Evening Telegraph.

BY GEORGE BERGNER. HARRISBURG, PA., WEDNESDAY EVENING, MARCH 9, 1864. PRICE TWO CENTS.

Daily Telegraph

PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE.

REPORTED EXPRESSLY FOR THE TELEGRAPH.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 8, 1864.

The Senate re-assembled at 3 o'clock, P. M., Mr. PENNEY, Speaker, in the chair.

There not being a quorum of Senators present,

Mr. NICHOLS moved that the Senate take a recess until four-and-a-half P. M., which was agreed to.

FOUR-AND-A-HALF P. M.

The Senate re-assembled at four-and-a-half P. M.

The SPEAKER ordered a call of the Senate, which resulted as follows:

PRESENT—Messrs. Champneys, Dunlap, Fleming, Graham, Hoge, Householder, Johnson, Lowry, M'Candless, Nichols, Ridgway, St. Clair, Turrell, Wilson, Worthington and Penney, *Speaker*—16.

ABSENT—Messrs. Beardslee, Bucher, Clymer, Connell, Donovan, Glatz, Hopkins, Kinsey, Lamberton, Latta, M'Sherry, Montgomery, Reilly, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—17.

Mr. NICHOLS moved to adjourn.

Mr. LOWRY desired to amend the motion so as to provide for a session this evening.

The SPEAKER. Less than a quorum being present, the Chair is of opinion that the rules for the time of meeting cannot be altered. No motion is in order but that of adjournment.

Mr. LOWRY gave notice of his intention to introduce to-morrow a resolution for the appointment of a committee, who should prepare a statement of the facts in connection with the present position of affairs. He also declared his intention to bring in a measure for an adjournment *sine die*, in view of existing circumstances.

Mr. NICHOLS suggested that, in case of the absence of the Senator from Philadelphia (Mr. CONNELL) on to-morrow, there would be no opportunity to introduce a bill of any character.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has only to say on that subject that the responsibility rests with the members who see proper to absent themselves from the Senate. The Constitution says that less than a quorum cannot do business.

The motion of Mr. NICHOLS was then agreed to, and the Senate Adjourned.

By Telegraph.

FROM WASHINGTON.

Death of Colonel Dahlgren.

The Whisky Bill Signed by the President.

PASSAGE OF THE GOLD BILL BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, March 8.

The *Republican* of this evening has the following:

In our first edition of yesterday we doubted the statement that Col. Dahlgren had reached our lines in safety. We did so because we knew at the time that the Richmond *Sentinel*, of Saturday morning last, a copy of which reached Gen. Meade's camp on Sunday evening, announced that Col. Dahlgren was killed in a skirmish at King and Queen Court House, on the Mattaponas river, on Friday last.

The fact was telegraphed to the President late on Sunday night, 8 or 9 hours after Gen. Butler's dispatch of Sunday was received, announcing the safety of Col. Dalgren, which was communicated by the President to the Colonel's father, Admiral Dalgren.

The news of the death of the Colonel was not made known to his father until this morning. There was a lingering hope that there might be some mistake about the report in the *Sentinel*, consequently we suppressed the publication of the fact yesterday. In the meantime Gen. Butler was requested by the President to make such investigation relative to the Sunday report that Col. Dahlgren was safe, as would positively settle the question one way or the other. Gen. Kilpatrick was also telegraphed to fix a time when Col. Dahlgren was last heard from.

Late last night General Butler telegraphed that he had received information concerning the announcement in the *Sentinel* that Dahlgren was killed at King and Queen Court House, and General Kilpatrick telegraphed that the last positive information he had received of him was that he was seen there on Thursday. The skirmish took place on the day after, in which the Colonel was killed.

The President becoming fully satisfied that there was no longer any good reason to doubt the report of Col. Dahlgren's death, deemed it his duty this morning to communicate the fact to Admiral Dahlgren, which he at once did. The latter has left for Fortress Monroe to take such other steps in the matter as may be deemed proper under the circumstances.

