

# Pennsylvania Telegraph

"INDEPENDENT IN ALL THINGS—NEUTRAL IN NONE"

VOL. XIV. HARRISBURG, PA. SATURDAY AFTERNOON, JANUARY 26, 1861. NO. 20.

### Steam Printing Office.

Having procured Steam Power Presses we are prepared to execute JOB AND BOOK PRINTING of every description, cheaper than it can be done at any other establishment in the country.

**RATES OF ADVERTISING.**

Four lines of type constitute one square. Lines or more than four constitute a square.

Half Square, one day	10
one month	30
three months	80
one year	300
one square one day	60
one week	200
one month	600
three months	1500
one year	6000

Business notices inserted at the rate of 10 cents per line before Marriages and Deaths, FIVE CENTS PER LINE for each insertion.

Marriages and Deaths to be charged as regular advertisements.

## Pennsylvania Legislature.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, January 23.

The House re-assembled at 7 o'clock, P. M., and resumed the consideration of Senate bill No. 1, entitled "Joint resolutions relative to the maintenance of the Constitution and Union."

The question was on the amendment submitted by Mr. DUFFIELD.

On the question,  
"Will the House agree to the amendment?"

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. HILL and Mr. DUNLAP, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boyer, Brodhead, Byrne, Cope, Dismant, Dwyer, Donley, Dunlap, Eilenberger, Gaskill, Hill, Kline, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, Manifold, Osterhout, Reiff, Rhoads, Smith, (Berks), and Smith, (Philadelphia)—20.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Acker, Alexander, Anderson, Armstrong, Ashcom, Austin, Ball, Barnley, Bartholomew, Biesel, Bixler, Blair, Bliss, Brewster, Burns, Butler, (Crawford), Clark, Collins, Cowan, Craig, Douglas, Elliott, Frazier, Gibboney, Goehring, Gordon, Graham, Happer, Harvey, Hillman, Hood, Hofus, Huhn, Irvin, Koch, Lawrence, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, Marshall, Moore, Mullin, Myers, Osterhout, Patterson, Peirce, Preston, Pugh, Reilly, Robinson, Roller, Schrock, Seltzer, Shafer, Stehman, Taylor, Thomas, White, Wilder, Williams, and Davis, *Speaker*—51.

So the question was determined in the negative.

REASONS FOR VOTING.

Mr. COLLINS. I wish to state briefly the reasons why I shall vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Philadelphia (Mr. DUFFIELD). I had at one time proposed to give my views upon the resolutions before the taking of the final vote; but as there has been so much said upon the subject, I concluded not to delay the action of the House, by any remarks.

The resolutions embodied in the amendment of the gentleman from Philadelphia appear to me to be not germane to the questions at issue. A portion of his resolutions I could hardly endorse. A portion of them I object to. They go for a repeal of certain sections of the Penal Code. In this respect they go farther than I could go. I object to a repeal of a portion of that Penal Code, but not to the extent contemplated by the resolution of the gentleman from Philadelphia.

With regard to the resolution affirming the equality of the citizens of the different States in the territories, I endorse that doctrine. There should be an equality between the citizens of all the States of this Union. But I apprehend that the gentleman's resolution is intended to express more than this—that it means to assert a right on the part of the States to interfere with the rights of the Federal Government in the territories. Understanding that to be the meaning attached to the resolution, I cannot vote for it. Therefore I shall give my vote—no.

Mr. MARSHALL (when his name was called). I had intended to express at length before this House my views upon this subject, but as my colleague (Mr. WILLIAMS) has addressed this House on various occasions and has faithfully expressed the sentiments of my constituents, I have refrained from an discussion of the question. I will now record my vote—no.

Mr. PATTERSON (when his name was called). I intend to vote against this amendment. One of my reasons for so doing is that it is useless. You can not repeal an act of assembly by joint resolutions of this sort. When this question shall come up on the report from the Judiciary Committee, I may then be prepared to vote on it. I vote—no.

The question recurring on the original resolutions.

