

# THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

VOL. XXII.—NO. 46.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O. GOODRICH.

TOWANDA:

Thursday Morning, April 17, 1862.

## Political.

### ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

#### SPEECH OF SENATOR LANDON.

SENATE, Wednesday Afternoon, March 12, 1862.

The Senate re-assembled at 3 o'clock, and proceeded to the consideration of Senate bill No. 323, joint resolutions relative to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER stated the question to be on the amendment of Mr. Clymer, offered the day previous.

REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE LANDON, IN REPLY TO SENATORS LARBERTON AND CLYMER.

Mr. LANDON. Mr. SPEAKER: I merely rise to introduce the discussion this afternoon in the few remarks I desire to make. The other day I had my say upon this subject, and occupied as much of the time of the Senate as would properly belong to me. I said all that I intended to say; and I may add, that I desired to say at the time—not exhausting the subject at all, merely giving my views in general. But after the extraordinary positions taken by the Senator from Berks, as well as his Democratic colleague, the Senator from Clarion, yesterday, I feel constrained to ask the further indulgence of the Senate for a short time. The specific amendment offered by the Senator from Berks, (Mr. Clymer), allows the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia to be the assent of the people of said District and of the State of Maryland to be first obtained.

This is but the rebash of an old, stale dish, repeated for the ten-thousandth time, of a miserable disgusting ditty. It has been the position especially of the party to which the Senator from Berks belongs, never to do anything of any special importance, never to take any politically important or national step, without adding that very amendment—"provided the consent of the slaveholding States can be and will be obtained." If their consent is obtained and their privilege secured, then they venture to proceed; but if the consent of the slaveholders were not obtained, if they entered a *non prosequi*, then all proceedings must be quashed. This in times past has been the spectacle of the party to which the gentleman belongs, and too much the rule of the whole country. It is now time that we took course of higher and better authority.

Senators upon the other side make an egregious mistake in their peculiar mode of arguing these questions at this time. They speak of slavery, of the constitutional rights of slaveholders, of the obligation of the free States to respect these rights, precisely as they did five years ago, forgetting entirely the change of circumstances, the change of issues, of means and necessities. Why, sir, but last night I saw stalwart men enter private dwellings in this town, and seize and carry into the streets beautiful and valuable furniture. Under other circumstances the act would have been a breach of the peace, an indictable offence; but as it was,—the flames crackling and curling hard by—the act was a justifiable and meritorious one. Sentiments and deeds that five years ago would have been inexcusable, are now not only justifiable, but an absolute necessity. To have suspended then the writ of *habeas corpus*, would have been intolerable; now it is praiseworthy. To have committed men to prison then, without judge or jury, would have been horribly despotic; now the change of circumstances makes it an act of determined patriotism. Then slavery bowed solely to the supremacy of the general government, and we awarded it all its constitutional guarantees; now it rears its head in treasonable defiance to that government, and we have nothing to promise it but constitutional penalties. Is it not strange that men have become so infatuated respecting the rights of slavery? It is not only strange, but painfully amusing. They urge on the destruction of shipping, the confiscation of material property, the butchering of traitors; but when we reach the cause of all our troubles, they raise their hands in holy horror, and cry halt! As well might I command, "out with the furniture, down with the walls, but take heed that you do not throw water upon the flames." I submit that such argumentation is not only fallacious, but puerile.

When the mariner is enveloped in the storm, it is wise in him to look carefully to the position and course of his vessel. Maintaining his position, allow me to state my precise position upon the subject under discussion; and then, if I can, to state the position of Senators upon the other side. This will enable us to move on understandingly.

For many long years I have regarded the whole system of slavery as morally wrong; and hence believed that all moralists were not only justifiable, but bound to bring all possible moral appliances to bear upon the institution, to enlighten the masses, elevate public opinion, and, as far as possible, to ameliorate the condition of the slave himself. But under our peculiar compact, I never could see how we could legislate it out of existence, so long as its upholders bowed to the behests of the Constitution of the land. The adoption of such a course of interference would be but another name for revolution. But now, when the defenders of the institution themselves have ignored your Constitution and all your governmental prerogatives, inaugurating both rebellion and revolution, I meet them upon their own chosen ground, and claim that they shall take the consequences.

