

THE JEFFERSONIAN

Devoted to Politics, Literature, Agriculture, Science, Morality, and General Intelligence.

VOL. 19. STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA. FEBRUARY 16, 1860. NO. 6

Published by Theodore Schoch.

TERMS.—Two dollars per annum in advance—Two dollars and a quarter, half yearly—and if not paid before the end of the year, Two dollars and a half. No papers discontinued until all arrears are paid, except at the option of the Editor. 17 A advertisements of one square (ten lines) or less, one or three insertions, \$1.00. Each additional insertion, 33 cents. Longer ones in proportion.

JOBS PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large, plain and ornamental Type, we are prepared to execute every description of

FANCY PRINTING.

Cards, Circulars, Bill Heads, Notes, Blank Receipts, Justice, Legal and other Blanks, Pamphlets, &c., printed with neatness and dispatch, on reasonable terms at this office.

J. Q. DUCKWORTH. JOHN HAYN
To Country Dealers.
DUCKWORTH & HAYN,
WHOLESALE DEALERS IN
Groceries, Provisions, Liquors, &c.
No. 80 Dey street, New York.
June 16, 1859.—ly.

SPEECH OF CASSIUS M. CLAY.

Delivered on the Capitol Steps at Frankfort, January 10, 1860.

The Irrepressible Conflict.

Another allegation is made against that Senator, intended to effect the Republican organization. It is now alleged that he has announced in his Rochester speech this much abused and cant phrase of a conflict; that there is a conflict between Slave Labor and Free Labor all through this Government; and that that conflict has been going on and will go on until one or the other utterly triumphs.—That is the assertion. We acknowledge it—we own up. So let us examine it.—Why, gentlemen, I understood that to be the declaration of our fathers in 1776.—I understand that to be the openly avowed sentiment of Washington, Madison, and Jefferson. I understand that to be the declaration of the resolution in Virginia, for which your candidate for Speaker of the Democratic party. Mr. Boocock, voted some years ago. I understood, furthermore, that that was the declaration of the late South Carolina Legislature; and above all, I have it here, taken from *The Louisville Courier*, the leading organ of the Democracy in Kentucky, made more than ten years ago. You would like to read it. Then will you have the goodness to turn to the files of that journal and see if I lie or not. [Cries of "Read it."]

[The speaker was interrupted by a heavy fall of rain which forced him to retire into the rotunda of the State House.]

I will read the extract which I cut with my own scissors from *The Louisville Courier*, and by referring to the files of that paper, you will find it in the words which I to-night quote:

"I presume that it will not be denied that Free Labor and Slave Labor are incompatible. The white man is unwilling to labor by the side of the slave, and the slave is equally averse to laboring by the side of the white man. There exists a mutual repugnancy, and it follows, of course, that the mass of the labor of Kentucky must be wholly the labor of the white man or wholly the labor of the slave."

What think you of that, coming from this high Democratic authority? Mark the extent to which this gentleman carries the idea. Not only that there is a conflict, but he goes further. He says not only does the white man refuse to labor with the slave, but mark him well, he puts the slave above the Democratic white laborer of the commonwealth and tells you the sentiment of the slave. What then is his conclusion? Why that in the conflict the "nigger" is to have precedence, so that Slave Labor becomes entirely predominant in the commonwealth. What sort of Democratic teaching is that? In the name of God let us hear no more from the Democratic party, from Gov. Magoffin, or Vice President Breckinridge, of this thing about the higher law or of this eternal conflict between Free and Slave Labor.

The Ignored Explanations.

But what did Gov. Seward say? With that characteristic injustice which pervades too many of the Democratic journals, all the essential and philosophic qualifications of that expression have been withheld from the free white laborers of the South. What says Gov. Seward?—Gov. Seward is a long-headed man. It is not denied that, whatsoever he may be, he knows what he is about. I heard one of the most distinguished jurists of the Commonwealth of Kentucky say that he had the clearest and most philosophic head of any man in the Union; and what does this clear-headed man say? Does he leave it capable of perversion? Does he say that because Slave Labor and Free Labor are incompatible, that the Republican party are going to enslave the white men of the South, or to interfere with the Slavery now existing in the South? No, sir! I deny that. I will state substantially what he does say. He says—and this is the important item which is left out by the Democratic press—that although this philosophical conclusion is going on whether it is the work of this century or of the next, or of ten centuries, or of ten thousand centuries, he does not undertake to determine, nor can any other man; but he does say that it will take place; not by violence, not by John Brown raids, or conflicts and bloodshed; but peaceably by the amendment of the Constitution and laws of the several Southern States themselves.