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The President having signed the Whisky bill, it is therefore a law.

The Gold bill has been passed by the House.

EXCITEMENT IN WESTERN MARYLAND

THREATENED REBEL RAID.

BALTIMORE, March 8.

We learn that there has been, for the past two days, considerable excitement in Frederick and Washington counties, growing out of rebel movements on the Virginia side of the Potomac, which are supposed to be premonitory of a cavalry raid through the upper counties of Maryland. The farmers are said to be sending their cattle to places of safety and a general removal of valuables has taken place. The military authorities in the meantime are on the alert, and every preparation is being made for any emergency that may arise. We doubt, however, whether it is more than a mere rumor, such as are constantly afloat along the border.

LATER.

BALTIMORE, March 8.—Reports are in circulation in this city, and have probably been telegraphed from here, of an invasion of Maryland by rebel raiders. It may confidently be stated that the only foundation for these rumors is the fact of a small rebel force having been seen in London county.

From New York.

NEW YORK, March 8.

The price of gold advanced to 164¼ on the report of the defeat of the Stebbins' gold bill.

Supervisor Booth, of Brooklyn, who just returned from Washington, has officially informed the board of supervisors that a call for 200,000 more men will soon be made, and that the draft would be enforced. He was so informed by Secretary Stanton, who advised him to keep on recruiting, as all the overplus would be credited to the county in the forthcoming draft.

More Captures by the Pirate Alabama.

NEW YORK, March 8.

The *Commercial Advertiser* says, advices have been received in this city from Bombay to the 28th of January, which state that it is feared that two or three American ships, the Southern Rights and Naples, have fallen victims to the pirate Alabama. These ships both left Bombay for Maulmain about the middle of January.

Riot at Baltimore.

BALTIMORE, March 8.

Considerable excitement occurred in the western limits of the city last night, occasioned by portions of a Connecticut and the First Maryland cavalry regiments. Both pistols and rifles were freely used, and several of the Connecticut cavalry regiment were badly wounded. The fight commenced about midnight. At one time regular vollies were fired, and the hooting and shouting of the contestants kept the residents of the vicinity in constant alarm.

XXXVIIIth Congress—First Session.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, March 8.

Mr. Wilson (Mass.) introduced a bill for the better organization of the quartermaster department. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Powell (Ky.) called up the joint resolution requesting the Secretary of War to transmit the report and evidence of the military commission of Gen. M'Dowell, who was President.

Mr. Wilson opposed the call for these papers, as they were necessary to be withheld, that they might be used in the prosecution of officers who were culpable.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Kasson presented the resolutions of the Iowa Legislature in favor of soldiers who have been discharged in consequence of wounds or disabilities, being employed in situations which they are competent to fill under the Federal Government, and heartily endorsing the policy of paying soldiers and sailors of African descent the same amount as is given to white soldiers for similar service.

The resolutions were referred to the Military Committee.

The House went into committee of the whole on the Senate amendments to the Deficiency bill, and agreed to the amendment discussed yesterday, for medicines and medical attendance for negro refugees, commonly called contrabands, for $33,000, and rejected the pending amendment thereto, restricting the expenditure to those who are or shall be actually in the service.

The House resumed the consideration of the gold bill. The Boutwell bill was amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to anticipate the payment of the interest on public debt from time to time, either with or without rebate of interest, as he may deem expedient. The gold bill, as above explained, was passed by 90 to 34.

Mr. Schneck reported, from the Military Committee bill, to drop unemployed Major and Brigadier Generals. Mr. Schneck advocated and Mr. Cox opposed the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. Cox remarked that there was something of a personal and partisan character in this bill. He hoped his colleague was so gallant as not to strike at a brother officer. The House should have an opportunity of seeing whether there was any back-hand stroke at any general officer who is unemployed.

