the collection of debts, modifies the existing laws for the enforcement of judgements, utters decrees for the payment of money, sets aside proceedings instituted in the courts, prohibits in certain cases the right to bring suits, enjoins proceedings on execution for the term of twelve months, giving new liens in certain cases, establishes homestead exemptions, declares what shall be a legal tender, abolishes in certain cases the remedy by foreign attachment, abolishing bail as heretofore authorized in cases *ex contracti*, but not in other cases known as actions *ex delicto*, &c., &c. General order No. 25 reads as follows:

"1. The distillation or manufacture of whiskey or other spirits from grain is prohibited in this military district. Any person so engaged or employed will be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor. The possession of a still or other apparatus for this purpose will be considered presumptive evidence of a violation of the revenue laws, and the party or parties using the same, or on whose premises, or in whose possession the same may be found, will be arrested and brought on trial before a military tribunal composed of the commanding officer of the post and two officers of the Army next in rank on duty within the territorial limits of the post. If the exigencies of the service do not permit the detail of other officers, that fact will be duly certified, and the post commander will hear and determine the case."

And here all these extraordinary edicts of Sickles relating to property and individual rights are declared by the final lines of the third section to be valid and to be as laws of the United States under the Sickles monarchy of the Carolinas.

Sir, I know not how many military orders have been issued in all, from the five monarchies, but, from the best information I can get, on computation I can make them some one thousand in all. And here, groping in the dark, without knowing what we do, we pronounce all these edicts or orders retrospective, retroactive, or *ex post facto*; we pronounce them all to be legal or valid law.

The third section of this bill directs the registration I know not by how many boards in the Southern States, but I presume the computation is small when I say that they must number some two thousand in all, for they have already cost $500,000, and a sum as much more is necessary in order to keep them up. These Boards of Registration are made up of white, black, and mulatto, the black predominating in many cases, or the mulatto balancing the Board, so that there will be an equal number, half white, half black. These boards thus created are forbidden to regard the oath which the citizen takes, and at their pleasure they may strike from the list the name of any one already registered who in their judgment improperly took the oath. And record evidence is not to be required, but parole evidence shall be sufficient. The evidence of any negro or mulatto against any white citizen will deprive him of his right to vote. In all these doings these two thousand boards of registry, white, black and yellow, are "not to be bound or governed in their action by any opinion of any officer of the United States Government:" for such are the words of the act.

What a government and registration you are thus creating in the Southern States! Over two thousand boards with different laws, different exposition of the laws, different constructions to be given to them throughout, from the Potomac to the Rio Grande; and however diverse or adverse shall be that construction, no opinion of any officer of the government is binding upon them, and there is to be no uniformity of construction. Why, one of the very blessings of Government is uniformity of action and of law; but there you enact that there shall be two thousand different laws of registration, with no Federal officer or any other power to create uniformity. The white man is given up to the negro, where negro registers predominate, or *vice versa*, if you please, and a premium is thus created to start a war of races.

The fourth section of this act not only annihilates all State Courts—what you have done before—but it goes yet further, takes one new step, and for the first time, strikes at the Government of the United States by declaring—

"That no civil court in the United States or of any State shall have jurisdiction of any proceeding, civil or criminal, against any such district commander, or any officer or person acting by his authority for or on account of the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this act."

At first you were but bold enough to strike out of existence the State courts; but now you are bold enough to strike out of existence the courts of the United States—to destroy them all at one blow. Your ban is general against courts and judges in any form. You seem to have a horror of the wig or the gown, and to trust only in epaulettes as fit governments for the people of ten States.

The fifth section declares—

"That no district commander shall be relieved from the command assigned to him under the aforesaid acts, unless the Senate shall have first advised and consented thereto, or unless by sentence of court martial he shall be cashiered or dismissed from the Army, or unless he shall consent to be so relieved."

