Evening Telegraph.

BY GEORGE BERGNER. HARRISBURG, PA., THURSDAY EVENING, MARCH 3, 1864. PRICE TWO CENTS.

Daily Telegraph

SPEECH OF

HON. H. C. ALLEMAN,

OF DAUPHIN,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, February 24, 1864, on the Resolution proposing to require proofs of loyalty from persons claiming payment for damages by the rebel raids.

Mr. ALLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the discussion on this resolution has taken an exceedingly wide range, for which the gentlemen upon the other side of the chamber are wholly responsible. Since they have set the precedent, however, I am not inclined to apologize to them for claiming a similar indulgence of an assumed privilege. They have acknowledged the existence of disloyalty within the borders of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But aside from that acknowledment we have proofs of the fact, yes, unmistakable, undeniable and damning proofs of its existence. And yet, in the face of this humiliating fact, there are gentlemen upon this floor who refuse to throw those safeguards around the public treasury which duty imposes upon them, and requires of us. Their action in this matter looks very like sympathy, sir, with those who are aiding, comforting and abetting those in armed rebellion against the constituted authorities of the land. Their conduct justifies the suspicion of sympathy with those whose hands are reeking with the hearts's blood of our fathers, of our sons and of our brothers. I had hoped, sir, upon the introduction of this resolution that its discussion would take a legal turn; I anticipated an astute and learned law argument from the gentleman from Franklin. I had reason to expect this, from his reputation as a lawyer. But there was nothing in that argument which came up to the standard of his reputation in the legal profession, nor anything in it which rose to the dignity of his ability as a statesman. The gentleman from Luzerne (Mr. BAKER) made a legal argument, and, I might add, an ingenious argument; and but for the fact that it was based upon a false hypothesis, the argument would have been unanswerable. He discussed the question as a shrewd lawyer would argue a bad case before a jury. He took advantage of his strong points, and attempted to divert the attention of the House from the proper issue, by assuming the fact of a right, and presuming the existence of a law authorizing remuneration for damages sustained in consequence of the rebel invasions. He failed to make a distinction between a law and a favor, a right and a privilege. There is nothing in our acts of Congress, neither anything upon our statute books, which justifies the unwarranted assumptions of the gentleman. There is no law whatever upon which to predicate this assumed right. It being, then, a matter of favor and not a question of law, it becomes a subject entirely discretionary with the Legislature. She can, if she sees proper to do so, make a gratuity to her sufferers; but in making these donations, she has the unquestioned right to impose such restrictions upon the donees as in her judgment seems best.

The theory of the gentleman fails, and the argument upon which it is founded tumbles as a matter of course.

There are some things, however, in the gentleman's speech which I very much admire.—He proposes to call things by their right names. He wishes a disloyal man to be called a traitor, and desires him to be punished as the infamy of a traitor deserves. He wants disloyalty to be called treason, and to be punished as the law directs. Upon this point I agree with him and extend him the right hand of fellowship.

I also agree with him most cordially in his venerated estimate of the trial by jury, and heartily endorse his beautiful encomium upon its inestimable benefits.

The speeches of the gentlemen from Philadelphia, Northumberland and Clearfield do not come up to the standard of dignity, or the requirements of the occasion. There is nothing in the speeches made by those gentlemen which presents a single tenable argument against the resolution; no, there is not one strong, or even good reason given against its passage. Those speeches are made up of deep partizan prejudices, intense partizan feelings, and tirades of partizan abuse, and have no bearing whatever upon the question at issue.

I am free to confess, Mr. Speaker, that there are features in that resolution which are exceedingly distasteful to me, and I might add very objectionable. It proposes a radical change in our law of evidence, as applied to those proposed commissioners. It proposes to abrogate an old and well established principle of the law—yes, one of the safeguards of the liberties of the people—one of the guaranties against despotism, tyranny and oppression—that venerated principle which recognizes every man innocent, until he is proved guilty, and which throws the *onus probandi* upon the accusing government.

This resolution gives the proposed commission power to assume every claimant disloyal, and upon this presumption of disloyalty, and until he disproves his imputation of guilt by satisfactory proof of his innocence, or his loyalty, he will not be permitted to claim one cent of the proposed donation.—This is a feature which I very much dislike, although it is an unquestioned right of the Legislature to impose the restriction, and may probably in this case take the shape of duty.