Mr. Schenck desired his colleague to use plain language and not deal in insinuations. There was nothing concealed in this bill. He could not lie under such suspicion. For one could no wrong was intended and would he knew of such insinuations.

Mr. Cox. You need not reply to any insinuation until one is made. I don't know whether the bill strikes at Fremont or M'Clellan, or any other officer.

Mr. Schenck replied neither nor both.

Mr. Cox said he wanted to see who was to be hurt by the bill. Was there to be any saving to the Government, or are others to be appointed to the places of those who are struck down? He did not deal in insinuations. He knew M'Clellan did not ask favors of gentlemen on the other side of the House. M'Clellan had lost in the public service every dollar he had earned as a civilian. It might be the purpose to strike at his pay.

The bill was made the order for Tuesday next. Adjourned.

Markets by Telegraph.

PHILADELPHIA, March 8.

The dullness noted in flour for some time past still continues, and prices are drooping under the unfavorable advices from abroad; small sales of superfine at $6@6 25; extra at $6 50@7 and extra family at $7 25@7 75. Rye flour dull at $6. In corn meal there is nothing doing. There is less wheat offering and is held firmly; sales of 3,000 bus. red at $1 60@1 63 and white firm at $1 75@1 95. Rye steady at $1 33. Corn is in good request, but supplies come forward slowly; sales of 5,000 bus. yellow at $1 21 afloat. Oats lower; 4,000 bus. Pennsylvania sold at 80c. Petroleum firmer; sales of crude at 28½@29½; refined in bbls. at 47@49 and free at 54@56c. Provisions firm at $23 50; mess pork 13½@14c. for hams in pickle and 14c. for lard. 300 bbls. Pennsylvania and Ohio whisky sold at 93@95c. Stocks firm; Pennsylvania fives 97; Reading railroad 70½; Morris Canal 73; Pennsylvania railroad 73¼; gold $1 64; exchange on New York par.

BALTIMORE, March 8.—Flour very dull and heavy; Howard Street super $675; grain scarce, but the market is quiet; corn firm and active at $1 18. Whisky dull and quiet at 95@96. Coffee firm at 37 for Rio.

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. WATSON,

OF PHILADELPHIA,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, March 3, 1864, on the bill to provide compensation for losses sustained from the rebel raids, etc.

Mr. Speaker, the course which this discussion has taken has been somewhat eccentric; and in rising to speak on the question, I am under the necessity of going back a little to answer remarks made during the first part of the discussion, when the debate was entirely with reference to the resolution of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KELLEY.) This bill of the gentleman from Franklin (Mr. SHARPE) struck me very favorably at first, and my impression was that I should support it. I believe that the arguments which the gentleman adduced in his appeal to the House ought to carry weight with them. I do not believe in repudiating any claim which any loyal man, from Franklin county or any other county of the southern border, has against the State Government for damages done to his property during the invasion of the State by the rebels. But, sir, the bill which is before us seems to be imperfect in some respects, and to establish a mode of doing this thing not altogether trustworthy. For this reason, sir, whilst I hold myself ready to vote for a proper bill to reimburse these citizens for the damages which they have sustained, I shall feel myself free to vote to refer this bill to the Committee on Federal Relations, or any other committee, to perfect it.

When my colleague of the Second district of Philadelphia (Mr. BARGER) was on the floor, during the discussion upon the resolution of the gentleman from Washington, he took occasion to make a personal reference to myself, which seems to call for some reply. That I may do him no injustice, I will read the portion of his remarks to which I refer.