Sir, I know not what the President of the United States may do; I know not what he may feel it his duty to do; I know that he is the Executive Officer of the United States, pronounced at one time to be the Government of the United States, against whom it was disloyal to utter even a word of censure. I know that he was the Brobdingnag of this Government. But he has suffered himself to be bound by a set of miserable Lilliputians, and there in the cords with which they have bound him, he struggles, but now struggles in vain to free himself. Thus having bound him, you now propose to re-violate the Constitution (article two, section two,) and to take from him the command of the Army of the United States. You forbid him to exercise his constitutional authority to post his generals where he thinks the public interest demands. Sir, if I were President of the United States, before I put a veto on this high-handed act, I would send Sheridan to govern the States of Massachusetts and Maine, to make or unmake their governors, their judges, their police, what their Representatives seem to rejoice in when practiced upon others; while I would send Sickles to Walrussia to educate the Esquimaux, or to be educated by them in the principles of civil and constitutional liberty. But you tell me you would then impeach the President. Sir, there are worse conditions in life than being impeached by a mutilated Congress of these United States, and one of them is being used to destroy the Constitution and Government of these United States. I tell the President the only chance he now has of being re-elected President of the United States is in being impeached by a Rump House, and turned out by a Rump Senate, and the Presiding Officer of that Senate being forced into his place. Sir, if the revolution ends thus, the historical end of all such revolutions as we are passing through, and if we make President that gentleman who with Senators has been "swinging round the circle" in Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas, there making, as reported, agrarian speeches, *a la* Prudhomme of the French Revolution, then, when we come to his divisions of property, beginning here in this House, say, with the Representative from Boston, or, the Representative from the Taunton district and ending with him from Lynn, then, I say, such will be the common revelry that in the intoxication of our joy we may re-elect the President of the United States. By the Constitution, the higher law, the supreme law, the President is made commander of the Army and Navy; and he is faithless to that Constitution if in the apprehension of impeachment he suffers that power to depart from him, as you propose in the fifth section of this bill.

And now, as if this bill was not bad enough, gentlemen after gentlemen propose to make it fiercer, to add to its ferocities. The honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] amends the bill by ordering all State, county and municipal officers to take the test oath, in order to concentrate all local representation in the military order. Another honorable gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. Wilson] from whom I had expected better things, proposes to punish any person who attempts to prevent or obstruct the execution of these acts by a fine of $5,000, to be levied by the military commander, or imprisonment of one year, or both the $5,000 and jail, as the military commander may will. Another gentleman, from Missouri, [Mr. Benjamin,] proposes to be less merciful than his Maker, which is to allow no presidential pardon to avail an unhappy southerner, but to keep him forever excluded from his citizenship—his right to vote. There seems to be a competition among gentlemen on the other side to outbid each other in the arts of cruelty and all the devices of degradation and punishment; and we are indebted to the mercies, it seems, of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Stevens] to save us from another Draconian code.

Mr. Speaker, I was about to be so much out of order as to quote the Constitution of the United States, and to show this House that this bill could not be passed by men who have sworn here to support that Constitution; but I forbear. I know there is but little, very little respect for that instrument here, and some on this floor have gone so far as to pronounce it "played out." There is, however, some respect felt in this House—more especially by lawyers—for what are known as Magna Charta, the petition of right, the bill of rights, extorted by our British ancestors from their kings. Hence, I propose to go back to those great eras of British liberty, in order, if possible, to arouse the American lawyers here to that noble defense of human rights, which British lawyers have seldom or never failed to make. In the most disastrous days of British history, when all liberty seemed to be cloven down, the British bar ever sent forth some brilliant men to uphold Magna Charta and the bills of rights, while I regret to say the American bar, more especially the Republican portion of the American bar, have failed us in the hour of trial. I beg the Republican lawyers, then, in this House to hear me read a chapter from Magna Charta, which was extorted from King John in the year 1215 by our semi-barbarous ancestors. I give it in the original, but it will be well understood, although it is in monkish Latin, not in the classic style of Horace or Tacitus or Sallust.