But I am not unmindful of one fact.—Sir, where it becomes a question between treason and my country, I am willing to shape the law, and bend the law, if necessary, against treason and in favor of my Government. It is an extraordinary proceeding, sir; but extraordinary cases sometimes require extraordinary remedies. However, since the gentleman from Chester has proposed a substitute which meets this objection, and remedies the defect, and as the gentleman from Washington has agreed to that substitute, I can, and will vote for it with a hearty good will.

Now, the line of demarkation on this question has been drawn strictly according to party affinities by the gentlemen on the other side of the House. The gentleman from Washington disclaimed any intention to make this a party issue, or to charge the Democratic party, as a party, with disloyalty; the gentleman from Lebanon was just as emphatic in his declaration upon this subject; he considered the very idea absurd, and assured the House that if there was any intention of the gentleman from Washington to implicate politics in this matter, he would certainly vote against the resolution; and yet the gentlemen upon the other side assumed that when we charged the fact that there were, and are disloyal persons in the State of Pennsylvania, we made the wholesale charge of disloyalty against the Democratic party. I dispute that assumption. Aside from the emphatic denial of the gentleman from Washington, there is not the slightest evidence of his intention, or of the intention of any other gentleman upon the Republican side of this House, to charge the Democratic party with disloyalty, or as the gentleman from Luzerne will have it, with treason, or complicity with treason.

But the gentlemen on the other side of the chamber made labored arguments to convince this House that disloyalty and Democracy are synonymous. I say they made labored arguments to convince us of the truth of that assumption, violent as it is; but I, for one, deny the doctrine. I am not the champion of the Democratic party; I shall not stand up here in defence of their principles. I have never been a Democrat, in the partizan sense of the word; I have never either affiliated, or sympathized with that party, for I am free to confess that I am a Republican of the strictest sect; yet I am proud to number among some of my very best personal friends, as firm, and as staunch, and as unwavering Democrats as ever arrayed themselves beneath the Democratic banner; and those men are just as true, just as loyal, and just as patriotic as any man who dares boast of the name of American citizen. It is in defence of those men that I speak; and when the leaders of the Democratic party, upon this floor make wholesale charges of disloyalty against their own party, or assume the presumption of such a charge, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I will deny the charge, and hurl it back with the absurdity, and contempt it deserves. It has come to a pretty pass, indeed, Mr. Speaker, when a Republican feels compelled to rise upon this floor and defend the Democratic party from the attacks of its own friends, and political exponents. Such is the glaring fact, and I here speak for the Republican side of the House, and re assert that we never intended to charge the Democratic party, as a party, with disloyalty. Whenever the question of loyalty has been brought up in this body, we have found gentlemen in every direction, upon the other side of the hall, springing to their feet and crying out, "I want to know why you charge the Democratic party with disloyalty." They wanted to know what we meant by that word "loyalty." The gentleman from Luzerne says it is a kingly phrase, a word that should be used only in monarchial and aristocratical forms of government, that no Republican should ever use the word loyalty. I disagree with my friend. I like the word loyalty. It is broad, comprehensive and significant. Yes, I love that word as if it had been coined for us, and to oblige the inquisitive gentlemen upon the other side, I will give them my definition of loyalty. It is fidelity to the Government—not fidelity to any one man, not fidelity to any one set of men, not fidelity to any particular class of men. I am no man worshipper. I will never bow the cringing knee in humble sycophancy to any man. I am the peer of any, but I will always bow the knee supplicantly to my government. A loyal man is true and faithful to his government. My definition of a disloyal man is a citizen who is neither true nor faithful to the government under which he lives. If that definition is so broad as to comprehend within its limits some of my acquaintances, the responsibility is with them and not with me. The gentleman from Franklin has told us that he represents no disloyal constituency. He tells us that there are none such in his district; he tell us that he would entrust the Constitution in the hands of every one of his constituents. Yes, in the face of the fact that the traitor Fitz Hugh lived in his county for twenty years, in the face of the fact that the traitor Logan was a long resident of his county. In addition to these cases already cited, I will call his attention to the fact that Solomon Helsor resided in his district. That man, Solomon Helsor, is, I believe, a constituent of the gentleman from Franklin, and a prisoner in Fort M'Henry, on a charge of aiding soldiers to desert and concealing others who had been drafted. Does the gentleman from Franklin pretend to say that that man, Solomon Helsor, is a loyal citizen? Would the gentleman from Franklin entrust the Constitution is his hands?