Congress should abolish slavery in the District of Columbia upon terms equitable and just. Then they should declare the slaves of all rebels free, as they veritably are; and I defy the sophistry of a Berks lawyer to prove the contrary. This being done, some plan like the one recommended by the President, should

be adopted for the removal of slavery from the loyal slaveholding States. With our eye upon the future, we should, when the proper time comes, provide a separate home and provisional government for these millions of unfortunate beings; saying to the school teacher and the missionary, "come on with your books and appliances and help us evangelize and elevate this race."

Such would be my plan; and such a course strikes my judgment as philanthropic and God-like. It not only awards justice to whom justice is due, but it promises the permanent peace and salvation of the country.

The mode of removing this evil may be a debatable subject; but the absolute necessity of the removal itself, is as fixed and certain as fatality. We find ourselves to-day as a nation floundering in a sea of troubles, with the monster slavery, heavier than a mill-stone, lashed to our necks; and the very waves that surge and dash about us are conjoined up by the mad-dened struggles of our giant enemy. The great question we have to meet is this: shall we break the chain—swim ourselves, but sink the enemy—or hold the chain and both go down together. For myself, I fall back upon nature's first great law, self-defence, and would save the nation by destroying that which seeks its life.

On the contrary, the position of Senators who addressed us yesterday is this: Congress should not abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. They admit that Congress has the power, but they deny to it the justice, right and expediency. They have avowed, in the next place, that instead of declaring the slaves of rebels free and taking initiatory steps for the ultimate freedom of the slaves of loyalists, the seceded States are to come back into the Union as of old, with all their immunities, all their institutions, and associations, and that slavery with its slave representation in Congress, with the lash and bowie knife, with the Democratic party as a necessary appendage, like the tail of a Behemoth, shall be restored to its former pride and domination. Here we stand, facing each other. I plead for the just, legal, certain suppression of this institution; they plead for its perpetuation *ad infinitum*. Upon this basis I am willing to go to the country—upon it, I am willing to meet them here, elsewhere, or anywhere.

What a beautiful perspective must arise to the imagination of Senators as they throw their glance along the track way of coming ages, and see this petted institution of theirs (which they desire to baptize into an earthly immortality) striking its roots deeper into the heart of the nation, lifting its boughs higher, and spreading them wider and still wider over the land, withering, blasting, denning every green thing within the circle of its shadow.—It may be poetical to them—it is not to me. Looking upon it with sickening heart, I can only exclaim with England's liberty loving poet: "Hail horrors!" I trust a better fate is in store for us. That Providence which gleamed all Europe for good seed with which to plant the continent originally, and stood by the fathers during a seven years struggle for freedom, has done too much for this country to allow ruthless tyrants at last to bury it alive, and riot upon its sepulchre. The country will not be ruined until the people of the free States consent to its destruction. When they restore and perpetuate slavery, their consent is given, the die cast, the deed done. You have then only to wait in melancholy mood for the bitter harvest of retributive justice. If that harvest fail to come, then are the laws of nature reversed, and the divine government a failure.