Is there a Democrat here unwilling to endorse that method of settling the conflict which Democratic papers assert exists? Suppose the great people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky choose to throw up the barbarian relic, who shall object? What says your Democratic authority? Have you not the right to do it? Is not that the idea? If it is not, here then is a "higher law"—the law of Slavery, higher than that of all Democratic principles, that is, the same Divine right against which we fought in the British King, by which he claimed to rule over us without our consent. Whatever it be, be it even the law of God, that is certainly not Democracy; it is despotism; it is the same old Divine right of Kings, and nothing else, disguise it as you may. So said Gov. Seward. So say I, and so says the Democratic party. The Republican party in the States of the Union say that it is none of their business—that if South Carolina, Kentucky, and Virginia choose to own slaves by voluntary consent, by the ascertained will of the majority of the people, let them hold on to the institution to all eternity, but, if the people of South Carolina, Georgia, or Kentucky, in their own potent power, as the sovereigns of their own country, choose to abolish it in a way that seems to them good, it is none of our business; in God's name, let them do it. That is the doctrine I have always avowed in this Commonwealth, that inasmuch as I was a free-born white citizen of Kentucky, for the freedom of which my fathers stood, my sentiments were for the expulsion of this system from our Commonwealth; but further than that I did not claim to go. If we choose to abolish or maintain Slavery, it is our business. If Virginia, South Carolina, or Missouri choose to abolish it, it is their business, and it is an officious intermeddling that tries to dictate to Kentucky, and say if I be allowed to exercise my Constitutional rights, these people are cowards. Inasmuch as I leave them free to claim their State sovereignty and powers, I claim to exercise my Constitutional rights as a citizen within the limits of my own jurisdiction.

That is the doctrine of the Republican party. So far as the Southern members of that party are concerned, they say that it is our business, and none of theirs; but so far as the National Government is concerned, it was established, as they believe, upon the basis of equal rights, and they say that into the free Territories of this Union Slavery shall not go. That is the ground—the distinctive ground of the Republican party; the only ground at issue between the great parties of the United States. But, as I said before, I do not stand here to vindicate Gov. Seward, especially; only so far as allegation has been made against him, and through him have been intended to set upon and against the Republican party, have I alluded to this matter at all.

Seward and John Brown.

While upon this subject, let us notice the connection attempted to be made between the Republican organization as concerned with that raid of John Brown upon Virginia; especially, perhaps, as it applies to this distinguished Senator from New York. Preliminary to this, allow me to state that upon the subject of Slavery there are three distinct parties in the United States. One that calls itself par excellence the Abolition party. That began under William Lloyd Garrison, and it is still kept up, partly by himself and partly by a greater than he, this great tug-a-boo, Wendell Phillips.—What are the doctrines of that party?—It is fairly and squarely acknowledge by them that the Constitution is a Slavery document, inasmuch as it binds all the millions of the Free States, in case of a servile insurrection in the Southern States, to stand by and defend the rights of the master against those of the slave. They come frankly and squarely to the mark, and say that, inasmuch as from their education and the teachings of their consciences they are unwilling to carry out that part of the compact, that they go for a dissolution of the Union; let the Slave States go to themselves, and let us go to ourselves. If the Southern States choose to hold slaves let them do it; but, inasmuch as we do not choose to hold slaves, we will not, and we will not bear the responsibility of their acts. Let us depart in peace, the one from the other. They are, however, non-resistants. But let me say, while speaking of Phillips, he is the greatest man that I ever listened to.—I speak of his intellect. One idea'd as he has been called, there is a power and versatility and universality in him that is possessed by no orator, living or dead. That is his opinion. He is a non-resistant. He stands responsible for his own opinions to man and God. It is not for me to defend him here.

The Radical Abolitionists.