"The gentleman who received the nomination for the Legislature—his opponent—was Captain James C. Whalley, who enlisted in the army of the United States as a private, and fought his way through seventeen battles to a captaincy. He was upon the bloody fields of the Peninsula and in the Army of the Potomac; and he came home with the honors of his regiment. He was nominated by his party for a seat upon the floor of this House; and, sir, he was denounced by the gentleman from Philadelphia, and by those who stumped the district with him at the last election, as a 'copperhead,' a 'traitor,' and a 'disloyal man.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I entered upon the canvass in my district, I was aware that my opponent had been a soldier, and had served his country well and faithfully. I sent for Captain James C. Whalley to come and see me, and we had a cordial and frank understanding that there should be no personal references whatever made on either side throughout the canvass. So far from having denounced him or any other soldier as a "copperhead," I abstained from such remarks very carefully through the entire canvass; and the day after the election, when we left the board of return judges in the Fifth ward, he shook hands with me, thanking me for having kept my pledge and not having said a single word derogatory of his character. I never did say that the gentleman was a "copperhead," and I have, upon principle, from the beginning of the war, abstained from saying anything whatever against any man who had tried to serve his country in the field. Being a civilian, sir, I thought I had no right to do so. If I had been a soldier, I should have felt perfectly free to canvass his principles. I would have said then just whatever I believed. I do not believe that Captain Whalley is a copperhead, and therefore I never could have said it. But, sir, I represent a district which has been, heretofore, Democratic. Why did not that district, which had previously elected, for three successive terms, a Democrat, elect James C. Whalley, the hero of seventeen battles? Is it any reflection, sir, upon the men of my party? Is it any reflection upon the patriotism of my party? It was a Democratic district and I carried it. The reasoning of the gentleman goes against himself, because, this being a Democratic district and this candidate being a man who had served his country in seventeen battles of this war, and who had been promoted to a captaincy for his services, they ought to be ashamed of themselves for defeating him—for he was defeated by the men of his own party.

But, sir, this matter of nominating military candidates covers a broader ground than merely this single instance. Whenever a party opposes the Republic in a war, it finds out very soon, sir, that the heart of this people is right and loyal and true, that this people adheres to the National Constitution and the Union. Such a party always finds out that it has made a great mistake; and to cover up its tracks it takes to nominating military candidates. Now, sir, the Democratic party nominated a candidate for Congress in the Chester district. He was a hero too—a man who had commanded the Pennsylvania Reserves in battle; and why did not his own party stand by him in that district? Why, sir, he met with a worse defeat than any man who ever ran there before. His own party voted against him. And so it is, sir, all over the country. This party is picking up soldier candidates to take off the odium it has incurred in consequence of its disloyal course in this war. For this reason, it puts up General M'Clellan as its choice for the Presidency; and if it cannot see its way to elect General M'Clellan, perhaps it can find some other soldier. I may be mistaken, but the leaders of that party do not seem to me to have any confidence in the people. These politicians of the Democratic party do not seem to have any other idea of this war than that our country is going to be plunged into a "military despotism." That is what they tell you everywhere. Now, how are we going to be plunged into a "military despotism," unless it is by supporting military candidates, and defeating every civilian who runs against a military candidate? That is the very way to make a "military despotism." These politicians who undertake to say to every civilian like myself who runs as a candidate for office, "you have no right to call this man disloyal, because you are a civilian and he has been a soldier," fail to appreciate the proper position of the country in this war, for this reason: you will find gentlemen always ready to bring up *ad captandum* resolutions to do impossible things for the soldiers; and whenever a gentleman on our side of the House has the firmness to say that these propositions are impracticable, they say, "you are going against the soldiers." They think that they will put that before our constituents, and the soldiers will vote against us. But, sir, I am perfectly willing to run the risk. Some of the soldiers who came home to vote, by permission of the War Department, voted the Democratic ticket; a great many more voted the Republican ticket. They have a right to vote just as they choose. I will never court the votes of the soldiers or any other class of citizens. My course, sir, shall be straightforward; and when I think an impracticable proposition is introduced simply for the purpose of making capital among the soldiers, I will take occasion to say so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me pass on to this question of loyalty and disloyalty, for that is the thing which lies at the bottom of this discussion. It was that word loyalty which caused this discussion in the first place. When the gentleman from Washington offered his resolution, it was assumed immediately that we were going to arraign men for treason. Now, sir, is disloyalty synonomous with treason? I ask that question of every reflecting man. I cannot see that the two terms are synonymous. Treason is a crime punishable by statute; but disloyalty does not imply treason, because treason requires that a man should commit the overt act of "adhering to the enemy, giving him aid and comfort." That is defined by the Constitution of the United States to be the only treason against the Government. Well, sir, can we not conceive it possible that there should be a feeling of dissatisfaction prevailing among a large class of people in the country—a feeling of rancorous dissatisfaction with the war and with the Government—a feeling of sympathy with the rebels—can we not conceive of that, and yet see that these men have not committed the overt act? That is a plain proposition, sir. I never charged any such thing as treason upon the Democratic party, nor upon any fragment of it of a respectable character. But I do say, sir, that, from the commencement of this war, the course pursued by Democratic politicians has been disloyal; and I think that it requires us but to look at the subject patiently, and to investigate the facts, to arrive at the conclusion that this party has in many ways been disloyal.