Allow me now, sir, to notice more specifically the positions taken and principles advocated by the Senators from Berks and Clarion. They both agree in having great sympathy for loyal men in the South. How eloquently they dilated upon the trials and devotion of such men, whose heart of hearts, they affirm, is with the Union and with us, notwithstanding their dangers, persecutions and sufferings; and those Senators appealingly inquire if we can have the hardihood to crush down the rights of such men. I answer, No! Those gentlemen shall not surpass me in doing homage to patriotic loyalty in this day of struggle. But, in reply, I ask them to-day and here if they are prepared to respect and regard the rights of all loyalists in the South? Will they abide by their own affirmed principles? When they find men by the thousand in Carolina—men with brawny muscles, with marrow in their bones, and prayers for the country's success in their hearts—men ready to lay their all upon the altar of that country, help fight its battles and share its victories—men who dodge pistol balls and swim rivers to get within our army lines—when they meet with such, I wish to know if they will recognize their loyalty and guarantee their rights. When the Burnside expedition was winding its way through the serpentine channel, among islands and shoals, who guided the expedition? A colored man. When your forces reached Hilton Head, who was it that came there with important tidings? Colored men. When your army was marching upon the savannahs of the west, who followed that army and whispered in their ear of the schemes, plans and machinations of the rebels? Loyal colored men. Yet gentlemen tell us, "you must restore the States to their former position, with all their peculiar institutions—that any thing short of this would be a violation of the Constitution." They avow that we must respect the rights of loyalists, and in the same breath propose to take millions of loyalists, apply afresh the branding iron, and hand them over to the re-damnation of slavery. Their position is alike void of both humanity and logic, and only suggests to us that class of men whose tender mercies are cruelty. Different should be my reward for southern loyalty. I would in the name of my country twine upon its brow the fadeless wreath of freedom and open up to it the untold joys of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." These Senators agree that the way to maintain the Constitution is to hold up and perpetuate slavery, and they looked lugubrious when charging upon others the fancied crimes of desecrating that sacred document by proclaiming liberty

to the slaves of rebels. My answer is this:—The Constitution affirms that, "The United States shall guarantee to every State a republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion and domestic insurrection." It also makes it the sworn duty of Congress "to suppress insurrection." It likewise adds, "Congress shall have full power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." I submit, sir, that these clauses give Congress, in this time of rebellion, unlimited and constitutional control over the whole subject of slavery; and if its abolition will aid in suppressing the rebellion they are imperatively bound to hurl it out of existence. Singular indeed it is if Congress have constitutional power to confiscate property, to levy enormous taxes, to burn shipping, cripple commerce and slaughter armies, but no right to interfere with the very institution that has created the necessity for such dire expedients. Are the rights and relations of slavery the only ones that are sacred? And must these be respected though all others be overborne? The Constitution was made for the protection of the country; and that is a fallacious interpretation which would make it not only protect slavery but sacrifice the country. Jeff. Davis and Senators upon this floor reason from different premises, but come to the same conclusion. The former says, "let us destroy the Constitution, that we may uphold slavery," the latter responds, "let us preserve the Constitution, and thus maintain slavery." My rejoinder is, "hold fast the Constitution, exercise its full powers in defence of the country, crush insurrection and place the government beyond the possibility of a future pro-slavery rebellion, by annihilating this institution—your most implacable enemy and the source of all your troubles." Years ago, John Quincy Adams, upon the floor of Congress, affirmed and demonstrated these very positions, to the utter discomfiture of his antagonists. He declared, as long since as 1831, that though it might then be inexpedient to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, yet in case of a foreign invasion or domestic insurrection, it would be the constitutional right of Congress to assume entire control of slavery; and should the emergencies of the country demand it, they not only had the right, but it would be their imperative duty to abolish the whole concern. But the sage of Quincy stands not alone. The leading Republican statesmen of this day endorse the same view. A large meeting was lately held in New York city to consider this very subject. At that meeting, letters were read from the leading minds of the nation. One of these letters, written by Montgomery Blair—a man from a slave State, and member of the Cabinet—has been largely quoted from by the Senator from Berks, but he paused in his quotations just when it suited his lame and limping argument. Let me add a quotation—the few last lines of the letter, which prove that even Blair recommends the emancipation of the slaves, and their removal to a separate home. Hear him:

"It needs, therefore, but the assurance which would be given by providing homes for the blacks elsewhere that they are to be regarded as sojourners when emancipated, as in point of fact they are, and ever will be, to insure the co-operation of the non-slaveholders in their emancipation. Nor would they require immediate, universal or involuntary transportation, or that any injustice whatever be done to the blacks. The enterprising would soon emigrate, and multitudes of less energy would follow if such success attended the pioneers, as the care with which the Government should foster so important an object would doubtless insure; and, with such facilities, it would require but few generations to put the temperate regions of America in the exclusive occupation of the white race, and remove the only obstacle to a perpetual Union of the State."

