Raftsman's Journal.

BY S. J. ROW. • CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1865. VOL. 11.—NO. 20.

TERMS OF THE JOURNAL.

The RAFTSMAN'S JOURNAL is published on Wednesday at $2.00 per annum in advance. ADVERTISEMENTS inserted at $1.50 per square, for three or less insertions—Ten lines (or less) counting a square. For every additional insertion 50 cents. A deduction will be made to yearly advertisers.

Business Directory.

IRVIN BROTHERS, Dealers in Square & Sawed Lumber. Dry Goods, Groceries, Flour, Grain, &c., &c., Burnside Pa., Sept. 23, 1863.

FREDERICK LEITZINGER, Manufacturer of all kinds of Stone-ware, Clearfield, Pa. Orders solicited—wholesale or retail. Jan. 1, 1863

CRANS & BARRETT, Attorneys at Law, Clearfield, Pa. May 13, 1863.
I. J. CRANS. : : : : : : WALTER BARRETT.

ROBERT J. WALLACE, Attorney at Law, Clearfield, Pa Office in Shaw's new row, Market street, opposite Naugle's jewelry store. May 26.

H. F. NAUGLE, Watch and Clock Maker, and dealer in Watches, Jewelry, &c. Room in Graham's row, Market street. Nov. 16.

H. BUCHER SWOOPE, Attorney at Law, Clearfield, Pa. Office in Graham's Row, four doo s west of Graham & Boynton's store. Nov. 16.

HARTSWICK & HUSTON, Dealers in Drugs, Medicines, Paints, Oils, Stationary, Perfumery, Fancy Goods, Notions, etc., etc., Market street, Clearfield, Pa. June, 29, 1864.

J. P. KRATZER, dealer in Dry Goods, Clothing, Hardware, Queensware, Groceries, Provisions &c. Front Street, above the Academy, Clearfield, Pa. April 27.

WILLIAM F. IRWIN, Market street, Clearfield, Pa., Dealer in Foreign and Domestic Merchandise, Hardware, Queensware, Groceries, and family articles generally. Nov. 16.

JOHN GUELICH, Manufacturer of all kinds of Cabinet-ware, Market street, Clearfield, Pa. He also makes to order Coffins, on short notice, and attends funerals with a hearse. April 0,'59.

DR. M. WOODS, PRACTICING PHYSICIAN, and Examining Surgeon for Pensions. Office, South-west corner of Second and Cherry Street, Clearfield, Pa. January 21, 1863.

THOMAS J. M'CULLOUGH, Attorney at Law, Clearfield, Pa. Office, east of the "Clearfield co. Bank." Deeds and other legal instruments prepared with promptness and accuracy. July 3.

J. B M'ENALLY, Attorney at Law, Clearfield, Pa. Practices in Clearfield and adjoining counties. Office in new brick building of J. Boynton, 2d street, one door south of Larich's Hotel.

RICHARD MOSSOP, Dealer in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods, Groceries, Flour, Bacon, Liquors, &c. Room, on Market street, a few doors west of *Journal Office*, Clearfield, Pa. Apr 27.

LARRIMER & TEST, Attorneys at Law, Clearfield, Pa. Will attend promptly to all legal and other business entrusted to their care in Clearfield and adjoining counties. August 6, 1856.

WM. ALBERT & BRO'S, Dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, Queensware, Flour, Bacon, etc., Woodland, Clearfield county, Penn'a. Also, extensive dealers in all kinds of sawed lumber, shingles, and square timber. Orders solicited. Woodland, Aug. 19th, 1863.

NEW WATCH & JEWELRY STORE.—The undersigned having located in the borough of Clearfield, (at the shop formerly occupied by R. Welch as a jewelry shop,) is prepared to do work of all kinds on the most reasonable terms. The cash will positively be expected when the work is delivered. He is confident that he cannot be excelled by any workmen in town or county. *Come one! come all to the Sign of the Big Watch.*
April 9,'62-1y-pd. S. H. LAUCHLIN.

TEMPERANCE HOUSE.—The subscriber would respectfully inform the citizens of Clearfield county, that he has rented the "Tipton Hotel," and will use every endeavor to accommodate those who may favor him with their custom. He will try to furnish the table with the best the country can afford, and will keep hay and feed to accommodate teamsters. Gentlemen don't forget the "Tipton Hotel." SAMUEL SMITH.
Tipton, Pa., May 25, 1864.

