

Raffert's Journal

BY S. J. ROW.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1862.

VOL. 8--NO. 38.

THE DEMOCRATIC ADDRESS.

Below we publish an address to the Democracy of the United States, issued by 14 members of the House of Representatives, (among whom is Vallandigham,) urging the reorganization of their party. We bespeak a careful perusal for this extraordinary document, and ask the reader to note several of its most remarkable features, to wit: It does not say one word against the rebels who are trying to destroy the Government; it does not congratulate the country upon the victories achieved by the Union armies over the traitors; it charges the Administration of Mr. Lincoln as one of continued usurpation, etc. It claims that the Democracy has always, and is now the party that fights for and upholds the Constitution, and the Union, and charges that the Republican party is responsible for the Rebellion, &c. But read the address.

ADDRESS

Of Democratic Members of Congress to the Democracy of the United States

FELLOW CITIZENS:—The perilous condition of our country demands that we should counsel together. Party organization, restricted within proper limits, is a positive good, and indeed essential to the preservation of public liberty. Without it the best Government would soon degenerate into the worst of tyrannies. In despotisms the chief use of power is in crushing out party opposition. In our country the experience of the last twelve months proves, more than any lesson in history, the necessity of party organization. The present Administration, chosen by a party, and in all civil acts and appointments has recognized, and still does, its fealty and obligations to that party. There must and will be an opposition. The public safety and good demand it. Shall it be a new organization or an old one? The Democratic party was founded more than sixty years ago. It has never been disbanded. To-day it numbers one million free hundred thousand electors in the States still loyal to the Union. Its recent numerous victories in municipal elections in the Western and Middle States prove its vitality. Within the last ten months it has held State Conventions and nominated full Democratic tickets in every Free State in the Union. Of no other party opposed to the Republicans can the same be said.

SHALL THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY BE NOW DISBANDED? Why should it? Are its ancient principles wrong? What are they? Let its platform for thirty years speak:

"Resolved, That the American Democracy place their trust in the intelligence, the patriotism, and the discriminating justice of the American people."

"That we regard this as a distinctive feature in our political creed, which we are proud to maintain before the world, as the great moral element in a form of government springing from and upheld by the popular will, and we contrast it with the creed and practice of Federalism, under whatever name or form, which seeks to pauper the will of the constituent, and which conceives no imposture too monstrous for the popular credulity."

"That the Federal Government is one of limited power, derived solely from the Constitution; and the grants of power made therein ought to be strictly construed by all the departments and agents of the Government; and that it is inexpedient and dangerous to exercise doubtful constitutional powers."

And as explanatory of these the following from Mr. Jefferson's first inaugural:

"The support of the STATE GOVERNMENTS in all their rights as the most competent administrations of our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies."

"The preservation of the GENERAL GOVERNMENT in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad."

"A jealous care of the right of election by the people."

"THE SUPREMACY OF THE CIVIL OVER THE MILITARY AUTHORITY."

"Economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened."

"The honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith."

"FREEDOM OF RELIGION, FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, AND FREEDOM OF PERSON UNDER PROTECTION OF THE HABEAS CORPUS, AND TRIAL BY JURY IMPARTIALLY SELECTED."

Such, Democrats, are the principles of your party, essential to public liberty and to the stability and wise administration of the Government, alike in peace and war. They are the principles upon which the Constitution was framed; and, under the control of a party which adhere to them, the Constitution would be maintained and the Union could not be dissolved.

Is the policy of the Democratic party wrong that it should be disbanded?

Its policy is consistent with its principles, and may be summed up, from the beginning, as follows: The support of liberty as against power; of the people as against their agents and servants; and of State rights as against consolidation and centralized despotism; a simple government; no public debt; low taxes; no high protective tariff; no general system of internal improvements by Federal authority; no National Bank; hard money for the Federal public dues; no assumption of State debts; expansion of territory; self government for the territories, subject only to the Constitution; the absolute compatibility of a union of the States, "part slave and part free;" the admission of new States, with or without slavery, as they may elect; no interference by the Federal Government with slavery in State and Territory, or in the District of Columbia; and, finally, as set forth in the Cincinnati Platform, in 1856, and reaffirmed in 1860, absolute and eternal "repudiation of ALL REGIONAL PARTIES AND PLATFORMS concerning domestic slavery which seek to embroil the States and incite treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and dissolution."