"Nullus liber homo capiatur, vel imprisonetur, aut disseisiatur de libero tenemento suo, vel libertatibus, vel liberis consuetudinibus suis, aut utlagetur, aut exuli, aut aliquo modo destruatur nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus nisi per legale judicium parium suorum vel per legem terræ. Nulli vendemus, nulli negabimus, aut differemus rectum vel justitiam."

Which is thus translated:

"No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold or his liberties or free customs or be outlawed or banished, or in any way destroyed; and we will not pass upon him, nor condemn him but by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the laws of the land. We will sell (referring to justice and its administration) to no man, and we will not deny nor defer either right or justice to any man."

This was as long ago as 1215. The *confirmatio chartarum* in the reign of King Edward was in 1297; and in the reign of Henry III there was a like declaration. The right of trial by jury, by a jury of his peers, was guaranteed to every British born subject, even in barbarous ages. But here, in this Congress, in spite, too, of our Declaration of Independence, here too in this mournful year 1867, twelve millions of human beings, white and black, are denied all trial before their peers, all courts or processes of law; and we propose to enact a measure more barbarous in principle, more indefensible than any of the violent and extraordinary acts of King John, from whom the British barons extorted this charter.

Sir, if there is no respect paid here to Magna Charta, extorted from King John by the barons at Runnymede, I trust some respect will be paid to the illustrious spirits of our own history who in the last generation, in all the States of this Union, copied from Magna Charta, and embodied in their various State Constitutions, similar principles of human liberty.

North Carolina is one of the States that you propose to strike out of the Union—North Carolina, where originated the Declaration of Independence—the Mecklenburg declaration, which was adopted some time before Mr. Jefferson had drafted the Declaration put forth by the Continental Congress. The first declaration of the State of North Carolina contains these provisions:

"That all political power is vested in and derived from the people only.

"That the people of this State ought to have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof.

"That no freeman shall be put to answer any criminal charge, but by indictment, presentment, or impeachment.

"That no freeman shall be convicted of any crime but by the unanimous verdict of a jury of good and lawful men in open court, as heretofore used.

"That no freeman ought to be taken, imprisoned, or dismissed of his freehold, liberties, or privileges, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, or deprived of his life, liberty, or property, but by the law of the land.

"That the people have a right to bear arms for the defense of the State; and as standing armies in time of peace are dangerous to liberty they ought not to be kept up; and that the military should be kept under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power."

But North Carolina is a Southern State. I call the attention of gentlemen, then, from Massachusetts to their own principles of liberty, their own declaration of rights:

"ART. 1. All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and inalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the rights of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

"3. All power residing originally in the people, and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government vested with authority, whether legislative, executive or judicial, are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them."

"10. Each individual of the society has a right to be protected by it, in the enjoyment of his life, liberty, and property, according to the standing laws." * * * * "No part of the property of any individual can with justice be taken from him or applied to the public use without his own consent, or that of the representative body of the people. In fine, the people of this Commonwealth are not controllable by any other laws than those to which their constitutional representative body have given their consent."

"12. * * * * No person shall be arrested, imprisoned or despoiled, or deprived of his property, immunities or privileges, put out of the protection of the law, exiled or deprived of his life, liberty or estate, but by the judgment of his peer, or the law of the land.

"And the Legislature shall not make any law that shall subject any person to a capital or infamous punishment (excepting for the government of the Army and Navy) without trial by jury."

The charter of New Hampshire is fuller than this of these great principles of liberty. I have not time to read them. The charter of Vermont is even yet fuller than that of New Hampshire. In those days the New England people were faithful to liberty. They were never before as unfaithful to the liberty of their own white race as now to eight millions of their own skin, color, and organization.