AUCTIONEER.—The undersigned having been Licensed an Auctioneer, would inform the citizens of Clearfield county that, he will attend to calling sales, in any part of the county, whenever called upon. Charges moderate.
Address, JOHN M'QUILKIN,
May 13 Bower Po., Clearfield co., Pa.
N. B. Persons calling sales without a proper license are subject to a penalty of $50, which provision will be enforced against those who may violate the same.

Three Farms For Sale!

SITUATE IN PIKE TOWNSHIP.

The subscriber will sell his three farms situate in Pike township, Clearfield county, Pa., at private sale. Also, one tract of unimproved land—numbered and described as follows, to wit:

No 1 Is an improved tract on which he resides, and contains about 260 acres—200 acres of which is cleared, 25 acres being in meadow, and the whole in a high state of cultivation and under good fences. The improvements are a good frame house, frame barn, (75 by 38 feet,) wagon shed, grain house, smoke house, wood house and other outbuildings. There is timber sufficient on the land for all farm uses, and an excellent coal bank. Also good water and a fine orchard of choice fruit growing thereon.

No. 2. Is an improved tract, and contains 135 acres—of which 80 acres are cleared, 10 acres being in meadow, and the whole in a good state of cultivation and under good fences, with excellent water on the farm. The buildings are a log house and an excellent frame barn and some other outbuildings. There is on this tract sufficient good timber for 7 or 8 rafts, and an excellent coal bank, together with an orchard of choice fruit trees.

No. 3. Is an improved tract, containing about 100 acres, 30 acres cleared, (new,) with a small plank house and barn thereon erected. The land is under good fences, with excellent water on it. About 3 rafts of good timber also standing thereon.

No. 4. Is an unimproved tract of 400 acres with some good pine timber growing on it, and will make an excellent farm when cleared.

The above tracts will be sold in a body, or seperately, to suit purchasers—preferring, however, to sell them in a body. The terms will be reasonable. The tracts can be seen at any time by calling on the subscriber, or inquiries by letter will be answered if addressed to Curwensville, Pa.
August 3, 1864. DANIEL BAILEY.

SALT! SALT!! SALT!!!—A prime article of ground alum salt, put up in patent sacks, at $3.25 per sack, at the cheap cash store of
November 27. R. MOSSOP.

FODDER CUTTERS—of a superior make—for sale at reasonable prices, a MERRELL and BIGLER'S, Clearfield, Pa

Remarks of

HON. G. W. SCOFIELD,

January 6, 1865,

In the House of Representatives, on the Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the prohibition of slavery.

MR. SCOFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make some observations in reply to the very remarkable criticism pronounced by the gentlemen from New York [Mr. BROOKS] on the anti-slavery portion of the President's message.

If the war should end now without a division of the Union, what would be the status of slavery? It has been abolished in Maryland by the new constitution; but it is said the soldiers had no right to vote, and without their votes the constitution was not adopted. West Virginia has provided for gradual emancipation; but that State, it is alleged, has no legal existence, and therefore its action is null and void. In the State of Virginia a new constitution prohibiting slavery has been adopted by the loyal people within the Union lines; but the constitutionality of this action has been much questioned, even by anti-slavery men. Missouri has partially abolished slavery, and the convention, soon to assemble there, it is supposed, will dispose of what is left. In Tennessee, Louisiana, and Arkansas, slavery has been prohibited by conventions representing the Union people of those States; but it is said that these conventions were irregularly called, and their action is therefore void. In Kentucky such slaves as enter the United States Army are freed by act of Congress; but it is alleged that the act is unconstitutional. Congress has abolished slavery in the District of Columbia, and prohibited it all in the Territories: but it is said the first act is void, without the assent of Maryland and Virginia, and the latter is in conflict with the dictum of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott. In all the remainder of the States the slaves were liberated by the President's proclamation; but that instrument, it is said, is too just to be legal. Under these several enactments, however, the slaves, without waiting to test their validity, are leaving their old masters, forming new associations, seeking education, earning new homes, learning self-reliance, and thus erecting barriers to the revival of slavery stronger than legislation itself.