Such was the ancient and the recent policy of the Democratic party, running through a period of sixty years—a policy consistent with the principles of the Constitution, and absolutely essential to the preservation of the Union.

Does the history of the Democratic party prove that it ought to be abandoned? "By

their fruits shall ye know them." Sectional parties do not achieve Union triumphs. For sixty years from the inauguration of Jefferson on the 4th of March, 1801, the Democratic party, with short intervals, controlled the power and the policy of the Federal Government. For forty-eight years out of these sixty, Democratic men ruled the country; for fifty-four years and eight months the Democratic policy prevailed. During this period Louisiana, Florida, Texas, New Mexico, and California were successively annexed to our territory, with an area more than twice as large as all the original Thirteen States together. Eight new States were admitted under strictly Democratic Administration—one under the Administration of Fillmore. From five millions, the population increased to thirty-one millions. The Revolutionary debt was extinguished. Two foreign wars were successfully prosecuted, with a moderate outlay and a small army and navy, and without the suspension of the habeas corpus; without one infraction of the Constitution; without one usurpation of power; without suppressing a single newspaper; without imprisoning a single editor; without limit to the freedom of the press, or of speech in or out of Congress, but in the midst of the grossest abuse of both; and without the arrest of a single traitor, though the House of Representatives sat during one of the wars, and in the other Senators invited the enemy to "GREET OUR VOLUNTEERS WITH BLOODY HANDS AND WELCOME THEM TO HOSPITABLE GRAVES."

During all this time wealth increased, business of all kinds multiplied, prosperity smiled on every side, taxes were low, wages were high, the North and the South furnished a market for each other's products at good prices; public liberty was secure, private rights undisturbed, every man's home was his castle; the courts were open to all; no passports for travel, no secret police, no spies, no informers, no bastilles; the right to assemble peaceably, the right to petition; freedom of religion, freedom of speech, a free ballot, and a free press; and all this time the Constitution maintained and the Union of the States preserved.

Such were the choice fruits of Democratic principles and policy, carried out through the whole period during which the Democratic party held the power and administered the Federal Government. Such has been the history of that party. It is a Union party, for it preserved the Union, by wisdom, peace, and compromise, for more than half a century.

Then neither the ancient principles, the policy, nor the past history of the Democratic party require nor would justify its disbandment.

Is there anything in the present crisis which demands it? The more immediate issue is, to MAINTAIN THE CONSTITUTION AS IT IS, AND TO RESTORE THE UNION AS IT WAS.

To maintain the Constitution is to respect the rights of the States and the liberties of the citizens. It is to adhere faithfully to the very principles and policy which the Democratic party has professed for more than half a century. Let its history, and the results, from the beginning, prove whether it has practised them. We appeal proudly to the record.

The first step towards a restoration of the Union as it was is to maintain the Constitution as it is. So long as it was maintained in fact, and not threatened with infraction in spirit and in letter, actual or imminent, the Union was unbroken.

To restore the Union, it is essential, first, to give assurance to every State and to the people of every section that their rights and liberties and property will be secure within the Union under the Constitution. What assurance so doubly sure as the restoration to power of that ancient organized consolidated Democratic party which for sixty years did secure the property, rights, and liberties of the States and of the people; and thus did maintain the Constitution and preserve the Union, and with the the multiplicity of blessings which distinguish us above other nations?