Mr. SHARPE. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. ALLEMAN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. SHARPE. Solomon Helsor was a citizen of ——. He never was a—

Mr. ALLEMAN. I obtained my information from the public press, and I am very glad to have the denial of the gentleman from Franklin, that this traitor is not a citizen of his county, or of his district. However, the gentleman from Franklin will probably not deny that John Forney is a citizen of his district. John Forney, sir, the man who murdered Lieutenant E. N. Ford in cold blood, is one of the constituents of the gentleman from Franklin. That man Forney struck down Lieutenant Ford while in the discharge of his official duties in attempting to arrest him and compel him to obey the will of the government. The blood of the murdered Ford appeals to heaven for vengeance, and cries aloud to his fellow-citizens for revenge; and, as sure as there is a God in heaven, vengeance and revenge will yet be meted out to the perpetrator of that infamous murder. This man Forney was tried before a jury, in the county of Fulton; and against the most convincing proofs of his guilt, against the charge of the court, which pointed with unerring certainty to the guilt of the defendant, that jury brought in a verdict of justifiable homicide. What base subserviency to party behests! I will ask the gentleman from Franklin whether he would entrust the Constitution in the hands of that jury? Will he entrust the Constitution in the hands of the murderer Forney? If you will entrust it in such hands, you can, with the same propriety and safety, entrust it in the hands of Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Joseph E. Johnston and their rebel coadjutors.

But the gentleman from Franklin tells us that he pleads only for his Republican constituents. What base ingratitude! turning his back so soon upon his friends! The Democrats in his county, he says, are poor; they claim no damages; it is the wealthy Republicans in his district who are appealing to him, and for whom he pleads. I tell the gentleman from Franklin that his Republican constituents will not endorse that plea. No, they will not thank him for that speech; the very thought of that utterance of their representative will make their cheeks tingle with crimson. Why, sir, I have never yet known a Republican who hesitated to take the oath of allegiance; I never heard of a Republican who refused to have the test of loyalty applied to him; and I will guarantee there is not a Republican constituent of the gentleman from Franklin who will refuse or object to have this test of loyalty applied to him. I do not wish to be considered egotistical; but, sir, I have administered the oath of allegiance to hundreds, I may say thousands of persons, and I never had a Republican appear before me who scrupled to take the oath of allegiance, or hesitated to have any test of loyalty applied to him. I cannot say as much for the Democrats. I have had Democrats leave and refuse to take the oath. I have had them denounce the act as "an act of tyranny, an act of usurpation and an infamous Abolition outrage." I never heard an expression of that kind from a Republican. Does the gentleman from Adams pretend to say that he has no disloyal constituency? Would the gentleman from Adams permit the Constitution to rest in the hands of each and every one of his constituents? I know, sir, of my own knowledge, that there are disloyal citizens in the county of Adams. The great Mogul, the head and front of your Democratic party in Adams, the man who edits your Democratic organ, the man who shapes and controls the Democratic politics of that county, was sent to Fort M'Henry, charged with treason—yes, I will use the word that my friend from Luzerne suggested; I will call it by its right name—he was charged with *treason* and is guilty of the charge. During the afternoon of the first day of July last, the first day of the great battle of Gettysburg, while the superior force of the enemy were driving back the advance of the Army of the Potomac, some of our gallant soldiers who were weary and worn out by the fatigues of the march, and some of them wounded during the engagement, found it impossible to keep up with their comrades in the forced retreat of the advance corps. In order to avoid either sure death or certain capture, they endeavored to conceal themselves from the pursuing, merciless and relentless foe. The hospitable mansion of a true, loyal and patriotic citizen of Gettysburg offered a welcome retreat, and the generous patriotism of Mrs. Buehler contributed to their concealment; but the treachery of this base traitor betrayed these unsuspecting and noble defenders of our liberties into the hands of the enemy. Yes, this leader of the Democratic party, escorted a rebel Lieutenant Colonel to the house of Mr. Buehler and pointed out the place of concealment of over a score of wounded, weary and almost famished Union veterans. The rebel officer, with his willing minions, entered the house, made all these soldiers prisoners, and led captivity captive.