It is apparent from this statement that if the confederacy should suddenly collapse, liberating our Union fellow-citizens that are believed to exist in large numbers within its picket lines, we would still have the slavery question, out of which the whole trouble grew, to be settled and disposed of. It ought to be equally apparent to all observing persons that there is but one way to end the strife Slavery in the end must die. It has cost the country too much suffering and too much patriotic blood, and is in theory an institution too monstrous, to be permitted to live. The only question is, shall it die now, by a constitutional amendment—a single stroke of the ax—or shall it linger in party warfare through a quarter or half a century of acrimonious debate, patchwork legislation, and conflicting adjudication? The people were consulted upon this question last fall, and they have responded in favor of emancipation. I respect their opinion, not because I am a politician, the motive hinted at in the message, but because experience has taught me to rely upon the judgment of the unambitious classes. I am reminded that there was a large minority. True, but the suffering consequent upon this terrible war, and not love of slavery, made the minority so large. The people suffered from the draft, from taxation, and from a depreciated currency, and untruthful men told them that their own Government imposed these hardships, not from the necessities created by the rebellion, but from mere love of despotic cruelty. Consult your Democratic constituency and you will find they are not so much infatuated with slavery as many suppose. I think I would not misrepresent the largest portion of the Democrats in my own district if I say that however much they have condemned anti-slavery agitation prior to the rebellion, they would now be glad to have the institution buried out of their sight forever. Two classes alone would object: those who are so poorly endowed as to be jealous of negro competition, and those who, being more happily born, apprehend that their pride and importance might in some way be compromised if the distance between themselves and any portion of the laboring class were lessened.

The President, in obedience to the advice of the people and the dictates of his own kind heart and unimpassioned judgment, has recommended that we should submit this amendment to the action of the States. Why should it not be done?

Because, says the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BROOKS,] we should not amend the Constitution in the midst of civil war. Why, then, did he, in the close of his speech, propose to amend it through the medium of a convention, so as to give slavery an increased representation in this House and a protraction of its mischievous life, and, further, to amend, in pursuit of some State sovereignty vagary, so as to sink the Government of the United States into a mere agency for the collection of customs? Do not take the medicine now, says the tender nurse to the sick man, wait till you are well and able to bear it. If the gentleman will examine his own heart he will probably find that it is the character of the amendment that is offensive to him, and not its untimely presentation.

Again, says the gentleman, some of the States are not represented here. He seems to forget that Congress does not make amendments to the Constitution, but only proposes them. They must be accepted by three fourths of all the States in the Union before they become part of the fundamental law. If Congress cannot even propose amendments before the seceded States come in, how can the gentleman call his convention? for that must be done by Congress. If these States are not represented here the fault it theirs, not ours. Must all the legislation be stayed until they choose to return? and if not, why this more than other important acts? If that rule should be adopted we would always be in the power of a few members who chose to place themselves beyond the reach of the Sergeant-at-Arms. The gentleman trifles with the gravity of the question and the good sense of the House when he raises these objections, but still proposes to waive them in favor of a convention to consider his own amendments.

Why not tolerate slavery, continues the honorable gentleman, and thus make the slaveholders contented with the Union? What evidence is there that toleration would content them? They seperated from the Union, and organized an independant government in February, 1861. When, prior to that, had the institution for whose prolonged cruelty the gentlemen pleads so earnestly lacked toleration? I submit that it had always been tolerated; nay, more, it had always had its will and its way in this Republic—I trust I will not offend any member's sensibilities if, I say its oppressive will and its unchristian way. Whatever was asked was granted. When it asked new markets to raise the price of men and women, and to create a demand for the surplus children of the institution, the request was granted. Louisiana and Florida Territories were purchased in part for this purpose. For this purpose Texas was smuggled into the Union, and a war unnecessary for any other purpose secured the northern provinces of Mexico. When it demanded that white laborers should go further north, and surrender mild-climated Missouri to slave labor, the surrender was made. When from motives of policy it demanded the passage of the Missouri compromise, it was passed. When it demanded its repeal it was repealed. It bade us vote down the Wilmot proviso, and we obeyed. It demanded that escaped bondmen should be caught and returned, free of cost, and we gave them the despotic law. Again it demanded exemption from the criticism to which all things else in a republic are exposed, and we granted the immunity. To enforce the slaveholders censorship of the mails, and authorized the burning of all offensive papers and letters, in the vain hope to destroy eternal ideas. To this end it demanded silence in this House and in the Senate, and we adopted the "Atherton gag." To this end it demanded silence in the North, and every city raised its pro-slavery mob to demolish presses and murder editors and lecturers. The hand of slavery has ever been against everybody, giving the Republic no rest day nor night All day long these Halls and the country resounded with its insolent demands. Now the West must be Africanized, now the East must be crushed, now Cuba must be stolen, and now Africa, unbarred to the pirates, and it woke us up at night with its fierce clamor for escaped negroes. No, sir, slavery rebelled not because it was not tolerated, but because it would not tolerate anything else; I may say because it could not afford to tolerate anything else. It would not tolerate the Declaration of Independence, because that instrument proclaimed the freedom and equality of the human race. It would not tolerate the literature of the English language, nor the Christianity of the American churches, nor the civilization of the nineteenth century, because their spirit was opposed to human bondage. It could not tolerate New England, because her education, her industry, her sobriety, her justice, and her unboasting courage was an implied censure upon slavery. And last of all, slavery refused to tolerate the great principle upon which this Republic is founded—upon which all republics must be founded; the will of the majority constitutionally expressed. It was not only intolerant, but belligerant. It could not be otherwise. It recognized a natural, though undeclared foe in every good cause, word, and work, and in its efforts to destroy these it has destroyed itself. Conscious of its own inherent wrong it began its defense before it was assailed, and like the glass fortress, it has fallen not by the assault of its enemies, but by the concussion of its own guns. It is pierced by its own poisoned arrows.