To restore the Union is to crush out sectionalism North and South. To begin the great work of restoration through the ballot-box is to kill abolition. The bitter waters of secession flowed first and are fed still from the unclean fountain of abolitionism. That fountain must be dried up. Armies may break down the power of the Confederate Government in the South, but the work of restoration can only be carried on through political organization and the ballot in the North and West. In this great work we cordially invite the cooperation of all men of every party who are opposed to the fell spirit of abolition, and who, in sincerity, desire the Constitution as it is and the Union as it was. Let the dead past bury its dead. Rally, lovers of the Union, the Constitution, and of Liberty to the standard of the Democratic party, already in the field and confident of victory. That party is the natural and persistent enemy of abolition. Upon this question its record as a national organization, however it may have been at times with particular men or in particular States, is clear and unquestionable. From the beginning of the anti-slavery agitation to the period of the last Democratic National Convention it has held but one language in regard to it. Let the record speak:

"Resolved, That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States, as the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the Constitution, that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions."

Upon these principles alone, so far as relates to slavery, can the Union as it was be restored; and no other Union, except the Union of Despotism, can be maintained in this country; and this last we will resist, as our fathers did, with our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

But it is said that you must disband the Democratic party "to support the Government." We answer that the Democratic party has always supported the Government; and while it was in power preserved the Government in all its vigor and integrity, not by force and arms, but by wisdom, sound policy,

and peace. But it never did admit, and never will, that this Administration, or any Administration, is "the Government." It holds, and ever has held, that the Federal Government is the agent of the people of the several States composing the Union; that it consists of three distinct departments—the Legislative, the Executive, and the Judicial—each equal by a part of the confidence and support of the States and the people; and that it is the duty of every patriot to sustain the several departments of the Government in the exercise of all the constitutional powers of each which may be necessary and proper for the preservation of the Government in its principles and in its vigor and integrity, and to stand by and defend to the utmost the flag which represents the Government, the Union, and the country.

In this sense the Democratic party has always sustained, and will now sustain, the Government against all foes, at home or abroad, in the North or the South, open or concealed, in office or out of office, in peace or in war.

If this is what the Republican party mean by supporting the Government, it is an idle thing to abandon the old and tried Democratic party, which for so many years and through so many trials supported, preserved, and maintained the Government of the Union. But if their real purpose be to aid the ancient enemies of the Democracy in subverting our present Constitution and form of government, and, under pretence of saving the Union, to erect a strong centralized despotism on its ruins, the Democratic party will resist them as the worst enemy to the Constitution and the Union, and to free government everywhere.

We do not propose to consider now the causes which led to the present unhappy civil war. A fitter time will come hereafter for such discussion. But we remind you now that compromise made your Union, and compromise fifteen months ago would have saved it. Repeated efforts were made at the last session of the Thirty-sixth Congress to this end. At every stage, the great mass of the South, with the whole Democratic party, and the whole Constitutional party, of the North and West, united in favor of certain amendments to the Constitution—and chief among them, the well-known "CRITTENDEN PROPOSITIONS," which would have averted civil war and maintained the Union. At every stage, all proposed amendments inconsistent with the sectional doctrines of the CHICAGO PLATFORM were strenuously resisted and defeated by the Republican party. The "Crittenden Propositions" never received a single Republican vote in either House. For the proper appeal to the Journals of Congress and to the Congressional Globe.

We scorn to reply to the charge that the Democratic party is opposed to granting aid and support to the Federal Government in maintaining its safety, integrity, and constitutional supremacy, and in favor of disbanding our armies and succumbing to the South. The charge is libellous and false. No man has advocated any such proposition. Democrats recognize it as their duty as patriots to support the Government in all constitutional, necessary, and proper efforts to maintain its safety, integrity, and constitutional authority; but at the same time they are inflexibly opposed to waging war against any of the States or people of this Union in any spirit of oppression, or for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, or of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of any State. Above all, the Democratic party will not support the Administration in any thing which looks or tends to the loss of our political or personal rights and liberties, or a change of our present democratic form of government.