Senator Wilson writes thus:

"Humanity, justice and patriotism all demand that the American people should never pardon the great criminal that has raised the banner of revolt against the unity and authority of the republic. The blood of our fallen sons demands that the Government for which they gave their lives should walk up to the verge of constitutional power in inflicting condign punishment upon their murderer. The nation, imperilled by slavery, should use every legal and constitutional power to put it in process of ultimate extinction. To that end I would at once abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, repeal the black code that dishonors the National capital, tender to the loyal slaveholding States the treasure of the Federal Government to aid them in the work of emancipation, deal justly and liberally with the loyal men of the rebel States, but free the bondmen of rebels."

David Wilmot adds his testimony as follows:

"The national life must be preserved, by applying the knife to the cancer that is eating the very substance and life of the nation. The nation must make a proclamation of freedom to the slaves of every traitor; and as a matter of policy, not of strict right, provide for making compensation to loyal slaveholders, for the temporary loss incident to the speedy emancipation of their slaves. Less than this we cannot do with honor or safety. We have a right to do more. We have a right, instantly and at once, to uproot and eradicate forever any local institution, law, custom, usage, that puts in imminent peril the national life. We have a right to kill Slavery, that the nation may live."

While the Democratic Warrior-governor of Rhode Island, publishes these noble and patriotic sentiments, I recommend opposing Senators upon this floor, to sit for a time at his feet and learn from his lips the true Democratic creed. What says he? Listen:

"It is a superficial view, therefore, of the present national crisis, which supposes that this conflict can end and leave things as it found them."

We must cross this flood that swells and foams, or abandon the national hopes of our glorious future. This issue already made between oppression and liberty must be fought out to the end now, or re-fought hereafter, and perhaps

under aggravated circumstances. Slavery re-established, and the same consequence essentially would follow again. \* \* \* \* \*

"There is really no possible hopeful end to this conflict but the end of slavery. There is no such easy escape from our national troubles as some seem to imagine—no prospects of the war being short but by being useless, or else by being radical and determined, and, I may add, in regard to false principles, most unsparring. To purpose, therefore, that the Union shall survive and its glory and power be triumphantly restored and perpetuated, is virtually to doom slavery to speedy extinction. The preservation of the Union and the destruction of Slavery are inseparable; age, identical now; and he who votes for the one necessarily votes for the other. \* \* \* \* \*

Surely, sir, we may consider this overwhelming testimony of warriors, patriots and sages, as a sufficient offset to the rapid declamation of the Senator from Berks.