Next come the Radical Abolition party. They say that the idea of dissolving the Union is too far removed, they cannot wait for this moral influence to exert itself. By the way, I should mention that the Garrison and Phillips party do not vote. They think if they vote under the Constitution, and hold office under it, they would be bound to take the oath of allegiance, and inasmuch as they cannot do that, they do not vote or hold office; but not so with the Radical Abolitionists; they hold that they have a right not only to vote but to abolish Slavery in the States. They, too, have a "higher law" and say

that inasmuch as slaveholders have proclaimed that Slavery is a higher law they make issue, and say that liberty is above all constitutions and laws, and that the slave is allowed entirely the use of his own discretion as to where and how he may liberate himself if liberation is within his reach. To that party belonged John Brown. To that party belonged Cook, and to that party belonged every man decidedly and ascertainedly implicated in that raid. Not one belonged to the Republican organization. No, Sirs. After all attempts in every quarter to make capital out of the affair there has not been proved to be one single Republican standing in alliance with Seward and myself that they have been able to implicate remotely or directly in this raid of John Brown.

I rejoice that those resolutions of investigation have been passed in the Senate of the United States, that they may call for Gov. Seward, that they may call for any other Republican, North and South, and bring them before the proper committee of the Senate of the United States, and there make them fairly and fully disclose all that they know upon the subject. I tell you, now, it will result in our vindication, and in the mortification of those who have attempted to do Seward this signal injustice.

Hang-Dog Testimony.

What is the testimony upon which your papers, and the papers of Madison, have arraigned before the Committee these men. Why, that a certain infamous English renegade, one Forbes—who avowedly fought for pay in Kansas, and whose pay ceased as the contest there ceased; who fought for money in that Territory where your children and my children met to seek homes, when driven out by the strong competition of unpaid wages—publishes and declares that he intimidated in a conversation with Mr. Seward, that such a raid was going on; as he afterwards said he did not understand it to be anything but a raid to collect together and carry out slaves from the Slave States by a kind of stampede. What does he say that Gov. Seward said? "Sir, I will have nothing to do with any such project. You have no business to talk to me, a Senator of the U. S., upon any such subject." But what does Mr. Seward say of all this when he heard of it on his distant travels? Said he, I saw a man by the name of Forbes, but I utterly deny, upon the honor of a man, that I ever had any intimation directly or indirectly touching upon any such raid. I put it to every honest man, to Mr. Magoffin, to Mr. Breckinridge and all their supporters, is there a single one of you, on such testimony as this by an infamous renegade who deserted his comrades in arms, who would put to death the meanest sheep-killing dog? I will speak for you! I know you would not—one of you would. Yet this is to implicate Gov. Seward, and through him to cast a slur upon the great Republican party of these United States. No, gentlemen, we may go down, but I tell you here, now, I tell all these gentlemen we will never go down upon such testimony as that. Therefore I reiterate, we challenge you to the disclosure. We boldly hurl back the imputation as untrue, whatever may be its intent and purpose, and we defy you to the testimony, and appeal to the country. That is what we do.

About Insurrections.

While upon this subject, allow me to say a word upon the subject of insurrections. I believe I have made more speeches in vindication of the Republican party than any man in the United States, North or South. I believe, from my correspondence with individuals, associations, and other combinations of that party, I am as intimately acquainted with the purposes of that party as any man in America, and I will tell you what I believe those purposes now to be, according to my understanding, and their views with regard to this whole subject of the liberation of slaves by force and servile insurrection.

We now and always have regarded the poor African as of an inferior race, and although we do not pretend to divine the inscrutable designs of Deity, although we cannot say what may be the design of the great "I am;" whether they shall ascend in the scale of humanity, and we go down or they go up still higher, we leave these questions entirely to the philosophical speculator, saying that is not a subject of political action at all; but so far as practicability is concerned, we say that black man is now of an inferior race, and although the poet says "that the worm feels a pang as great as when a giant dies," yet we believe that is all poetry and not truth. The life of man and of woman is desirable as it is elevated and removed from the condition of the beast of the field that perisheth. Therefore it is, that when Great Britain held her supremacy over the immense millions of India, attempting by the despotic power of force, to rule it by no amalgamation of interests, taking it under a common protection and into a common glory, those untold millions of Eastern men, but ruling by force; and when upon the abstract proposition, every man was bound to confess that the right was on the side of the Indians, yet my sympathies were on the side of our common ancestors, and I imagine, that outside of a few fanatics, there were no men among these thirty millions of people that did not sympathize with the British white race as against the red and colored races of India, although, as I say,