The proofs of that man's guilt were laid before me; and so help me God, had he been brought before me with the proofs of his guilt, he would have been a dangling carcass between heaven and earth, a spectacle of horror for men, and an object of terror to traitors. That man is now in the county of Adams, fulminating his treason. Do you call that loyalty? Would you entrust the Constitution in the hands of such a man? Ah, there were other citizens of the borough of Gettysburg who, while the rebels occupied it, opened wide their doors and extended to the enemy the tender hospitalities of their homes; yes, every comfort which they could contribute was offered freely to those rebels in arms against the Government. These same citizens, after the terrible three days fight upon our own soil, refused to throw open their previously hospitable houses to the Union soldier, or allow him a place to rest his weary limbs and aching head. Yes, contributions of the comforts and luxuries of life which they possessed, were either reluctantly given or entirely denied them. Why, sir, this game of sympathy for the rebels was carried on so strongly that its practice became not only a burning disgrace, but an unbearable and ignominious insult. They would lug their nicely prepared delicacies to the hospitals, contemptuously pass by the Union sufferer, and lavish them graciously upon the infamous rebel. The sufferings of the wounded soldier who fought and bled in defence of their homes and their liberties, received none of their sympathies or none of their attentions. Think of the feelings of that patriotic hero while lying upon the very verge of the grave, suffering the most intense agony of body, and compelled to endure the writhing torture of soul, at witnessing and experiencing vile perfidy, base ingratitude and inhuman treachery from those who owed him an everlasting debt of gratitude? What encouragement was there for him to pour out his life's blood, and sacrifice himself upon the altar of his country in defence of those who were exhibiting love for their enemies, and contempt for their friends? Yes, these base acts of infamy and unscrupulous sympathy with treason were so palpable that complaints became general, compelling me to issue a general order for the protection of the Union wounded against the insults which were daily heaped upon them.

I quote the third Article of General Order No. 2:

III. Any luxuries sent to the hospitals for wounded confederates by their sympathizing friends, must be handed over to the surgeon in charge, and under his direction will be distributed equally among the Union and confederate wounded.

After that order was issued I saw it executed to the letter; but many and bitter were the denunciations which were heaped upon my head by these "sympathizing friends," yet these denunciations did me no harm.

It is but justice, to the good people of Gettysburg, however, to say that these disloyal persons were but few in number, and the charge which I have made must not be construed into a wholesale denunciation against the citizens of that borough. Oh! no, there are just as true, just as patriotic and just as loyal men and women in that town as you will find in the most loyal community of the North; and what is more, an unparalleled degree of generous hospitality, self-sacrificing devotion to suffering humanity, and relentless hatred of treason and its supporters.

The rebel hordes marched on. They penetrated the county of York, and marched through the Democratic strongholds of the Codoruses, Manheims and Dover, towards the county seat and were greeted by their sympathizing friends, (evidently members of some secret organization,) who made some mysterious signs to them; but the rebel chivalry would recognize no signs, but signs of submission to their dictation. They marched on towards the ancient borough of York, and when a distance of six or eight miles from that town, they were met by a deputation of citizens, consisting of the chief burgess, and a portion at least of the co-ordinate borough authorities, who went out under a flag of truce, and tendered the unconditional surrender of York to the enemy.

Mr. SPANGLER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. ALLEMAN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. SPANGLER. The person from York who tendered the unconditional surrender of the town was a member of the Black Republican party, Mr. Arthur Farquhar.

Mr. ALLEMAN. I am very glad to hear that the town council of York is not entirely Democratic in its composition. I think this "Black Republican," as the gentleman from York chooses to dignify him, and undignify himself, must be either a "black sheep" in the flock, as the gentleman from Lebanon expressed it, or else an exceedingly silly politician, to allow his Democratic associates to dupe him, by making him the scape goat of their plotted treason. Let the gentleman from York deny it if he dare, that the chief of that deputation, and a very large majority of it, yes, the men who controlled and forced their action, are members in most excellent standing of the Democratic party.