I may pass then to another point. He affirms that not slavery but tricksters of the south and fanatics of the north actuated by belish purposes have caused all our troubles. Mark I in his judgment the offence of southerners has reached to trickery, while the crime of northern fanatics has towered up to the terrible climax of hellish. What have these poor "fanatics" done—these abolitionists that you talk so much about? Gentlemen waxed eloquent as they contemplated the fact that Wendell Phillips sometimes lectured upon the subject of slavery. Their eyes opened wide when they affirmed that many years ago Wm. Lloyd Garrison established a paper in the city of Boston. They seem astonished that men should talk and write upon the subject of slavery—that is what has been done at the north. They admit, to be sure, that there have been some tricksters in the south who have co-operated with those men—but certainly with no great fraternity between the two parties. I repeat, what have these abolitionists done? Have they invaded any man's rights? "Yes," the response was, "John Brown did." Yes, he did, sir. And then the double charge is that those abolitionists sang a song to his memory. I never did, because I have not the ability to sing, but if I had I would at least have joined in the chorus. With regard to John Brown I have to say this: I did not introduce him; the Senator from Clarion made the introduction. I have only to say that in many things he may have been a mistaken man; but for all that, his name will live when the name of the Governor who hung him is forgotten in rottenness; and as the one goes down lower and lower, the memory of the other will rise higher and higher as a man, though of fallibility, yet of heroism, of manhood and philanthropy. But as to the song, the Senator told us that our soldiers were not gangrened with this fanaticism. Why, sir, I am sorry his reading is so limited. Who marched deliberately, treading to the beat of the drum down the great street of the city of New York? Was it not one of the regiments of your brave soldiers? And, as they went, they sang that same terrible song: "John Brown, though his body is in the dust, his soul is marching on;" and the people by the thousand and ten thousand along the street and from the balconies and windows with tearful eyes and tremulous voices joined in the chorus. "Fanaticism" becoming quite general, affecting your regiment of soldiers, as well as the common people, even in the city of New York. The fanatics have gone thus far, they have dared to think and talk and write upon slavery—they have even sung a song—and this is HELLISH! On the other hand, what have your slaveholders done? Who has filled the northern mail bags and pronounced northern priests incendiary documents? Who has impeded travel and subjected the country to an oppressive system of espionage. There stands a Senator, (Mr. Lowry,) and every man to look at him would know that he was half heart and a good part of the balance brains—he would not hurt anybody, a gentleman, as he is, who upon going down into Virginia, was seized, and forty men appointed to guard him. I do not wonder at the fact that John Brown with sixteen men, two negroes and a cow, held the Commonwealth of Virginia for eight and forty hours! Who was it that maltreated and stripped christian ministers and sent them afloat down the Mississippi river on a slab? Who is it that has held northern men in confinement for their unexpressed principles and suspected ideas? Oh! sir, it is only these gentlemen. Southern traitors whose offences never rise higher than trickery. I tell these Senators frankly and plainly, they are the direct advocates of slavery and the indirect apologists of rebels, the principles they have proclaimed here are better suited to the traitor Congress in Richmond than to the Senate of Pennsylvania, and if uttered in the former place would call down the applause of the House. The Senator from Berks affirms that he who lifts his hands against the government, has no right to protection in person, property or life.—Good! true! I agree with him there. But if these seceded States, that have lifted both hands against the Government, have no right to protection as regards property or life, how do you get along with this next declaration that these same men, are to be allowed to come into the Government and plead the immunities of the Constitution. The Senator says they have no right to protection either in person, life or property; yet he claims that in the winking up every one of them shall be permitted to come into a national court, and take position behind the Constitution, and plead all its privileges in their favor. I leave him to harmonize it, and it is but one of many contradictions that I commend to his second sober thought. The Senator from Berks puts this question to us very earnestly. Said he:—

"Would it not be terrible to strip these innocent people in the District of Columbia of their property—they have got their property, their hard earnings, invested there in their slaves, and would it not be terrible to strip them of their property?" Mr. Speaker, this State must pay its sixteen million of dollars per annum to save the country. Is it not terrible? If we all have to make sacrifices to save the country, ought not slaveholders to be

willing to bear their part in the sacrifice? It is terrible for each one of us to have our dollars decimated; but if it is necessary, in order to save the country, very well; and we say to those slave owners: "You, gentlemen, must bear your part. We will not ask you to bear more, but you must contribute your quota in some form, manner or shape, to save the country." You observe, sir, I do not enlarge upon these points—only touch them—for I desire to be very brief. Both of those Senators agree in declaring that the democratic party is the conservator of the country and Constitution. Now, no man must find fault with me for alluding to partyism here in the Senate. I did not introduce the subject, but rather the Senators on the opposite side; and I am ready to follow them in all their windings upon this question. They affirmed that the great democratic party is the conservator of the Constitution and of the country, and, as usual, they put you and myself, and our associates, upon the defensive. That is the custom, here and elsewhere. We, miserable fanatics, are the ones who have done all the mischief, and, like Milton's sin, we are the ones who have brought all the evils upon the country. Before the people, in the papers, and everywhere, we must stand upon the defensive. Now, let us reverse that. While we may be accountable for some things, I tell you there is a heavy account that they must square up.