When the war broke out, sir, many efforts were made by leading men of the Republican party to sink all political differences, in order that while the war was going on, we might have one united people in the Northern States, standing by the Government in the war. Almost all of us can call to mind the efforts made in this direction—how we even dropped our name and asked people to go in with us to form a Union party. Sir, it was of no use. There was among the Democratic party as a mass no wish that the North should be united. When we ran Union tickets, there was always a Democratic ticket against us; and there has been from the very beginning of the war. What occasion was there for that? Could not these men recognise for once that the Republic was in danger—that it called upon every man who loved his country to drop, for the time being, his party affiliations, and rally round the flag of the Republic? I think that might have been expected of them. But there was no possibility of getting the Democratic party, as a party, to unite with us and to sink political differences.

Well, sir, as time went on, the few men who stood up in Congress and called this an Abolition war when it had not yet become so, began to disseminate their doctrine wider and wider, and the Democratic party began to gather courage more and more, and to make headway against the government. From town to town, and from newspaper to newspaper, and from political meeting to political meeting, the thing went on and gathered strength, until now men of the highest respectability in the Democratic party will get up everywhere and preach that this is an Abolition war—that it is not a war for the preservation of the Republic, but simply an Abolition war to get rid of slavery. Well, sir, I should be very glad if it were. Fault is continually found with the National Administration on account of its policy on the subject of slavery. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we went into this war, the mass of the Republican party in Congress were very much opposed to making the issue for or against slavery; and when, in Congress, a resolution was offered declaring simply that the war was made for the preservation of the Union alone, the Republicans voted for it. But, sir, the war went on. A wise Providence overruled everything for the best. The war went on, and struggled from State to State, and from battle field to battle field; and wherever it went, slavery died out. Slowly and by degrees the heart of the nation rose up and said: "This institution, which is causing this monstrous war—this institution, which has stained our land with blood, which is slaying our brothers, our fathers and our sons—this institution, for which this war has been waged by the South, must perish. And because the people of the North have come to this conclusion, and because President Lincoln has issued his Proclamation of Emancipation, we are met with the cry that it is an "Abolition war."

Why, sir, I confess that when that proclamation of emancipation was issued, I had very little hope that it would be of much advantage; but I was mistaken. It was like the dove sent out from Noah's Ark. That proclamation led the way; and freedom now is sure. The proclamation has the approval of every rational man in the North. That proclamation of liberty carries with it the whole programme of the future.