But no, Democrats, it is not the support of the Government in restoring the Union which the party in power require of you. You are asked to give up your principles, your policy, and your party, and to stand by the Administration of the party in power, in all its acts. Above all it is demanded of you that you yield at least a silent support to their whole policy, and to withhold all security into their public conduct of every kind, least you should "embarrass the Administration." You are thus asked to renounce one of the first principles and the chief security of a Democratic government—the right of public servants responsible to their master the people; to render the representative accountable to the constituent; the ancient and undoubted prerogative of Americans to canvass public measures and public men. It is this "high constitutional privilege" which Daniel Webster declared he would "defend and exercise within the House and out of the House, and in all places in time of war, in time of peace, and at all times!" It is a right secured by the constitution—a right inalienable to the people, and formidable to tyrants only.

If ever there was a time when the existence and consolidation of the Democratic party upon its principles and policy was a vital necessity to public and private liberty, it is now.

Unquestionably the Constitution gives ample power to the several Departments of the Government to carry on war strictly subject to its provisions, and in case of civil war, with perfect security to citizens of the loyal States. Every act necessary for the safety and efficiency of the Government, and for a complete and most vigorous trial of its strength, is yet wholly consistent with the observance of every provision of that instrument, and of the laws in pursuance of it, if the sole motives of those in power were the suppression of the "rebellion," and no more. And yet the history of the Administration for the twelve months past has been and continues to be a history of repeated usurpations of power and of violations of the Constitution, and of the public and private rights of the citizen.

For the proof we appeal to facts too recent to need recital here, and too flagrant and heinous for the calm narrative which we propose. Similar acts were done and a like policy pursued in the threatened war with France in the time of John Adams, and with the same ultimate purpose. But in two or three years the people forced them into an honorable peace with France, rebuked the excesses and abuses of power, vindicated the Constitution, and turned over the Federal Government to the principles and policy of the Democratic party. To the "sober second thought of the people," therefore, and to the ballot-box, we now appeal when again in like peril with our fathers.

But if every Democrat concurred in the policy of prosecuting the war to the utter subjugation of the South and for the subversion of her State Government with her institutions, without a Convention of the States, and with-

out an overture for peace, we should just as resolutely resist the disbanding of the Democratic party. It is the only party capable of carrying on a war; it is the only party which has ever conducted a war to a successful issue, and the only party which has done it without abuse of power, without molestation to the rights of any class of citizens, and with due regard to economy. All this, if need be, it is able to do again. If success, then, in a military point of view be required, the Democratic party alone can command it.

To conclude: Inviting all men, without distinction of State, section, or party, who are for the Constitution as it is and the Union as it was, to unite with us in this great work upon terms of perfect equality, we insist that—The restoration of the Union, whether through peace or by war, demands the continued organization and success of the Democratic party.

The preservation of the Constitution demands it.

The maintenance of liberty and free democratic government demands it.

The restoration of a sound system of internal policy demands it.

Economy and honesty in the public expenditures, now at the rate of four millions of dollars a day, demands it.

The rapid accumulation of an enormous and permanent public debt demands it—a public debt already one thousand millions of dollars, and equal at the present rate, in three years, to England's debt of a century and a half in growth.

The heavy taxation, direct and indirect, State and Federal, already more than two hundred millions of dollars a year, eating out the substance of the people, augmenting every year, demands it.

Reduced wages, low prices, depression of trade, decay of business, scarcity of work, and impending ruin on every side demand it. And, finally, the restoration of the concord, good feeling, and prosperity of former years, demands that the Democratic party shall be maintained and made victorious.

W. A. RICHARDSON, of Illinois.
A. L. KNAPP, of Illinois.
J. C. ROBINSON, of Illinois.
JOHN LAW, of Indiana.
D. W. VOORHEES, of Indiana.
W. ALLEN, of Ohio.
C. A. WHITE, of Ohio.
WARREN P. NOBLE, of Ohio.
GEO. H. PENDLETON, of Ohio.
JAS. R. MORRIS, of Ohio.
C. L. VALLANDIGHAM, of Ohio.
PHILIP JOHNSON, of Penn.
S. E. ANCONA, of Penn.
GEO. K. SHIEL, of Oregon.