But I am not arguing the defence of the Republican party—that party needs no defence against the charge of treason. I am arguing against traitors, and their wicked sympathizers, who are endeavoring to filch money from the public treasury; yes, men who have the audacity to demand compensation for the very curse which they brought upon themselves.

The surrender was made to the General commanding the rebel advance, who accepted the treason, but despised the traitors, and his reply was a withering rebuke to their infamy: "We did not expect a surrender, certainly not before reaching the sight of your town, and making a formal demand of you." This I have from the lips of a rebel General, who spoke in the most contemptuous terms of the cowardly treason of the authorities of York. This I have heard confirmed by others, and never yet denied. That scathing rebuke should be written with a pencil of sunbeams, in letters of living light, to the everlasting shame of the perpetrators of that most abominable outrage, and accursed treason.

Yes, with outstretched arms, and willing hands, they bid their Southern friends a hearty welcome to the hospitalities of their cheerful homes. Do you look upon the action of those dignitaries as indicative of fidelity to the Constitution? Do you call that fealty to the Government? Do you call that loyalty?

The rebels accepted their proffered invitations and entered York as a triumphant and victorious army. They received marked attentions from their sympathizing friends, but leech-like, the rebels cried, "give, give." They did "give," and now they are importuning us to "give" them in return. Do they deserve it? They brought calamity upon themselves, and may the consequences of their own infamy rest with them. Cumberland county also claims remuneration for damages occasioned by the last rebel invasion. Are none of her citizens disloyal? Would it be improper to apply the test of loyalty to her claimants? It could certainly do them no harm, and might do the State Treasury an amazing deal of good. I think there is a breath of suspicion against some of the citizens of old Mother Cumberland, who should be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

The rebels occupied Carlisle, and evacuated it; when General Smith, with a handful of raw, but brave militia, took possession of the town. Fitzhugh Lee returned, and threatened the place, and with his usual chivalry, threw his compliments into the town in the shape of bombshells; to which the gallant Smith courteously, but forcibly replied in thunder-tones, against a surrender of the town. Some of the citizens threw up their hands in holy horror at the refusal of General Smith to comply with Fitzhugh Lee's demands, and begged of him for "God's sake" to surrender the town. Why! were they fearful of the capture of our little band? It is more than probable that they feared there would be "somebody hurt" among their southern friends. This may be loyalty, but it is a singular way of showing it. I understand that a citizen of Mechanicsburg, in the *goodness* of his heart, pointed out to the rebel cavalry the most direct road to York; and also the locality of concealed whisky, which served them well for drunken debauch. The test of loyalty to that officious individual could certainly do him no harm.

Does the gentleman from Cumberland believe in the loyalty of his entire constituency? Would he submit the Constitution in the hands of all of them? Does he believe that the ends of justice would be well subserved by refusing to apply the test of loyalty to his constituent claimants? I have too much confidence in his judgment, and conscience, to believe that he would, or could, answer those questions affirmatively.

Will the gentleman from Bedford pretend to say that he represents an entirely loyal constituency?

Mr. MEYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to answer his question?

Mr. ALLEMAN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. MEYERS. I say that I do represent a constituency loyal to the Constitution.

Mr. ALLEMAN. I am glad to hear it, but beg leave to doubt it. I will inform that gentleman that at least two citizens of his county left it, and traveled a distance of thirty-four miles to M'Connellsburg, to join the rebel army. Those two men marched on with the rebel hordes, and participated with them in the battle of Gettysburg. One of those precious scoundrels was captured in that fight, and sent to Fort Delaware a prisoner of war; but through the influence of his father, and friends, he was released, and permitted to return to his home in Bedford. That same man was carried about to your Democratic meetings and held up as a paragon of Democratic perfection. [Laughter.] The other man is yet in the rebel army unless the devil has his dues. [Renewed laughter.]