Now, sir, let them cry "Abolition!" That is the cuckoo note they have always sounded. When there was nothing better to drum upon, they have always set to work and drummed upon the dry old hide of Abolition. The United States bank, sir, used to be their fancy cry. Whenever they felt at a loss for a subject to talk about, the United States bank was always selected. The United States bank having disappeared, Abolition takes its place in the programme of the Democratic party as their Gorgon horror with which to affright the people. But, sir, what is this thing Abolition? What is it that is so dreadful to the gentleman from Luzerne (Mr. HAKES) and the gentleman from Philadelphia, my colleague, (Mr. BARGER,) and to other gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House. Abolition! is it something which menaces the rights and the interests of the people of the North? Is it something which would subvert this Government and take away men's rights? Why, sir, it is the abolition of the vilest, the the most abominable institution that the sun ever shone upon—the abolition of an institution which carries with it crimes of every grade and hue.

I have here a pamphlet, sent to me by a friend in the War Department at Washington, which was found in one of the pigeon-holes there, and is a reminiscence of the past. It is called "Letters to the people of the Northern States," and has written upon the cover, "Hon. John B. Floyd, with warmest regards of Albert Pike." Now, here is a pamphlet written by a man who maintains that slavery is a blessing; and yet, sir, this man, who is a slaveholder himself, as he says, who lives in the South, and has fought against the Government—fought for slavery itself—this man speaks as follows in regard to slavery:

"I do not deny, I say again, the evils of slavery. *Necessarily* it gives power that may be abused. Nor will I underrate its abuses. *It involves frequent separations of families. It here and there prevents the development of a mind and intellect that might, perhaps, rival that of the white man, if it were free to expand. Marriage does not create an indissoluble bond. It gives occasion to prostitution.* The slave toils all his life for mere clothing, shelter and food; and the lash is heard sometimes on the plantation; and, in rare cases, cruelties punishable by the law are practised."

That is the institution which this Gorgon horror Abolition is to abolish—an institution in regard to which the man who undertakes to defend it, and to maintain that it is a blessing, admits that it involves crimes which I will not name.

Now, sir, I am free to say that I can look back to the time when I shrank from the idea of being an Abolitionist. It seemed to be something which affrighted every man of conservative views, who wished the Union to stand. And perhaps my feelings might still be the same if this rebellion had not happened. But, looking, as I do, upon three years of war, unprecedented in modern annals for bloody strife—looking, as I do, at the immense debt which this war has heaped upon the country—I cannot make up my mind that this institution, so horrible in its character, so disgraceful to the country, and disgraceful to the nation, shall survive this war. I say, sir, that if we do not crush slavery we shall be forever disgraced.

The National Government did not make war for abolition; the National Government defended itself when threatened by the enemy. War was made against us in the interest of slavery, and the National Government has gone along with the country. If has raised armies to defend its capital, and as the war has gone on slavery has been seen to be the cause of it, and the people have made up their minds, and the Government has made up its mind that this institution must perish with the war.

Now, sir, if I had time to read extracts—as I very seldom do in any speech—I would like to read something from the addresses of the Democratic State Committee of Pennsylvania. When anybody complains of us for referring to that disloyalty which festers in the Democratic party, we need only point to the Democratic State Committee's address of 1862, put forth by Mr. Hughes. If that is not a defence of the rebellion, I do not know what can be a defence of the rebellion. It went as far as any man has a right to go, without being arrested for giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Why, sir, that address (as most of the members of this House have read it, I need not cite extracts from it)—that very address contended that the Abolition agitation was the sole cause of the war; that it had brought the war upon us, and that the only way to end the rebellion and restore the Union was to make war upon Abolition! Was a more monstrous idea ever heard of? Was there ever any sane man who would take such a position as this—that with an immense army of rebels threatening our capital, and with our best officers deserting us and going over to the enemy—with our brothers slain, and with all Europe almost ready to recognise this southern confederacy as an independent nation—we must stop making war upon the rebels, and make war upon Abolition? Now, sir, if that is not disloyalty I do not know what can be disloyalty. It was not treason; there was no overt act; but if it was not disloyalty, I cannot undertake to say what disloyalty is. And again, the address put forth by Colonel Biddle, Chairman of the Democratic State Committee during the last campaign, went over pretty much the same ground.