the right was on the side of the East Indians. Why? Because there was this development of our race, making them little less than god-like and divine, and because more especially those men had proved by their brutality, when a temporary success crowned their efforts, that they were unfit for liberty. The man who dares not to be generous, is not fit to rule or to be free, and we all rejoiced when we understood that the old British lion had risen triumphant over the Juggermautish flags of the people.

But we come down a page lower in history, and see Hungary when it struggled against a superior power, for that independence which Austria attempted to take away from them. When she fought for her God-given and national rights of independence, all this was changed.—Why? Because, by the liberation of their slaves they showed that they perceived a great principle, and in this acknowledgment of a great principle, they based themselves indissolubly upon the sympathy of all the unbiased intellect of our wide world humanity. We all desired Hungary to triumph. We all desired her independence. So, in regard to the black race, I say here to-night that which I have said as many as ten or twelve years ago, that if that issue arose, which God forbid it should come, when the African slave and the superior race should take up arms to vindicate their liberty, which can be in some States done but by the abolishment of the white race, I am on the side of my own race. The solution of this problem is a fraternal one.—These are the sentiments which I have always avowed, and therefore I cast back the infamous calumny that there is in my breast any sentiment like that which would sanction the making of a raid upon the South. Further, I believe this to be the sentiment, so far as I know them, of the members of the great Republican party of the States.

The Pursuit of Happiness.

Well now gentlemen, the great question is pertinently asked, "Why did a large portion of the Republican party sympathize with John Brown upon his death?" I care not who the truth may be, whether it be friend or foe, I stand here avowing, and if I know myself, as God is my helper, I intend to speak candidly and frankly, and above board, and I tell you why. Men of Kentucky, there was this sympathy for John Brown. Your resolutions here to-day, as emanating from the Democratic State Convention, tell us that the Republican party is responsible for the John Brown raid. These are the resolutions, and they will go out in this Commonwealth; this is the meaning of the resolutions as they will go to the people of Kentucky, and as we read to the same purport in the Message of President Magoffin, and in the speech of the Vice-President. They draw an inference, they have now abandoned the charge direct, and now they have drawn the inference that our principles led to that raid, and therefore we are responsible. Well, now, gentlemen, if the responsibility rests upon principle, it goes further back than Seward, Clay, or any other Republican.—Where does it go? To the year 1776, when your fathers and my fathers declared themselves free and independent of the British crown, and when they further declared that "all men are created free and equal, and are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."—There rests the responsibility according to your resolutions, not upon us, but upon that band of patriots. They were those who made the avowals, and we are those that stand by the faith once transmitted to the saints. When you accuse me, and all of us, you accuse them, and until you are ready to accuse them, and are ready to go with John C. Calhoun in the Senate of the United States, and say that the Declaration of Independence is all a lie, I demur to your allegation. I say that you are stopped from alleging that against us. You ought not to strike at the inferior while the superior workers for the blessings of life and liberty remain untouched—these glorious men who preceded us and gave us this Constitution.

The Democratic Party Responsible.

Now I will tell you where the responsibility came from. It came from this same Democratic party. Now I make that allegation, but I am not going to base it upon speculation. I am not putting the charges upon inferences drawn by Cass. Clay, but I make the charge direct; but if I don't produce the evidence and prove that, I say, if you give me the opportunity, let me hereafter stand infamous before men.