Mr. SMITH (Philadelphia). I do not wish to detain the House with any lengthy remarks upon the resolutions now pending. But sir, I feel as though I would not be doing justice to the constituency which I have the honor to represent, did I not make an attempt to express their almost unanimous opinion and regret, upon the present unhappy condition of our country. I am directed by that constituency to place upon the Record of this House their protest against the method of adjustment so forcibly laid down by the gentleman from Allegheny and others of the Republican Party in this House. Such a course would exasperate the Southern States now wavering in their allegiance, while concession and compromise would, in my opinion, conciliate and strengthen the bond which now so feebly holds us together; let us act toward our Southern Brethren in this the darkest hour of our country's history in a spirit which is gentle and easy. Kindness, the Christian principle of action, may induce them to discard their present attitude of rebellion, while severity, the Heathen one, would drive them the further on to madness.

It has been well and truly said, that "of all disorders the best is that which is least." It is discreet to have the better promptings of the heart be blunted; when the worst passions of nature have been aroused; when so blind by partisan feelings, that it is impossible to give at just conclusions—conclusions on which hang the unity of these States, the peace and happiness of thirty millions of people—without due reflection and most cautious and guarded action.

Are we so pure and free from blame or reflection in all our acts, as a State, that we can be allowed to censure and dictate terms to our sister States and equals in the confederacy? Have we done nothing of which they can complain? We are told day after day, since these resolutions have been introduced, that we have neither law or shadow of law on our Statute Books that conflicts with or abrogates any law of Congress. If that be so, if they are only words and useless enactments, why not strike them off? why has the finger of reproach pointed at us, and our noble and patriotic State classed with the other nullifiers of Congressional enactments in the Northern States, when we can so easily and without injustice to ourselves, stand like Cæsar's wife—unoffended? Whether or those laws be wrong inflicted, or an injustice imposed, upon the people of this State, by the legislative enactments of the past, or the present alarming and exciting developments, that are shaking our government in the last throes of dissolution had transpired—it matters not to us—whether the laws on our statute books are constitutional or unconstitutional (as we know the best legal minds of our State conflict on that subject) it is not mine the wish, much less the ability, to discuss. But, sir, as has been said we can judge of the future only by the past—"our whole history as a nation—from its commencement as a separate and independent government, has been one of concessions and compromises. The only cord of Union that binds us as one nation, great, powerful, and respected, the great anchor-chain of the great State, on which are centered the hopes of all lovers of liberty and equality throughout the world, was forged in

the compromising and extended debates of over two year's duration that culminated at the ratification of the articles of confederation, July 9th, 1778, rivetted and tempered through the fires of the Revolutionary struggle, perfected at the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1787, and to it has been added link after link, in every acquisition of territory, and by the birth of every new sister into the family of States down to the present time. Not only the history of our Republic, but our very lives are concessions and compromises with our Creator through our Saviour. The great Franklin said in the convention of 1787, that "both sides should part with some of their demands," and who does not know that the great magna Charta of our liberties was only originally perfected and adopted after long, tedious and angry debates—when mutual and conflicting interests were merged in the "nobler man" and patriot, for his country's cause and the good of mankind. If our erring brethren of the South, whose precipitate action we deplore, have been led, by false and erroneous counsels, into steps that, unless retraced, will inevitably lead to the dissolution and ruin of this fair temple of human liberty, should we not in that spirit, inculcated by the Great Teacher of mankind, go to that sister State in kindness, love and sympathy, soothe and bind her wounds, whether imaginary or real, and win her back to the paths of peace, harmony and fraternal union. It is our duty to counsel moderation; better, far better, to endure present wrongs than to hasten to grapple with those we know not of in the unseen future. Let us have all peaceful and Christian measures to bring about a reconciliation; exhaust all plans the fertile brain of man is capable of suggesting, by entreating, by kindly expostulation, by appeals to their patriotism, their love of country, their memories of the hallowed past, by all the ties of blood, country, and religion which unite us as the people of one country; let us sacrifice party prejudices, ambition, all, all but our honor and our manhood, to bring about a reconciliation, and once more restore peace to our troubled country. Let us, as Americans, as citizens of the great family of States, not lose sight of the fact that to win and maintain our happy Union has cost our ancestors both blood and treasure—and that an attempt to sever or win back a revolted portion of our country, would be to renege our own sacred promise, or a portion of the same, would be to renege at the horror of war, want and deprivation, with ten-fold malignity, cruelty and bloodshed.

Mr. BLISS. Mr. SPEAKER. I have been ready for several days to come to a vote on the resolutions before us, I had not intended to do more than to cast my vote; but the accumulation of arguments and thoughts urged upon our country, has determined me to say a few words upon the merits of this question; and in which is involved the great question of the rights of constitutional government.