BY REQUEST.

"OCCASIONAL" REVIEW OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADDRESS.

From the Philadelphia Press, of May 9th.
WASHINGTON, May 8, 1862.

A document called the address of Democratic members of Congress to the Democracy of the United States appears in the *National Intelligencer* this morning. It is signed by only fourteen members of the House. Not a single Democrat in the Senate and not a single Representative from the Border States seems to have given it his sanction. And when its statements are examined, in the light of history and tested by fair argumentation, even those who have endorsed it will be heartily ashamed of it. No more emphatic admonition of the purposes entertained by the leaders of the present Democratic organization could have been laid before the American people than this extraordinary production. Not a single word appears in this address in favor of the war for the maintenance of the Government, or in opposition to the rebels who are fighting for its overthrow. Is it not amazing, in such a crisis as this, while nearly seven hundred thousand freemen are offering their lives as a sacrifice to the flag—while hundreds of families are mourning the loss of their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers, and with the record before their eyes of the monstrous atrocities perpetrated upon the wounded who have fallen into the hands of the traitors, and even upon the dead bodies of those who died in honorable battle—that distinguished gentlemen, professing to represent a large portion of the people of the United States, should deliberately and coldly refuse to say that the war in which we are now engaged is a just war, and that it is being conducted to preserve the freest and most generous Government in the world? The bravery, and the skill, and the moderation which have extorted from hostile and foreign nations expressions of astonishment and praise, do not awaken a single throb in the breasts of these fourteen "Democratic members of Congress." Instead of this, we find a studied effort to misrepresent the Administration of Mr. Lincoln, and the freshest and plainest events of the last two years. I have not time now to point out more than one or two of the most flagrant instances of this misrepresentation. The address says:

"We do not propose to consider now the causes which led to the present unhappy civil war. A fitter time will come hereafter for such discussion. But we remind you now that compromise made your Union, and compromise fifteen months ago would have saved it. Repeated efforts were made at the last session of the Thirty-sixth Congress to this end. At every stage, the great mass of the South, with the whole Democratic party, and the whole Constitutional party, of the North and West, united in favor of certain amendments to the Constitution—and chief among them, the well-known 'Crittenden Propositions,' which would have averted civil war, and maintained the Union. At every stage, all proposed amendments inconsistent with the sectional doctrines of the CHICAGO PLATFORM were strenuously resisted and defeated by the Republican party."

The best witness to refute this astounding assertion is Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, who, in the Senate of the United States, on the 31st of January last used, the following language:

The Senator told us that the adoption of the Clark amendment to the Crittenden resolutions defeated the settlement of the questions of controversy; and that, but for that vote, all could have been peace and prosperity now. We were told that the Clark amendment defeated the Crittenden compromise, and prevented a settlement of the controversy. On this point I will read a portion of the speech of my worthy and talented friend from California, [Mr. Latham,] and when I speak of him thus, I do it in no unmeaning sense. I intend that he, not I, shall answer the Senator from Delaware. I know that sometimes, when gentlemen are fixing up their pretty rhetorical flourishes, they do not take time to see all the sharp corners they may encounter. If they can make a readable sentence, and float on in a smooth, easy stream, all goes well and they are satisfied. As I have said, the Senator from Delaware told us that the Clark amendment was the turning point in the whole matter; that from it had flowed rebellion, revolution, war, the shooting and imprisonment of people in different States—perhaps he meant to include my own. This was the Pandora's box that has been opened, out of which all the evils that now afflict the land have flowed. Thank God I still have hope that all will yet be saved. My worthy friend from California, [Mr. Latham,] during the last session of Congress, made one of the best speeches he ever made. I bought five thousand copies for distribution, but I had no constituents to send them to, [laughter,] and they have been lying in your document room ever since, with the exception of a few, which I thought would do good in some quarters. In the course of that speech, upon this very point, he made use of these remarks:

"Mr. President, being last winter a careful eye-witness of all that occurred, I soon became satisfied that it was a deliberate, wilful design, on the part of some Representatives of Southern States, to seize upon the election of Mr. Lincoln merely as an excuse to precipitate this revolution upon the country. One evidence, to my mind, is the fact that South Carolina never sent Senators here."