In the first place, what says the great American party of Kentucky—that party which, with all its faults, still embodies so many great truths, and which, amid all its short comings from the higher standard that we have marked out for ourselves still has some regard for truth and justice! What does the representative of that party say, your late President, and the candidate of that party for the Presidency? What does he say—the man that you Americans voted for—the man that you have been in the habit of holding up as a true patriot and conservative man? What did he say to the late Union meeting?—What did Millard Fillmore say upon that subject? Why, said he: Gentlemen, I am getting old; I have retired from political life; my work is done, good or bad; I regret that I was under the necessity of signing the bill called the Fugitive Slave

Law, but I felt it to be my duty, and however much I may regret it, yet a firm regard to the Constitution and laws of the country compelled me to sign that bill. And all this trouble says Mr. Fillmore, "the lamentable tragedy at Harper's Ferry, is clearly traceable to this unfortunate controversy about Slavery in Kansas." Where does he say the responsibility lies? It lies upon that Democratic measure that repealed the Missouri Compromise of 1820. There is the cause of it. Still, are we going to take Mr. Fillmore's word for it? High authority as he may be, we do not intend to take it; but we will review for a very few moments the history of the country in connection with that matter, and see if it does not bring the responsibility upon that party, as affirmed by Mr. Fillmore, and seconded by myself and the Republican party.

Well, now, gentlemen, there is a man lately dead, a man whose name I have the honor to bear, and with great humility I say it. I stand here to-night to defend his principles. Henry Clay is admitted to be the founder, and entitled to all the honor of it, of that Compromise of 1820. As I passed down yesterday from my house and my agricultural pursuits, by the City of Lexington, I saw a huge pile of massive stone raised to the memory of Henry Clay. Gentlemen, are you going to re-enact the folly and madness that the Saviour denounced in the ancient Jews? Are you going to ornament and whitewash the outward sepulchre, while inwardly there is nothing but corruption? Do you intend to build eternal monuments to brass the memory of Henry Clay, while you trample under foot the men who have the courage to stand up and defend his principles? Will you garnish the tomb, while the immortal shall be ignored in his representatives? If you intend to deny these principles, go and level that monument to the ground, return that marble to the quarry, and then rush upon us and hide them in our blood, but not till then. He is the author of that Compromise, and what is it? That north of 36 deg. 30 min., African Slavery shall never extend, leaving it entirely as a matter of inference whether south of that line or not shall extend. That is the Missouri Compromise. Now, while I admit that that there is no power in Congress to make strictly what may be called a compromise, because it has an unlimited and sovereign power bounded only by the Constitution itself, so that no one Congress shall say what a succeeding Congress shall or shall not do, yet the language has been used; it was a compact, and it was elevated and placed alongside the Constitution itself. An honest registrar of the event states that after it passed, so great was the sanctity of that measure that it became as a part of the Constitution itself, the palladium of our liberty, and he was afraid if ever it should go down the Constitution would go down with it. It existed to the year 1854.

Allegations Answered.

Gentlemen, I utterly deny the allegations that I hear made in this Hall of Representatives, that the Compromise of 1820 was repealed or intended to be repealed by the Compromises of 1850, and upon this point I appeal to the country. No wonder that it is dark to-night—no wonder that they have put out the lights. Read the speeches of that day. Why, Mr. Clay was alive in 1850. Mr. Clay was in the Congress of the United States—he took part in the debates of 1850, and I am at a loss to find where the statement was made. In 1854 was the very first time we were told that it was all claimed that there was an intention, immediate or remote, direct or reflective, to affect the Compromise of 1820 by that of 1850. How will I prove that? I prove it to you by the admission of Stephen A. Douglas himself. Yes, Sirs, that man who is held up here in Kentucky, that by a certain kind of hocus pocus is to be foisted upon you and the Charleston Convention, tell us in his first Senate report, before the Kansas Nebraska Bill was offered, that no ruthless hand shall dare to rise against that Compromise. Go to *The Congressional Globe*. I know it is now on record. I defy the Democratic party or anybody to deny that when they referred to the Compromise of 1820, it was to be preserved for years after. It is said it was to be repealed. Are you not ashamed of yourselves? If you are not you should be now to venture such an assertion as that.

It is history, gentlemen. You may tear me down from this stand; you may consecrate the principles which I here to-night defend, with my blood, if you please, but there will stand the truth, and that truth says that your assertion is untrue, and that every Democrat knows it to be untrue, that the Compromise of 1820 was repealed by the Compromise of 1850. It is not true! And that it is not true has been avowed by the leading man that brought in and carried that bill, and who based his claim for the Presidency upon his devotion to the South, Thank God for pen, ink, and paper, sometimes used in this Commonwealth and others, although it is very anti-democratic to use them it seems.