It is said that charity should begin at home. That may be; but when you come to the question of infamy, I wish to place my county last in the category. I am not going to stand up here and defend the entire constituency which I have the honor to represent, against the charge of disloyalty. And I utter this with a burning sense of shame; the fact is glaring, I must confess it—sorry as I am, I cannot help it.—Why, sir, when the rebels were marching upon the city of Harrisburg and almost within cannon range of it, we had, as we yet have, an "old public functionary" who was so impressed with his own dignity, and so inflated with his own importance, that he expressed an ardent desire to surrender Harrisburg for the purpose of preserving our property from destruction. Yes, he would surrender the town, with all its hallowed memories. He would surrender this State Capitol, with all its archives. He would surrender the Governor, and the Government. He would crown our city with everlasting infamy, and cover her citizens with ineffable disgrace; he would do all this to gratify a selfish ambition of making the tender of an ignoble surrender to his Southren brethren. That expressed desire roused the patriotic fire of this city. It roused the ire and indignation of all parties. They rose up *en masse*, and had that dignitary attempted to execute his expressed desire, there would have been a traitor executed with it.

Why, sir, we have a newspaper published in our town, the organ of the Democratic party, which has, ever since the breaking out of this rebellion, been sowing unsparingly and broadcast its treason. I keep no file of the *Patriot and Union*, and have no access to any. I have no papers from which to quote; I am, consequently, compelled to speak entirely from recollection of the articles at the time of publication. That paper, at the inception of our civil war, vehemently denounced the right of coercion, and chimed in with Buchanan's doctrine denying the right and the power of the General Government to coerce a State, and declared that if the General Administration should attempt to coerce the South, and march her troops through Pennsylvania, those troops would wade through blood before reaching its border. What a beautiful specimen of loyalty! and what a commentary upon the wish which was father to the thought! It placed too low an estimate upon the patriotism of the people of Pennsylvania, and showed its ignorance of the laws of human nature, by supposing that the people would surrender their liberties to the blind dictates of partizan prejudices.

That same paper, sir, while the rebels were marching down the Shenandoah Valley in June last, hooted at the very idea that the rebels intended an invasion of our Commonwealth; they sneered contemptuously at it, but the rebels marched on, and captured Winchester; and yet this paper would not acknowledge the evident intention of the rebels to visit Pennsylvania. They marched on to Hagerstown, and yet the *Patriot and Union* would not acknowledge a fact that was patent to almost every man of intelligence. They marched on to Pennsylvania and into Chambersburg; yet that paper denied the fact of an invasion of the State until we had repeated official proofs of the fact. It was then forced to acknowledge that the rebels were in Pennsylvania; but they coupled with that acknowledgment, sir, this most disgraceful declaration: "It is said the rebels are in Pennsylvania, but they are acting like gentlemen; they are paying for what they get, and are paying in greenbacks." What did this mean? It was an undoubted attempt to educate the minds of the people for a shameful surrender of the seat of government of Pennsylvania, nothing less, but probably something more. That same paper, during the campaign last season, urged upon every citizen to go to the polls and put an end to the infamies of this administration at the ballot-box. That they had a perfect right to do; but the people in their wisdom, sustained the administration. That paper declared their intention, if unsuccessful at the ballot-box, that they (the Democratic party) would then resort to a revolution sustained by lead and steel. The word "revolution," I think, was italicized. What did that mean? Did it mean that they were determined to deluge our homes with blood?—Did it mean that they wanted war in Pennsylvania? Did it mean that treason should be fought upon our own soil? If that is what they mean, they can have it. If they want to fight us here, we are just as willing, and just as ready to meet the foe on the soil of Pennsylvania as the "sacred soil of Virginia;" and be that either a Northern or a Southern foe.

It is but justice, however, to the present editor of the *Patriot and Union*, to say that he very recently assumed control of that paper, and is not responsible for the articles alluded to, and the charges made against it.

In addition to those specially cited cases there is evidence of disloyalty in other portions of the Commonwealth. There were unmistakable evidences of a bloody determination to resist the operations of the draft in certain interior counties of the State, and singular as it may appear, those counties are all intensely Democratic. Yes, sir, the Government was compelled to withdraw troops from the army, and station them in the Democratic strongholds of Berks, Luzerne and Schuylkill, for the purpose of securing the execution of her orders.