Then they certainly were not influenced by the Clark amendment.

An additional evidence is, that when gentlemen on this floor, by their votes, could have controlled legislation, they refused to cast them from fear that the very proposition submitted to this body might have an influence in changing the opinions of their constituents. Why, sir, when the resolutions submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. Clark,] were offered as an amendment to the Crittenden propositions, for the manifest purpose of embarrassing the latter, and the vote taken on the 16th of January, 1861, I ask, what did we see? There were fifty-five Senators at that time upon this floor in person. The *Globe* of the second session, Thirty-sixth Congress, part 1, page 490, shows that upon the call of the yeas and nays immediately preceding the vote on the substitute of Mr. Clark's amendment, there were fifty-five yeas cast. I will read the vote from the *Globe*:

"Yeas—Messrs. Anthony, Baker, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, King, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson—25."

Nays—Messrs. Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Clingman, Crittenden, Douglas, Fitch, Green, Gwin, Hemphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Salsbury, Sebastian, Slidell, and Wigfall—30.

The vote being taken immediately after on the Clark proposition, was as follows:

"Yeas—Messrs. Anthony, Baker, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, King, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson—25."

Nays—Messrs. Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Clingman, Crittenden, Fitch, Green, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Salsbury, and Sebastian—30.

"Six Senators retained their seats and refused to vote, thus themselves allowing the Clark proposition to supply the Crittenden resolutions by a vote of 25 to 23. Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, Mr. Hemphill and Mr. Wigfall, of Texas, Mr. Iverson, of Georgia, Mr. Johnson, of Arkansas, and Mr. Slidell, of Louisiana, were in their seats, but refused to cast their votes."

I sat right behind Mr. Benjamin, and I am not sure that my worthy friend was not close by, when he refused to vote, and I said to him, "Mr. Benjamin, why do you not vote? Why not save this proposition and see if we cannot bring the country to it?" He gave me no answer, but an abrupt answer, and said he would control his own action without consulting me or anybody else. Said I, "vote and show yourself an honest man." As soon as the vote was taken, he and others telegraphed South, "We cannot get any compromise." Here were six Southern men refusing to vote, when the amendment would have been rejected by four majority if they had voted. Who, then, has brought these evils on the country? Was it Mr. Clark? He was acting on his own policy; but with the help he had from the outside of the Chamber, if all those on this side had been true to the Constitution and faithful to their constituents, and had acted with fidelity to the country, the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire could have been voted down, the defeat of which the Senator from Delaware says, would have saved the country. What fault was it? Who is responsible for it? I think that is not only getting the nail through, but clenching it on the other side, and the whole staple commodity is taken out of the speech. Who did it? Southern traitors, as was said in the speech of the Senator from California. They did it. They wanted no compromise. They accomplished their object by withholding their votes; and hence the country has been involved in the present difficulty. Let me read another extract from this speech of the Senator from California:

"I recollect full well the joy that pervaded the faces of some of those gentlemen at the result, and the sorrow manifested by the renegade Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Crittenden) The record shows that Mr. Pugh, from Ohio, despairing of any compromise between the extremes of ultra Republicans and Disunionists,

working manifestly for the same end, moved, immediately after the vote was announced, to lay the whole subject on the table. If you will turn to page 448, the same volume, you will find, when, at a late period, Mr. Cameron, from Pennsylvania, moved to reconsider the vote, appeals having been made to sustain those who were struggling to preserve the peace of the country, that the vote was reconsidered; and when, at last, the Crittenden propositions were submitted on the 2d day of March, these Southern States having nearly all seceded; they were then lost by but one vote. Here is the vote:

"Yeas—Messrs. Bayard, Bigler, Bright, Crittenden, Douglas, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Polk, Pugh, Rice, Sebastian, Thomson, and Wigfall—18."