The modern, degenerated Democratic party is the great conservator of the country, is it? The impersonation of patriotism! The embodiment of political wisdom—the very hyperbole of party purity! What party has for years co-operated with slaveholders in this country, worked with them, coalesced with them, and faithfully done their bidding? The Democratic party, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to ridicule any great association of men; but I remember to have seen (and you have seen the same), in the streets of this city a small man with a crust of bread in his fingers. He holds up the crust, whistles, and forth steps the dog—a long haired, devil eyed mongrel hybrid. Mark the drill that follows: Speak! The dog yelps. Lie down! He obeys. Roll over! He hesitates not for dirt. Go lie down in the corner! He goes, looking as a subdued, complacent dog only can look. Slavery has for the past twenty-five years treated the Democratic party precisely in this manner. Holding the presidency or some other office in its thumb and finger, it has whistled, and that party has said, "here am I." It held up the crust and that party laid down; it said "roll over in the dirt," and the party rolled over; and when it had made sufficient use of the party, it said, "go lie down in the corner." I do not ridicule anybody; but I say that slave leaders have made the party speak and lie down as they desired. Gentlemen have come here and talked about compromise.—Good Heavens! Why did they not compromise with their brethren at Charleston when the old craft ran aground and when they run it into the dry dock of Baltimore for repair? Why did they not compromise then and not reprove me for refusing to compromise now? What did one of their leaders say years ago? Said he: "we, through the influence of slavery at the north and the Democratic party at the north can hold the government; and when the time shall come that we cannot hold it we will separate and destroy it." That is what Calhoun said who plundered the treasury? A Democratic agent. Who stole your national arms? A Democratic officer. Who preached treason in Congress until the national countenance turned pale? Democratic Senators. And, sir, they ought to have hung higher than Haman instead of being allowed to depart, as they were. Who sat in the Presidential chair, tied bad and foot, I admit, and under both and mortgage—who sat there looking feebly on while the nation, with throbbing heart and quivering energies, appealed to him to nerve himself up and put his foot, like Jackson, upon the treason, but who sat there like the mummied fungus of an overshadowing power and did nothing—who was it! A Democratic President. Who abrogated the Missouri Compromise and alarmed the fears of the millions of the North? The Democratic party. Who turned the fields of Kansas into a field of blood? The same party. Who through our national prisons, put in durance vile for social collusion with open traitors, members of the same party? Who constitute the rebel army? Democratic brethren, whom the Senator from Berks proposes to restore to full communion and fellowship. And yet, sir, even here, continuing the same old ditty, that party claims superior excellence. It resembles the hand of the corrupt, dying monarch, who had become so accustomed to singing lies and death warrants, that when smitten with the chills of the grave, his fingers still continued the motions. They began with the glories of democracy and wind up with the sacredness of slavery, reminding one, (and I shall draw an illustration germane to my subject,)—reminding one of the poor slaveholders who was not able to own a whole negro, and whose daily prayer was, "Oh Lord bless me, my wife, and my half of Cuff." So, sir, with the democratic party; they wind up eternally with "their half of cuff." Now, I want the gentlemen if they see fit, here or elsewhere to defend those things, I desire them to reconcile their party claims with their party conduct. When this rebellion first broke out, the cry was "change the Constitution, compromise, do anything;" they were ready to amend the Constitution; they were ready to neutralize it, expunge it, turn it inside out upside down, any way at all, in order to accommodate the provisions of that Constitution to the wishes of their southern masters. Now we see the hopes of the slaveholder rest upon the Constitution remaining as it is, and he being permitted—if unable to destroy that Constitution—to come into court and plead its immunities and protection. The Senators from Clarion and Berks are most eloquent in claiming that the Constitution shall remain as it is, and the Democratic party will protect it intact and save the Union without a war. You see the point, sir. When it was necessary in order to answer the purpose of slavery, the Constitution could be changed; when no change will best