In the face of these damning facts, can gentlemen hesitate for a moment to acknowledge the existence of disloyalty in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? The charge is only too true. Now, I put it to gentlemen upon the other side of the chamber who profess loyalty themselves, and are willing to "swear every morning, noon and night to support the Constitution and favor the preservation of the Union," whether the imposition of this proposed test of loyalty is not only in strict accordance with the legitimate power of right, but a question of undoubted and imperative duty?

The gentleman from Northumberland said that the allusion of the rebels in Chambersburg to their Constitutional friends was with a sneer, that they were sneering at their "constitutional friends," and despised every man who stuck to the Constitution and the laws of this country. There can be no doubt that the intelligent and high strung portion of the South do despise those "constitutional friends" of theirs in the North. Any man of a high-toned sense of honor will scorn the rantings of a hypocrite, whose hypocrisy leads only to selfish ambition, or the gratification of selfish purposes. So far as the actions of the Democracic party, or members of that party, in the North, either directly or indirectly aid the aims of the Southern confederacy, they are perfectly willing to accept such aid, and but for this expected, yes, and acknowledged aid, the rebellion would long ago have been crushed. I do not believe that the Democratic party desire the recognition of the Southern confederacy, their object is peace with the South upon almost any terms, and why? Because their old strength lies south of Mason and Dixon's line. As a party, they can control but a single State in the North, and without the votes of their Southern allies, they are unable to accomplish their national purposes. It is for this reason that the Democratic party crouch significantly and sycophantly to their Southern brethren; and some of their leaders go so far upon this subject, that the only definition applicable to their actions, is treason to their government. The Southern leaders of the rebellion do not desire to return to their allegiance, and have no respect for those plotting traitors in the North. I read, sir, from a telegraphic dispatch of June 20th, 1863:—"An interview has just taken place between the rebel General Jenkins and some Republicans of Chambersburg. After discussing for some time matters connected with the war, a prominent office holder stepped up and introduced himself to the rebel General. General Jenkins said he ought to refuse taking him by the hand. The office-holder deired to know the reason for such a remark. General Jenkins asked the question, 'Are you the district attorney of Franklin county?' 'Yes,' was the reply. 'Then you are a regular copperhead!' 'That is what they call me,' was the reply. To which the rebel general retorted, 'Lincoln ought to have hung you and the rest of the copperheads long ago. We would not tolerate any such men in the southern confederacy. We respect those who are against us in the North, but despise the copperheads.'"

I never use the term "copperhead," Mr. Speaker. In speaking of the members of the Democratic party, I call them Democrats; and in speaking of disloyal men, I call them traitors. But I have a solution for this term copperhead. Major General Trimble asked me, sir, in one of the conversations which I had with him, what my politics are. I told him I was a Republican. He said, "I have respect for men who are openly in favor of their Government, but we despise the contemptible copperheads." I asked him what he meant by copperheads. I said, "we have but two parties in the North—the Democratic party and the Republican party—what do you mean by copperheads?" "I mean those who are among you, who are not of you; I mean those of your own men who are secretly operating against your Government; I mean those who are bending like crouching sycophants to us. We despise such men." That comes from the lips of as pure a rebel as ever took up arms against the Government.

Allusions have been made to Andrew Jackson, the hero of New Orleans. The good old patriot is brought in here in support of treason. Ah! could the old sage of the Hermitage have heard that speech he would have punished its author with a deserved rebuke.

It was enough to make his mouldering bones rattle in their coffin. The man who first put his iron heel upon the nullifying State of South Carolina, and swore by the Eternal "the Union must and shall be preserved," could never be guilty of treason, or complicity with treason. Bringing Andrew Jackson here in support of such an abominable doctrine is the very essence of sacrilege.

The gentleman from Philadelphia (Mr. BARGER) referred to the fact that there are gentlemen upon this side of the House "who were at one time firm adherents of Henry Clay." Yes, there are gentlemen upon this floor who love the name, and venerate the memory of Henry Clay. He was the idol of his party, and loved his country dearly, and for that country he made personal and political sacrifices which none but a patriot could make. He nobly threw himself into the fearful chasm, made wide by the contending feuds, and saved his country repeatedly from anarchy and civil war.