The Game of Grab.

Let us get along a little further. Why did they want to repeal the Compromise of 1820. What is the matter, you Democrats of the United States? You have had the power, you say, all the time or almost all the time, from the foundation

of the Government to the present day.—You have had possession of the Government since its foundation, and where is the necessity now of repealing this Compromise? Why, although you had the influence of the Government, both in its foreign and domestic policy, under pretense of subserving the rights of the people, you have used them to maintain the rights of Slavery, and after a race of nearly three-quarters of a century, you are entirely behind. The North has grown in population and material and intellectual development far beyond your growth—"the sceptre is about to depart from Judah;" and what now? Why, we must repeal the Missouri Compromise, and take the start upon the progressive area of freedom, and check this power of conflict that *The Louisville Courier* and Gov. Seward speak of, and thus we may maintain our supremacy. That was it! Why, although you have divided the territory between the North and the South, that Territory, you say, was purchased by the common blood and treasure, and therefore you have a right to go into it, and carry your slaves; when you do not allow the man who goes there from Ohio to carry them there. You have passed your law prohibiting the African slave trade; you monopolize the carrying of slaves among yourselves.

Although you divide that territory ceded to this Government, and make out of it Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri—three Slave States—and when the North comes to take possession of her portion of the bargain, consisting of all the territory north of 36 deg. 30 min, you say, "No, gentlemen; that game is out, we must have a new deal." [Laughter.] Well, now my honest friend, what do you mean by a new deal? Are you going to put up stakes and begin anew? Are you going to put up Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, and see in the struggle whether Freedom or Slavery is the stronger?—"Ob, no! nothing of that kind; we hold all we have got, and we intend to play the game of snatch, and get all we can." [Laughter.]

Douglas's Dream.

Come on again, then! Mr. Douglas, for the purpose of gaining political power to the loss of his constituents, and for the purpose of maintaining the interests of Slavery and slaveholders, against the great voting population of the country both North and South, and to make Slavery predominant, tells us that the Missouri Compromise of 1820 is unconstitutional. This man, who a few years before had come into the Senate of the United States, admitting that this Compromise was sacred and must not be touched, some two or three days after had a dream, and the result is that he finds out he had been mistaken; that the action taken in 1788 was a mistake, that the action was the non-extension of Slavery, was re-enacted under the Constitution in 1789, and carried out under every President from Washington to Monroe, in having declared that they had a right to restrain the spread of Slavery, was a mistake. He suddenly found out that our fathers did not know anything about the matter; their action was unconstitutional; it was unconstitutional to pass this great measure; and therefore the Democratic party repealed it, and Douglas helped them do it.

Well, what did the Northern men do? What did the Republican party do? Why, they said, Gentlemen, it is a lamentable thing that the declaration of the Constitution itself gives the power expressly to Congress to regulate the Territories—that is the word, "to regulate" the Territories—making no limitation, but giving absolute power, and yet you deny the constitutionality of action under it. As I said before, the very first action under the Constitution in 1789 was an exercise of that power to "make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories," and following down as long as the Presidents that were alive at the signing of the Constitution, lived, and coming to our own times as late as when Oregon was formed into a Territory, to a few days ago, this action has been deemed constitutional when all the measures were found out to be based upon a fallacy, and it was discovered that we had no power to carry them out. What did we do? Because we loved the Union—because we, North and South, had fought the common battles of the country, and joined in the love of a common liberty, standing shoulder to shoulder, we will try the thing once more; we believe Free Labor is competent to sustain itself; we will go into the Territory, apply the test, and see whether or not it shall be Free or Slave.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

A writer has compared worldly friendship to our shadow; and a better comparison was never made; for while we walk in sunshine it sticks close to us, but the moment we enter the shade it deserts us.

To enjoy to-day, stop worrying about to-morrow. Next week will be just as capable of taking care of itself as this one. And why shouldn't it? It will have seven days' more experience.

The water that flows from a spring does not congeal in winter. And those sentiments of friendship which flow from the heart cannot be frozen in adversity.