Sir, the Declaration of Independence in numerous sections condemns in spirit and intent the whole principle of this bill, and I do not wonder that on the 4th of July last the Republican party failed to celebrate it as heretofore, for this declaration of Independence cannot be read now in a Republican assemblage without making every Republican blush.

I know I am to be told that we have the power, as the South is a conquered people, to pass the bill; that the Constitution is abrogated there and that by the right of conquest we can make this extraordinary law. Sir, the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Stevens,] who introduced this bill, proposed at first only confiscation, but here is an enslavement of twelve millions of human beings in this bill. First, it abrogates all their rights of property. The liberty of the citizen is entirely in the hands of the military commanders. The life of every man is at the absolute disposal of one man, and that man the President of the United States. Tell me, oh, tell me not, then, of four million black people having been emancipated from chattel slavery when by this act you impose a cruel legal slavery in its most odious forms, without the right of property, liberty, or life, without any personal right, upon eight millions white human beings, a worse than chattel slavery.

I deny, sir, that there is anything which justifies confiscation, or the passage of such an act under the right of conquest. I could read whole chapters from Grotius, or Vattel, or Puffendorf, and from Wheaton and Story and Kent, which condemn this bill. It is in utter defiance of natural, and national, and constitutional law, and I say to you now, that may be concerned in it, many of you will live to repent of the tyranny perpetrated upon their people. I might cite the prize cases if I had time, and show that they condemn the principles of this bill.

All history condemns it too. Rome was built up in utter defiance of the principles of this bill. Rome governed every country, not by conquest and subjugation such as you propose, but by assimilating the conquered subjects with Roman citizens, by giving them Roman rights and Roman privileges and Roman citizenship, while here are eight millions white human beings whom you deprive of every right of an American citizen. Even the Tartars, when they conquered China, did not destroy the institutions of China, but assimilated their institutions with those of the conquered. And when Cyrus conquered the Assyrians of old, he repeated their rights and privileges, and guaranteed to them all the liberties they possessed.

There is no parallel in history for this bill but that of the infamous conduct of the Duke of Alva, in Spain. Answer me not that he destroyed twenty thousand lives, for here you destroy what is more precious than life; the right of man to his liberty, the sentiment that he is a man, that he is equal before other men. Why, sir, I had rather lose my life a thousand times than live under the government of these five monarchs as established by the infamous principles of this infamous bill. Our English ancestors, even Charles II after the bloodiest of civil wars, gave peerages to Monk and Fleetwood and a mitre to Baxter, while you only give military tyrants to your people, and declare a total abnegation of their rights. Even Louis XVIII, though a Bourbon, made marshals and statesmen of Bonapartists, while you have exerted in this bill all of your ingenuity to deprive the white people of their right to vote. When Hungary was subjugated and overthrown the Emperor of Austria did not exert such tyrannical power over the Huns, for he gave them a constitution and he gave them a parliament, while you take away from the Southern people their constitution and laws, and refuse them representation in the national legislature. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, two great tories, were more liberal and merciful to the Irish people than you are to the people of the South. Although O'Connel was the instigation of riots in Ireland, the Duke of Wellington and his party did not refuse him a seat as a member from the County of Clare, while you shut out the Kentucky delegation from seats here simply for the reason that they differ from you in politics, and for that and that alone.

Sir, I deprecate the passage of this bill in its effect upon the people of the southern country. Far better would it be for that land, from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, to be as it was one hundred and fifty years ago, a howling wilderness, than to be subjected to the amalgamation of races which you are now proposing in this bill. Our country is now made up of many different races, not only Caucasian, Mongolian, Indian, Chinese, with Japanese about to come here in the Pacific steamers by thousands, and at last the Esquimaux; but you have selected the least intelligent, the poorest informed, except the Esquimaux; you have selected the African to share with you co-partnership in this Government, while your own wives and children, your minor boys are shut out from the right of suffrage. You have given to the negro equality and copartnership with the white man. Sir, it is impossible for these two races, in my judgment, ever to live together on terms of intimacy. You have stored up and are yet storing up for them the elements of awful strife which will produce a perpetual conflict of races.