"With voice and mien of stern control,
Words of fire burst from his soul
Like lightnings from the tempest clouds,"

in bitter and deserved denunciation of the conduct of those fiends who were plotting the destruction of the liberties of our government. What! quote Henry Clay in support of treason? the sage who "would sooner be right than President!" The patriot who sacrificed his all for his country. You insult the disciples of that gallant old leader; you pervert the history of the times! and you unkindly, unwarrantably and maliciously traduce the nation.

Every opportunity which has presented itself upon this floor has been taken advantage of by the leading Democrats to stigmatize the Administration; and why? Because they hate Abraham Lincoln? Because they despise the Administration of Abraham Lincoln? No, but for the purpose of throwing obstacles in the way of the Government. Their aim is not to hurt Abraham Lincoln; their object is to stab the Government which is protecting them.

Inasmuch as this discussion has taken a partizan direction, and the general topics of our difficulties already alluded to, it may not be out of place to take a bird's-eye view of the origin and cause of our national troubles, and the responsibilities of the present Administration in connection therewith.

The first allusion, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the dissolution of the Union, was made in the third session of the Eleventh Congress, in 1811. That idea was thrown out as a probability of the future, happening upon a certain contingency, and it was received by that Congress with sentiments of utter abhorrence. But in the progress of time this idea became more familiar to the minds of the public.

In 1819, when Missouri came knocking at the door of the Union for admission, the question of the feasibility of a dissolution of the Union was then discussed. The difficulty, however, was satisfactorily adjusted before Congress, and the subject disappeared from the public mind until the year 1831. In 1828 Congress passed a tariff act. In 1831 and '32 South Carolina raised her head against it, and pronounced it unconstitutional, unjust and oppressive in its operation against her; but Andrew Jackson, in his famous proclamation, issued December 10, 1832, put an end to the cry of nullification, and prophetically announced that the slavery question would be the next pretext for a dissolution of the Union. Now, sir, the first permanent organization of the Abolition party was in 1835; and I allude to the fact merely because it has been referred to by the other side. That party was then exceedingly small, but it has grown amazingly by degrees. In 1860, they presented no choice for the Presidency, although there was a distinct organization; there was no affiliation between the masses of the Abolitionists and the Republicans. A portion of the Abolitionists voted the Republican ticket, and a small portion of them—those who were really in favor of a dissolution of the Union—voted the Breckinridge ticket, with the expectation of carrying out the object of the Breckinridge party in bringing about a speedy dismemberment of our country. This I am free to acknowledge, as it is now a matter of history.

Sir, I am no Abolitionist, if by that term you mean a disunionist; I have always been characterized as a conservative, in favor of the States regulating their own peculiar institutions, in their own peculiar way; but I have always been opposed to the further extension of slavery. The time has come, however, when extreme conservatism looks very like sympathy with treason, and I am free to say that if Abolitionism means hostility to slavery, the curse and the cause of this rebellion, I proclaim myself an Abolitionist. This is no time to discuss the propriety of recognizing an institution which is gnawing at the very vitality of our existence as a nation. Slavery now means treason. It is no longer a question of Abolitionism, it is now a simple question between slavery and our country, treason and our Government.

The curse of slavery has been the cause of all our national ills and woes. It has devastated the fairest portions of our land, blighted our hopes, blasted our prospects, made happy homes desolate, cut down the flower and the pride of the country in the beauty of youth and vigor of manhood, hurled tens of thousands of brave and gallant warriors into speedy and to bloody graves, clothed the whole country in sable mourning, and now the nation weeps, her mothers weep, her daughters weep, and all is gloom and sadness, save where heroism has cast a gleam of sunshine and glory over the dark and bloody scene.

The Republican party now looks upon the institution of slavery as doomed and settled. Yes, slavery is dead; it committed suicide, and its ally, treason, will soon die with it. The Democratic party can no longer make capital out of that abominable sin. Her leaders in Congress now look upon the institution as defunct, and the party must soon recognize the question as settled. The rebel authorities at Richmond already acknowledge the corner-stone of their Government, the idol pet of

(CONTINUED ON FOURTH PAGE.)