There have been times in the course of this war when I thought that perhaps these men ought to be arrested; I thought that there ought to be a limit to what is called the freedom of the press and of speech—that when the country was involved in war, it did become every man to talk loyally, and that no man had a right to preach treason through the newspapers or in public speeches. But, sir, I thought over the matter again, and I made up my mind that it was better to let this thing go on; it was better to follow out the policy of Thomas Jefferson, when he said that "error of opinion may safely be tolerated where truth is left free to combat it." Well, sir, the arrests were stopped; newspapers were left free to publish everything they chose to print; and so they go on now. But the sense of the people has righted the Government. Last fall a year the elections went against us; but no sooner were the arrests stopped, no sooner were these men left free to preach treason, than the elections went against them. The moral sentiment of the people rose up in indignation against them and rebuked them.

To show, sir, that I do no injustice to the Democratic press, I want to read a short article, published in the Philadelphia *Age* of last Saturday. It publishes the address of the retiring members of the rebel congress on the outside, and then says of it editorially what I am about to read.

"The Confederate Address.—(you will observe these people always style our enemies "the confederates;" they never speak of them as the rebels:)

"THE CONFEDERATE ADDRESS.—The farewell address of the members of the Southern Congress to their constituents, is an interesting contribution to the history of the times. The *Round Table* has ventured the opinion that the only good songs that have been written since the war began, were two which appeared in the Richmond journals, and that those which have been produced by our poet-asters have all sounded very much as if inspired by the hope of winning a five hundred dollar premium, or still worse, as if beclouded by the fumes of a League feast."

Before going on, sir, I want to make a remark in respect to that. I took up a newspaper the other day which contained a displayed advertisement of a book called "Lyrics of the War;" and having read that article in the *Round Table*, I thought I would see who were the authors of these "Lyrics of the War." You will observe that this writer calls them "poet-asters." The authors embraced such men as Henry W. Longfellow, George H. Boker, John G. Whittier, and every leading poet that our country can boast. Now, these are "poet-asters," because they write loyally. They cannot suit the delicate tastes of these gentlemen. Perhaps the elegant extract read by my friend from Chester the other evening, was better suited to their taste. That is the kind of poetry that suits them; but the productions of the author of "Hiawatha" and "Evangeline" do not suit these gentlemen on the other side of the House,—because they are loyal—because they sustain the Government and the war; that is the real offence.

But, sir, I will continue the reading of this article:

"A like criticism may be made upon the political manifestoes which have been put forth from Washington, whereas—unfortunately for us—the documents which have emanated from Richmond have, almost without exception, possessed the dangerous quality of earnestness. This address, which we publish this morning, reads certainly as if it came from men whose minds are made up, and who are willing to bear the consequences of their decision. Its out-spoken frankness is another characteristic from which we do not derive the same comfort as do our loyal contemporaries. Even WASHINGTON did not dare to use such candor in his communications in the time of the Revolution, and we very much fear that no one will lay this address down after reading it, without a lurking apprehension that whatever may be the condition of the backbone, the heart and spirit of the "accursed rebellion" are not broken yet. We have suffered too much already from the assurances of Mr. Seward and friends as to the speedy close of the war, for it to be worth our while to longer shut our eyes to facts, however distasteful they may be."

That is the way, sir, that every State paper put forth during this rebellion has been spoken of by certain newspapers in the Northern States. It is the strangest thing in the world, that nobody connected with the Government, nobody connected with the Republican party, is able to write an address, a message or a State paper of any kind, which is satisfactory to these very loyal Democratic editors. Why, the ablest men, sir, in the country are in this Government and in Congress as representatives of the Republican party; and the other side of the House may be challenged to produce statesmen who can compare with Charles Sumner and William H. Seward. It does not admit of a question, that in point of intellect the statesmen of the Republican party compare favorably, at least, with any man in the Democratic party. And yet, they cannot at any time write a State paper, or deliver a speech in Congress, which is considered creditable by the men who write for the Democratic newspapers.