Sir, the negro Haytien is wiser than you. He allows no white man to own real estate on that island. The black Liberian is wiser than you. He allows no white man to share with him the government of that country. The experiment in Jamaica of a mingled government has broken down, and all free government there is absorbed by the British Parliament which through orders in council, disregarding both whites and blacks, exercises supreme power. Nowhere on earth has ever this mixed government succeeded.

One race is superior to another. God so ordained, and no fiat of authority of yours can bring down the Caucasian to the African, or bring up the African to the Caucasian. All efforts, all struggles will be in vain. And this is no new experiment. It has been tried throughout the whole of Spanish America. Juarez, a half Indian, now Governor and ruler of Mexico, is just now showing there the barbaric character of this mingled Government of unnaturally associated races, while in the numerous other Spanish-negro-Indian hybrid States they are almost all of them in constant civil war, armies running and overrunning one another, with the blood of the white man and the blood of the negro both deteriorated by thus commingling, and yet here this rash, this fearful experiment! No, not an experiment, for experience has already shown that it never can succeed. You propose to mix and mingle the twelve millions of your countrymen in the Southern States of the Union. You take the most ignorant, the most uneducated, the most brutish of the population and give them absolute control through boards of registration or through the ballot box. It needs not the eye of prophecy, it needs no skill of divination to foretell what must be the effect of such a crime as this, for all history shows you what has been the effect and pronounces what it will be hereafter.

But, sir, I find I must draw to a close, and allow me to say in doing so that I know that just now you are here above public opinion, not only of this country, but of the world. But there is an unwritten law, there is a law of God that embodies itself in public opinion, which hereafter will hold you responsible for the destruction of the institutions of your country. You may overthrow the Constitution, you may force the previous question upon us less than half a day for the discussion of the great principles of this bill, but history, posterity, will do us justice. I have long been in public life, but this is now the proudest hour of that life, if I am ever able to speak again, to remonstrate here in this House, and to make a record of this remonstrance against the outrageous, the infamous principles of this tyrannical military bill.

Horace Greeley is after the "Grand Army of the Republic" with a sharp stick. He says the society is ruled by politicians who are using it for their own advancement. He declares that no true soldier will have anything to do with it. He pronounces it anti-republican, barbarous, "inimical to the Constitution and the Union," and adds: "It will be a sad day for our party when soldiers find no better work to do than to prowl over the battle-fields of the past, and dig up the bodies of the slain." The head of the "philosopher" is perfectly "level" upon this subject.

A MONOPOLY.—Decidedly, Chicago is monopolizing all the scandalous business. Parties acting in direct violation of well known laws go to Chicago as naturally as ducks to water. The moment an erring wife or too romantic daughter disappears, Chicago suggests itself as their place of destruction and sure enough they turn up there in due time. Why this should be so, we leave to philosophers to decide; we merely note the fact.

Old Brimstone Brownlow of Tennessee, has eight thousand of his parasites in arms to carry his election, and murders, robberies, and arson are of daily occurrence. For all crimes committed these creatures are promised the Governor's pardon if detected or convicted! Such is the state of affairs which the Radical leaders are laboring to bring about in every State of the Union, both South and North.

"Papa," said John Smith's youngest son last Thursday, "can I go to the circus?"

"No, my boy," affectionately replied Smith; "if you are a good boy I will take you to see your grandmother's grave, this evening."

Briggs has a great faculty for getting things cheap. The other day he had a beautiful set of teeth inserted for next to nothing. He kicked a dog.

Many persons look upon themselves as struggling to benefit the world, when in fact the world looks upon them as struggling only to benefit themselves.

Explanations are bad things. You best preserve your dignity by avoiding them. The character which cannot defend itself is not worth defending.

The Radical Convention at Trenton, New Jersey, was composed of half whites and half blacks.