We owe it to ourselves—to Pennsylvania—to the interests and honor of the noble old Commonwealth we here represent, and to the cause of a progressive christian civilization and to the rights of human nature, that we meet these questions and decide upon them, guided by a higher and purer motive than devotion to mere party ties. It becomes us to act in view of the vast interests to human society that are involved in the final settlement of the question, whether Pennsylvania will fully acknowledge the claims of constitutional government and will resolve to fulfill her obligations.

The eyes of the civilized world are upon us, and anxious, palpating hearts are to be made glad or to be beat with renewed impatience against the walls of their prisons, as the swift-winged messenger—the lightning of Heaven, bears over the land the story of our final decision—whether, in the opinion of this body, the Constitution of our country contains the provisions and the power for its own preservation. It required six thousand years of experience and observation for man to gain that knowledge, and to employ that mysterious power in nature, as his ready and trusty messenger.

If we can be permitted to make as grand a stride in our knowledge of the elements and principles of human government, and of man's duties and obligations under it, we may indeed expect to be freed from those terrible convulsions with which the world has been afflicted, the like of which now threatens to involve our country in a fratricidal war.

I presume there is not a member on this floor who will not claim to be ready to pursue any honorable course that would in the most effectual manner and in the briefest possible time, bring the vexing question to a final settlement.

The questions in my view are involved in the Senate resolutions. The amendment offered here by the member from Philadelphia cannot be considered and demoralized by the exorbitant demands of the slave power at Charleston and Baltimore—demands that they know they could not submit to without ensuring an humiliating defeat before the people—and finally, in spite of all their precautions and devices, that defeat in November. And now, sir, are we asking us to make more concessions to the demands of slavery, than the South demanded of them at Charleston. The Republican party, from the victory achieved at the stronghold of the freeman, the ballot box, can make no such concessions as are thus demanded.

To this call upon our charity I believe I utter the language of the masses of the freemen of the North, when I say we have no such concessions to make. We do not claim the right to propose to barter away for an uncertain hope of peace the rights of freemen.

Men on the other side have plead for the concessions that they assumed would tend to restore quiet to the country, in the name of our holy religion. All that I can believe that Christian religion demands, I will gladly yield. I own allegiance to His who endured all that the malice of the Jews could inflict, and finally gave himself as a sacrifice on the cross for the redemption and salvation of his enemies—having purified by his life the dignity and purity of primitive human nature, and by so doing giving a perfect pattern for the imitation of his disciples in their future labors for the redemption of the masses of the human race, which is the legitimate tendency of cultivated and educated human nature. I say that when I hear religion in any form, but especial-

ly when the religion that inculcates universal philanthropy, is appealed to in defence or extenuation of the institution of human slavery, it calls to remembrance the encouraging fact that primitive Christianity, by the lives and teachings of its disciples, almost entirely eradicated human slavery from the whole Roman Empire, and I rejoice in my heart in the prospect that a purified Christian influence will dispel the horrors, and finally the thing itself, from human society, as the light of day dispels the gloom and darkness of night.

But we must look honestly at the relation of parties in this contest. By the co-operation and assistance of a traitor in the cabinet, the secessionists have, at great cost to the general government, succeeded in arming themselves for a war of resistance with the general government. They are now in the possession of the forts and other property of the government and have fired upon a government vessel, and compelled her to desist from the execution of her commission; such is the position of actual hostility assumed by South Carolina. Other States have justified and sustained and co-operated with her.

The cotton States have gone out of the Union as far as their own acts of secession and resistance to law can take them out, and they ask nothing of the Government but to surrender to their demands.

But in view of the position of the border slave States, we are told that first or last we must concede, and that it is better to do so before we are involved in a bloody war. Conciliation and concession are urged as being necessary, and as becoming to the North as a magnanimous and generous people.

I am prepared to go as far for conciliation as to concede as much as anybody that does not intend to forsake the fortress of our rights, to a well-defended and well understood constitutional government.

But, I am not prepared for compromises, conciliation nor concession, until I can be satisfied that the man with whom I am to deal, and with whom I am to keep faith, have some devotion to constitutional government. In the talk here, it is all how much we can agree to give to appease our offended neighbors. On the contrary, when you hear from the South, they are counselling upon how much she will demand; and, sir, this is our ultimatum. It is what we are constantly hearing from the South if such demands—for they are not negotiating with us—are regarded, we tear down the government.