Now, sir, this paper is published in the city of Philadelphia but not by Philadelphians. They had to bring two men from York county to start that paper. That is a specimen of the loyalty of which men boast as flourishing down in that region. When that paper was started, it began with an editor who was really a loyal Democrat—a man of highly cultivated mind—a man sixty years of age, who had represented our country in Europe in a diplomatic capacity. He began his course as the editor of that paper, determined, as he told friends of mine, to make it a loyal Democratic newspaper. Well, sir, he did not stay there long. He was not allowed to make that loyal Democratic paper, and he left it. He joined the Republican party, and delivered an address before the Union League, stating why he had left that paper—that the associations which were around him were such as no loyal man ought to tolerate, and he would not stay there. And, sir, the editor of a Democratic paper here in Harrisburg went out in the same way.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can regret more than I do that any such state of things as this should exist. Nobody can regret more than I do, for the sake of the craft to which I have the honor to belong, that there are published all over our country, newspapers like that, in every little hamlet as well as in every city; which are misleading the people, which are inculcating the idea that this Government is engaged in a mere crusade against Southern slavery—inculcating the idea that the Government is a military despotism, and that the people ought not to sustain it.

Mr. Speaker, when gentlemen may come here and talk about their newspapers being mobbed by soldiers, they must bear in mind the provocation the soldiers have had; they must bear in mind the long-suffering of this people; they must bear in mind the doctrines put forth in a certain class of newspapers. And I tell you, sir, public sentiment must be considmore rapidly than by volunteering. I would have been very glad if the system inaugurated by Genaral Cameron, when he was Secretary of War, had been continued; but this was a law decided to be constitutional by eminent jurists, and when it went into force in the city of New York, the Democratic newspapers and politicians, from day to day, led the Democrats in the city of New York to believe that the Government was cheating them—that the Government was carrying on this thing in an improper manner—that it was going to take them away by force and leave the Republicans at home.

Now, this is the sort of mischief in which the leaders of this Democratic party have been engaged since this war began. Their course has not been harmless. They have entirely debauched the minds of a large class of people in the Northern States. In our own State we have seen in what such practices culminated. The troubles in Schuylkill clearly came from this sort of agitation. Those men in Schuylkill county who have been guilty of acts of outrage were misled by Democratic politicians and newspapers. There is no question about it. Talk about no disloyalty in Pennsylvania! Why, sir, we can all call to mind instances, occurring generally in Democratic districts, where deserters arrested by the military authorities were rescued by mobs. Now, will any man tell me that a parcel of Republicans would have rescued a deserter? Yet that has been done all over Pennsylvania; and some lives have been lost in the skirmishes consequent upon it.

Again, sir, in the city of New York, where this dreadful riot occurred, a large mass meeting was held—said to have been one of the largest ever held in that city—at which a leading Democratic politician, now a member of Congress, made a speech, (and others of the same party made speeches also, though he led the way,) urging a treaty of peace—urging that this war must be stopped—not stopped when it had succeeded; not that the rebellion should be put down; not that the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws should be enforced at the point of bayonet—but that the war should be stopped and peace made. Were there any Republicans there? If there were, I never heard of them. The truth is, it was a Democratic meeting, led off by the ex-mayor of New York, one of the most powerful Democrats in New York city.

But, sir, time is passing and I leave this branch of the subject, to refer to some of the acts of the Government itself, and to give my views concerning them.

This war, sir, as I said, was precipitated upon us. Originally it was a war of self-defence. It was not a war of aggression. When Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States, some eight States rebelled; their representatives retired from Congress, after delivering farewell addresses, and those States organized a Government, at Montgomery, in Alabama. They started the machine; they enlisted men. They

(CONTINUED ON FOURTH PAGE.)