Nays—Messrs. Anthony, Bingham, Chandler, Clark, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Harlan, King, Morrill, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson—20."

"If these seceding Southern Senators had remained, they would have passed, by a large vote, (as it did without them,) an amendment, by a two-thirds vote, forbidding Congress ever interfering with Slavery in the States. The Crittenden propositions would have been endorsed by a majority vote, the subject finally going before the people, who have never yet, after consideration, refused justice, for any length of time, to any portion of the country."

"I believe more, Mr. President, that these gentlemen were acting in pursuance of a settled and fixed plan to break up and destroy this Government."

When we had it in our power to vote down the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, and adopt the Crittenden resolutions, certain Southern Senators prevented it; and yet, at a late day of the session, after they had seceded, the Crittenden proposition was only lost by one vote. If rebellion and bloodshed and murder have followed, to whose skirts does the responsibility attach? I summed up all these facts myself in a speech during the last session; but I have preferred to read the speech of the Senator from California, he being better authority, and having presented the facts better than I could.

It may be alleged by Mr. Vallandigham, whose name is of course attached to this address, and who was probably its author, that because the Republicans did not vote for the Crittenden compromise, therefore this formal declaration of the "Democratic members of Congress" stand uncontradicted; but Andrew Johnson in the same speech from which I have quoted, shows that the Republicans gave the strongest assurances of their disposition and determination to do everything to convince the people of the South that they intended no violation of the Constitution, and no infraction of the rights of any State of the Union. He says:

"What else was done at the very same session? The House of Representatives passed, and sent to this body, a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States, so as to prohibit Congress from ever hereafter interfering with the institution of slavery in the States, making that restriction a part of the organic law of the land. That constitutional amendment came here after the Senators from seven States had seceded; and yet it was passed by a two-thirds vote in the Senate. Have you ever heard of any one of the States which had then seceded, or which has since seceded, taking up that amendment to the Constitution, and saying they would ratify it, and make it a part of that instrument? No. Does not the whole history of this rebellion tell you that it was a revolution that the leaders wanted, that they started for, that they intended to have? The facts to which I have referred show how the Crittenden proposition might have been carried; and when the Senators from the slave States were reduced to one-fourth of the members of this body, the two Houses passed a proposition to amend the Constitution, so as to guaranty to the States perfect security in regard to the institution of slavery in all future time, and prohibiting Congress from legislating on the subject."

It is in the face of such a record as this that these "Democratic members of Congress" now come forward and "appeal to the journals of Congress and to the Congressional Globe" to establish the deliberate allegation that, during the last session of the Thirty-sixth Congress, repeated efforts at compromise were made, "and at every stage all proposed amendments inconsistent with the sectional doctrines of the Chicago platform were strenuously and unanimously resisted and defeated by the Republican party." But these fourteen Democratic members of Congress are met by other evidence equally overwhelming. On the 17th of December, 1860, shortly after the election of Mr. Lincoln, and before Secession had taken place, the House of Representatives of the United States adopted the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land, and its ready and faithful observance the duty of all good and law-abiding citizens; Therefore, "Resolved, That we deprecate the spirit of disobedience to that Constitution wherever manifested, and that we earnestly recommend the repeal of all statutes, including personal-liberty bills, so-called, enacted by State legislatures, conflicting with, and in violation of that sacred instrument, and the laws of Congress made in pursuance thereof."

This resolution, calling upon the States to repeal their personal-liberty bills, was passed by a unanimous vote; and the States, acting in the same spirit, did proceed to reconsider them, although they were shown to be totally ineffective; and for ten years they had never caused the escape of a single fugitive slave.

And again, on the motion of the Hon. John Sherman, of Ohio, at a later day, the following resolution was passed by the same body:

"Resolved, That neither Congress nor the people or Governments of the non-slavehold-

CONCLUDED ON FOURTH PAGE