I am not prepared to negotiate with those who thus talk of making conditions upon which this government may stand. It is with the people that love the Constitution and laws of this country that negotiation can be carried on, and to whom concessions can be made, in the government of our country.

As this government stands, and there is a State that calls for its protection. It has a Constitutional right to the protection of the Union, and it will rely upon its own strength, and in view of the aspect of the conflicting feelings and sentiment in this country upon the slavery question, some compromise is needed, and on that compromise the feelings of the north, as well as the South, must be consulted. The North, as well as the South, must be appeased and conciliated. They have made known their devotion to liberty, and the feelings of the northern freemen. If free speech and a free press are to be stricken down in the South, and the insults and indignities offered to Northern men on Southern soil are continued, or the protection that the Constitution affords to slavery is to be removed by mad secession, then I tremble for the defenceless and unprotected, in that fratricidal war, the feelings of the millions who spirit have never been trained to emotions of kindness, and who can be led by reckless and designing men, to any acts, however horrid.

There is, however, a path that leads to peace, and that path we are pointed to by the history of the past and by all the sound teachings of mental and political philosophy. The reign of Liberty in France and the overthrow of the old government in England, were events preceded by conciliation, by talk of compromise and concession. The history of the world is full of such lessons. The road to peace is through law and obedience to demand.

If those who profess to be devoted to the constitution and the law will rally to their support and resolve that no terms of compromise can be talked about or considered until the national honor can be restored and the national flag respected, then shall we be on the road to peace, but if at the demand of the slave oligarchy we lay aside the constitution and stop to listen to the conditions it may prescribe for a reorganization, then liberty for a time may fall, but it will rise again and be built firmly on the ruins of that for the time has crushed it.

These resolutions acknowledge the claims of the constitution and our obligation as a State to assist in defending it. I therefore recognize them as saying that it is required of this body at this time.

LEAVE TO VOTE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked for and obtained leave to record his vote on the amendment of Mr. DUFFIELD to the joint resolutions of the Senate relative to the maintenance of the Constitution and the Union. He voted "no."

Mr. ASHCOM asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. BIXLER asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. HAYS asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. IRWIN asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. LAURENCE asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. RHOADS asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. LOWTHER asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. MULLIN asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. STRANG asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "no."

Mr. BUTLER (Carbon) asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "aye."

Mr. DUFFIELD asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "aye."

Mr. M'DONOUGH asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "aye."

Mr. BRESSLER asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "aye."

Mr. MORRISON asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "aye."

Mr. MYERS asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "aye."

Mr. WILSON asked for and obtained the same leave. He voted "aye."

The final vote on the amendment of Mr. Duffield, in consequence of the above additional votes was yeas, 24, nays 66.

The question recurring on the adoption of the

first resolution on the Senate.

The resolution was read as follows:  
Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in General Assembly met, and it is hereby resolved, 1. That the Constitution of the United States of America was ordained and established, as set forth by its preamble, by the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity; and if the people of any State in this Union are not in the full enjoyment of all the benefits intended to be secured to them by the said Constitution, if their rights under it are disregarded, their tranquility disturbed, their property retarded or their liberties imperilled by the people of any other State, full and adequate redress can and ought to be provided for such grievances through the action of Congress and other proper departments of the National Government.

Mr. LEISENRING moved to amend the same as follows:  
"Resolved, That the words, 'and State,' and the letter 'a' at the end of the word 'government,' so as to make it read, 'national and State governments.'"

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, when I withdrew the amendment which I had the honor to submit, to the resolutions now before us, I announced my purpose, as will be recollected, to renew it, if I was not entirely satisfied with the resolutions passed by the Senate, and which are now before the House. I thought them deficient in precision, in tenacity, in nerve, I thought them diffuse. It struck me that they wanted a little of the Anglo-Saxon ring—that they did not speak out, as our fathers spoke out on solemn public occasions like this. I rise now, however, for the purpose of saying that with a view to compromise (as compromise seems to be palatable and desirable in certain quarters of this House) I propose to withhold the amendment submitted by me with the view of obtaining the united and unanimous action of this House upon these resolutions.

I hope that we shall agree to vote down all amendments and adopt those resolutions as they stand; and I trust that our Democratic friends will be found voting with us.

On the question,  
"Will the House agree to the amendment?"