subserve the interests of slavery, then they are opposed to any change. I believe they are both good lawyers. Now, I would like to ask them if that is the way they treat unsuccessful thieves, burglars and incendiaries. When those gentlemen (?) try to fire houses and are caught in the act and brought into court, do these Senators who are their counsel, plead before the court thus: "these gentlemen did try to succeed in breaking into a house for such and such purposes, but they failed, they did not succeed and are brought before you; we claim that they shall have the same privileges as are guaranteed to innocent men. Is that the way they plead? Yet these slaveholders are moving heaven and earth to destroy the Government, and these Senators claim that if they cannot succeed, they shall at least be allowed to come in and enjoy its protection.—Mr. Speaker, there was a law in Athens that theft was honorable if the thief was not detected. If the man was caught he was disgraced—not because of the theft but that he was so imprudent as to be discovered. Accordingly, sir, it is recorded in history that a man once stole a fox. He clasped in his arms, wrapped his mantle around it and started with it. As you would suppose, from the nature of the animal, it was not very quiet; but being pursued, and fearing detection, the man held on and clasped him to his bosom while the fox tore away into his very vitals. Now, sir, while for years and years, as a country, we have been hugging this one institution to our bosom, it has been gnawing and gnawing into our vitals, and now it has got at the very heart strings of the country, and is tearing out its soul, rioting upon its dearest interests, and pressing its complete dismemberment. Yet gentlemen predicate that institution upon the law of the great God, and say it shall remain intact. They demand that it shall dig away at the palpitating heart of the nation, and when the nation is virtually dead it shall still be allowed, like an insatiable hyena to crouch upon its bones. When we talk of saving the country, of killing the vampire, of emancipating the bondman, they are thrown into political spasms and party hysterics. They denounced it as a fanatical novelty.

Let me remind gentlemen that emancipation is no new or isolated idea, generated in the whirling brains of modern fanatics. Its records are old as the pyramids; its footprints are upon the sands of the Nile. Modern sophists may sneer at it, but ages since the "ancient days" flung before its redeemed hosts the banner of fire and cloud, and constrained the waves of the sea to beat a retreat at their approach. The history of emancipation constitutes a bright page in the annals of England. For twenty long years such men as Wilberforce and Clarkson labored assiduously for the suppression of the slave trade and the abolition of slavery itself. They were derided and hissed at. Never faltering, they wearied not, but poured the truth upon the nation's frozen heart, as fall the sun's rays upon the glacier, till icy selfishness and prejudice melted into streams of justice and mercy, affording a fit illustration of the great fact that—

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again,  
The immortal years of God are hers;  
While error wounded, writes in pain  
And dies amid her worshippers."

Russia is lifting the yoke from the necks of millions of serfs. Your political father's taught it. Every man knows or should know, that Madison erased from the original draft of the Constitution the word slave, declaring that in that sacred document there should not be a single word that could possible acknowledge the enormities of slavery upon our hand and divine retribution upon the other, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just," said Jefferson. Franklin was president of the first abolition society in Pennsylvania, while Washington avowed the removal of this system was the great desire of his heart, and for its accomplishment his vote never should be wanting." The free state have taught this doctrine by example, and the present cotton states, years since, when the public mind was less polluted than now, held abolition meetings and passed anti-slavery resolutions. Here is a history, in which we find the noblest men advocating a great principle, and that principle, when reduced to practice, producing the most benign results. We find too that our country is trembling and bleeding at every pour from the attacks of slavery. We appeal to those redoubtable Democratic statesmen in this emergency, in the name of sacred history, by the precepts of their fathers, by the example of other lands, by the claims of patriotism and philanthropy to join with us and help save the country by striking to the heart its deadliest foe.

The Senator from Berks affirmed that there was no higher governmental law in earth or heaven than the Constitution; and put on the look of the statesman, not to say the dictator, and added, "he who says there is, is either a fanatic or a traitor." I do not know that the gentleman was conscious of the wide sweep of that remark. I hardly think he was aware upon what different subjects, teachings and principles that circle touched, and which he would sweep away by the assertion that there is no higher law in governmental matters than the Constitution, and who says there is, is a fanatic or a traitor. Let us look at it.—A man must look at some things very closely; and I will ask you to look at this carefully.—I will not declaim upon it. Truth, justice, equity, right and virtue are eternal principles.—Mr. Speaker, they do not change with the climate nor with place; truth in Pennsylvania is truth in New York, at the North Pole or at the Equator. Justice is ditto. These are everlasting principles. Truth is the attribute of God, old as eternity, existing before the foundations of the world were laid, before the morning stars sang together for joy. Now, sir, these principles among men spring from the very relation of things. A thing is obligatory because of certain relations—a thing is right because of certain relations—another thing is wrong because of those relations. For instance there is a father, he holds a certain relation to his child, and because of that peculiar relation

[Concluded on fourth page.]