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. LEISENRING and Mr. DUNLAP, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boyer, Brodhead, Butler, (Carbon), Byrne, Cope, Dismant, Divins, Donley, Duffield, Dunlap, Eilenberger, Gaskill, Hill, Kline, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, M'Donough, Morrison, Myers, Osterhout, Randall, Reiff, Rhoads, Smith, (Berks), and Smith, (Philadelphia)—26.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Acker, Alexander, Anderson, Armstrong, Ashcom, Austin, Ball, Barnley, Bartholomew, Biesel, Bixler, Blair, Bliss, Brewster, Burns, Butler, (Crawford), Clark, Cowan, Craig, Douglas, Dunlap, Elliott, Frazier, Gibboney, Goehring, Gordon, Graham, Happer, Harvey, Hillman, Hood, Hofus, Huhn, Irvin, Koch, Lawrence, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, Marshall, Moore, Mullin, Myers, Osterhout, Patterson, Peirce, Preston, Pugh, Reilly, Robinson, Roller, Schrock, Seltzer, Shafer, Stehman, Taylor, Thomas, White, Wilder, Williams, Wilson and Davis, *Speaker*—68.

So the question was determined in the negative.

The question recurring,  
"Will the House agree to the first resolution?"

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. DUNLAP and Mr. COWAN, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Abbott, Acker, Alexander, Anderson, Armstrong, Ashcom, Austin, Ball, Barnley, Bartholomew, Biesel, Bixler, Blair, Bliss, Boyer, Brewster, Brewster, Brodhead, Burns, Butler, (Carbon), Butler, (Crawford), Byrne, Clark, Collins, Cowan, Craig, Dismant, Divins, Donley, Douglas, Duffield, Dunlap, Dunlap, Eilenberger, Elliott, Frazier, Gaskill, Gibboney, Goehring, Gordon, Graham, Happer, Harvey, Hayes, Hill, Hillman, Hood, Hofus, Huhn, Irvin, Kline, Koch, Lawrence, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, Marshall, Moore, Mullin, Myers, Osterhout, Patterson, Peirce, Preston, Pugh, Reilly, Robinson, Roller, Schrock, Seltzer, Shafer, Stehman, Taylor, Thomas, White, Wilder, Williams, Wilson and Davis, *Speaker*—57.

NAYS—None.

So the question was determined in the affirmative.

The second resolution was read as follows:  
2d. Resolved, That while the people of Pennsylvania entertain, and desire to cherish, the most fraternal sentiments for their brethren of other States, and are ready now, as they have ever been, to co-operate in all measures needful for their welfare, security and happiness, and the full enjoyment of all their rights under the Constitution, which makes us one people, we claim for all the territories, and faithful observance of all the duties and obligations imposed thereby. That while they cannot surrender their love of liberty inherited from the founders of their State, sealed with the blood of the revolution, and witnessed in the history of their legislation; and while they claim all their rights under the Constitution, they nevertheless, maintain now, as they have ever done, the constitutional rights of the people of the slaveholding States to the uninterrupted enjoyment of their own domestic institutions.

Mr. RHOADS moved to amend the same, as follows:  
"In the fifth line of the resolution, after the word 'inherited,' insert the words 'for all white men.'"

On the motion,  
"Will the House agree to the amendment?"

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. RHOADS and Mr. SMITH (Berks) and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boyer, Brodhead, Byrne, Cope, Dismant, Duffield, Dunlap, Hill, Kline, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, M'Donough, Manifold, Morrison, Myers, Osterhout, Randall, Reiff, Rhoads, Smith, (Berks), Smith, (Philadelphia)—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Acker, Alexander, Anderson, Armstrong, Ashcom, Austin, Ball, Barnley, Bartholomew, Biesel, Bixler, Blair, Bliss, Brewster, Brewster, Burns, Butler, (Crawford), Clark, Collins, Cowan, Craig, Donley, Douglas, Dunlap, Elliott, Frazier, Gibboney, Goehring, Gordon, Graham, Happer, Harvey, Hayes, Hillman, Hood, Hofus, Huhn, Irvin, Koch, Lawrence, M'Donough, Mullin, Moore, Mullin, Patterson, Peirce, Preston, Pugh, Reilly, Robinson, Roller, Schrock, Seltzer, Shafer, Stehman, Strang, Taylor, Thomas, White, Wilder, Williams, Wilson and Davis, *Speaker*—64.

So the question was determined in the negative.

REASONS FOR VOTING.

Mr. BYRNE. I did not intend to vote, because I do not think that this amendment is

necessary. I vote, however, I might be misunderstood, I vote aye.

The question recurring,  
"Will the House agree to the second resolution?"

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. BYRNE and Mr. GORDON, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Abbott, Acker, Alexander, Anderson, Armstrong, Ashcom, Austin, Ball, Barnley, Bartholomew, Biesel, Bixler, Blair, Bliss, Boyer, Brewster, Brewster, Brodhead, Burns, Butler, (Crawford), Byrne, Clark, Collins, Cope, Cowan, Craig, Dismant, Divins, Donley, Douglas, Duffield, Dunlap, Dunlap, Eilenberger, Elliott, Frazier, Gaskill, Gibboney, Goehring, Gordon, Graham, Happer, Harvey, Hayes, Hill, Hillman, Hood, Hofus, Huhn, Irvin, Kline, Koch, Lawrence, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, Lowther, M'Donough, M'Gonigal, Manifold, Marshall, Moore, Morrison, Mullin, Myers, Osterhout, Patterson, Peirce, Preston, Pugh, Reilly, Robinson, Roller, Schrock, Seltzer, Shafer, Stehman, Strang, Taylor, Thomas, White, Wilder, Williams, Wilson and Davis, *Speaker*—50.

NAYS—Mr. Butler, (Carbon)—1.

So the question was determined in the affirmative.

The third resolution was read as follows:  
3d. Resolved, That we adopt the sentiment (and language) of President Andrew Jackson, expressed in his message to Congress, on the sixteenth of January, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three, "That the right of the people of a State to dissolve themselves as well, and without the consent of the other States, from their most solemn obligations, and hazard the liberties and happiness of the millions composing this Union, cannot be acknowledged; and that such authority is utterly repugnant both to the principles upon which the general government is constituted, and the objects which were expressly formed to attain."

Mr. DUFFIELD moved to amend the same by adding at the end thereof the following words: "That a State or any other great portion of the people suffering under long and intolerable oppression, and having tried all Constitutional remedies without the hope of redress, may have a natural right, when their happiness cannot be otherwise secured, and when they can do so without greater injury to others, to absolve themselves from their obligations to the government and appeal to the last resort, need not on the present occasion be denied."

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I understand the amendment properly, it imports the right of revolution. That is a right which, I suppose, nobody will undertake to question at this time of day, particularly as our own title to government depends upon it; that is its foundation. Mr. DUFFIELD, if he will, please to state, have understood it correctly, affirm it by my votes to pass as they have come from the Senate.

Mr. DUFFIELD. If the gentleman from Allegheny's "voice is still for war," he certainly should vote for this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there were anything in the circumstances of the country to authorize the invocation of this ultimate right, this last resort of men and nations, I should vote for it. But there is no such condition of circumstances; gentlemen do not pretend that there is. Why then offer the amendment?

Mr. HOFIUS. Before voting either for or against this amendment, I would like to be informed from the gentleman who has offered it. I wish to ask the gentleman if he has offered this amendment with the view of showing that South Carolina has pursued a right and proper course.

Mr. DUFFIELD. I have offered it for the purpose of testing the sincerity of gentlemen on this floor who now profess to be such warm supporters of the doctrines of General Jackson, and wish to see whether they will endorse one part of his proclamation and repudiate another.

Mr. HOFIUS. I think the gentleman must have misunderstood my question. I framed it with the view of eliciting either an affirmative or a negative answer. I asked the gentleman whether his object in offering this amendment was for the purpose of showing that South Carolina had pursued a right and proper course.

Mr. DUFFIELD. If it were necessary, and if I thought the gentleman really in earnest, I might answer the question, but under the circumstances I beg leave, very respectfully, to decline. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLLINS. I think there need be no difficulty between Democrats and Republicans in this House on this question. If the question were to be decided whether a State has the right to revolt under such circumstances as are assumed by General Jackson, I have no doubt that every Republican here would give his voice, affirming the position assumed by General Jackson. But we are not called upon here to endorse every thing that General Jackson may have said. We are called upon to endorse a sentiment which he uttered at a particular occasion and for a particular purpose, to meet a particular emergency. A similar emergency now presents itself to the American people, and we are only endorsing that sentiment promulgated by General Jackson, which has a peculiar reference to the present exigency. With regard to those causes which General Jackson set forth as sufficient to justify a State in revolting, we deny that such causes now exist.

The question has been very properly put by the gentleman from Mercer, (Mr. HOFIUS), "Will the House believe that South Carolina has been trampled upon until she can have no redress within this Union, and that she has a right to resort to war? If that is the position in which gentlemen desire to be placed, let them come before the country upon that position. We do not believe that such a state of things exists.

When the time comes that circumstances require it, we shall be ready to endorse the sentiment of General Jackson embodied in the amendment of the gentleman from Philadelphia. But there is no use in that side of the House endeavoring to thrust upon us such questions as this, for the purpose of placing us in a position in which we may seem to deny certain sentiments of General Jackson, while affirming others. I believe that the position of General Jackson, as set forth in the amendment, is a sound one, but I do not believe that the existing circumstances which he enumerates do now exist so as to sanction the present attitude of the seceding States. Although at a proper time I would endorse the sentiment of the amendment, I am, under the present circumstances, compelled to vote against it.

Mr. MARSHALL. If the gentleman from Philadelphia (Mr. DUFFIELD) can show me that South Carolina has pursued such grievances as cannot longer be endured, and that she has resorted to every constitutional measure without obtaining redress, I will vote for his amendment; otherwise I shall vote against it.

Mr. RANDALL. The third resolution denies the right of a State to dissolve its connection with the other States of the Union, without their consent. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Philadelphia (Mr. DUFFIELD) qualifies this assertion by quoting Gen. Jackson's opinions, also expressed in the same proclamation, "That a State or any other great portion of the people suffering under long and intolerable oppression, and having tried all constitutional remedies, may have a natural right, when their rights cannot be otherwise secured, to absolve themselves from their obligations to the government." I heartily endorse all Gen. Jackson said in that Proclamation. The gentleman from Allegheny (Mr. WILLIAMS) has stated that the principle embodied in the amendment meets with his endorsement, but he declines voting for it. I agree with him in all that he says, but I shall vote for it, and will then, if the amendment should be adopted, vote for the resolution as amended, believing in the principles therein contained; but if the amendment should be lost, I shall be compelled to vote against the resolution. My reason is, that the resolution presents an abstract question and does not confine itself to the present crisis, and denies the right of a State to absolve itself from the Union, no matter what causes may be presented—a doctrine asserted by the House in refusing to adopt the amendment explaining the original resolution. I cannot vote for it. I want it to be clearly understood that I do not believe that there is any Constitutional right of secession, but I believe in the right of revolution. I do not endorse the position of South Carolina. I consider the resolution, under any circumstances, to be a declaration of war, when we should do all in our power to preserve good feeling with the Southern States.

Mr. BYRNE. I am very much gratified to find the other side of the House ready to endorse even a part of General Jackson's doctrines, and I trust the time will soon come when they will endorse a good deal more. I like this progression towards sound doctrine. The doctrines of General Jackson are all good in their place, but I do not think that the adoption of this amendment is called for. I do not think that South Carolina, just at this time, needs any such declaration from us. I care very little, however, whether this amendment be adopted or not. I shall vote for the resolution at any rate.

On the question,  
"Will the House agree to the amendment?"

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. DUFFIELD and Mr. RANDALL and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boyer, Brodhead, Butler, (Carbon), Cope, Dismant, Divins, Donley, Duffield, Dunlap, Eilenberger, Gaskill, Hill, Kline, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, Manifold, Morrison, Myers, Osterhout, Randall, Reiff, Rhoads, Smith, (Berks), Smith, (Philadelphia)—54.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Acker, Alexander, Anderson, Armstrong, Ashcom, Austin, Ball, Barnley, Bartholomew, Biesel, Bixler, Blair, Bliss, Brewster, Burns, Butler, (Crawford), Clark, Collins, Cowan, Craig, Dismant, Divins, Donley, Douglas, Duffield, Dunlap, Dunlap, Eilenberger, Elliott, Frazier, Gaskill, Gibboney, Goehring, Gordon, Graham, Happer, Harvey, Hayes, Hill, Hillman, Hood, Hofus, Huhn, Irvin, Kline, Koch, Lawrence, Leisenring, Lichtenwalner, Marshall, Moore, Mullin, Myers, Osterhout, Patterson, Peirce, Preston, Pugh, Reilly, Robinson, Roller, Schrock, Seltzer, Shafer, Stehman, Taylor, Thomas, White, Wilder, Williams, Wilson, and Davis, *Speaker*—65.

So the question was determined in the negative.

REASONS FOR VOTING.