"So the struck eagle, stretched upon the plain,
No more through rolling clouds to soar again
Viewed his own feathers on the fatal dart,
And winged the shaft that quivered in his heart."

We can hardly claim the honor of aiding in its taking off. Like Falstaff's victim, it was quite dead before we dared to strike. But tolerate it, cries the gentleman, and pacify the madmen of the South. If New York were afflicted with hydrophobia, the gentleman would advise his constituents to tolerate mad dogs. Do not muzzle them, he would tenderly exclaim, do not chain them, do not kill them, but tolerate, conciliate, cherish them until this terrible disease disappears from the city. But if slavery is prohibited the country will become homogeneous, and, in his opinion, homogeneity is not desirable. Neither the ancient nor modern nations of Europe, he informs us, were homogeneous. They had many systems of worship, and many kinds of languages and races of men; but unfortunately for his argument, in another part of his speech, and for a different purpose, he confesses that these same nations were afflicted with long and frequent civil wars originating in that lack of homogeneity which he so much commends. But if this diversity of character is as desirable as represented, certainly we have enough of it without trying to reinstate slavery. Religion is nowhere more free than in this country. Every man selects his own altar. And as for races and languages, what quarter of the many-tongued earth has not contributed to our population? No thanks however to the honorable gentleman for this. As the leader and organ editor of the American party, he could not tolerate these foreign-born races, nor the adherents of the Catholic church, and he comes here now and asks us to be more intolerant even than that. He asks us to prescribe a whole race, not only to the extent to which proscribed foreign-born races, but to go further and proscribe them from the human family and rank them with the brute creation. And he asks us to do this in the name of toleration. "Strange that a man's mouth can run on thus."

It has been often said of late that history repeats itself. Of course it cannot be literally true; but the gentleman cites it, and then proceeds to search for the prototype of the terrible drama now being enacted on this continent, and affects to find it in the Revolution of 1776. Having settled this point to his own satisfaction, he proceeds to assign to the living actors their historic parts. The rebels take the position of the colonial revolutionists, the Government of the United States re-enact the part of George III and his ministers, while for himself and the Opposition debaters of this House he selects the honorable *role* of Chatham, Fox, Burke, and other champions of colonial rights in the British Parliament. Let us examine this. It is true that the colonists rebelled against the Government of Great Britain, and the slaveholders rebelled against the Government of the United States; but here the likeness ends. Between the circumstances that might provoke or justify rebellion in the two cases there is no resemblance. The Government from which the colonies separated was three thousand miles beyond the seas. They could not even communicate with it in those days in less than two or three months. In that Government they had no representation, and their wants and wishes no authoritative voice. Nor was it the form of government most acceptable to the colonists. They prefered a republic. The rapidly increasing population and the geographical extent and position of the colonies demanded nationality. Sooner or later it must come. The tea tax and other trifling grievances only hurried on an event that was sure to occur from the influence of geography and population alone. How is it in these respects with the present rebellion? The Government against which the slaveholders rebelled was not a foreign one; it was as much theirs as ours. They were fully represented in it. There was scarcely a law, I think there was not a single law, upon the statute-book to which they had not given their assent. It was the Government they helped to make, and it was made as they wanted it. They had ever had their share of control and patronage in it, and more than their share, for they boasted with much truth that cotton was king. Nor is there any geographical reasons in their favor. It is conceded even by the rebels themselves that a division of the territory lying compactly between the lakes and gulf, the Atlantic and the Mississippi, into two nations would be a great misfortune to both. If it were the Pacific States demanding separation, bad as that would be, there would be some sense in it; but for this territory you cannot even find a dividing line. When you attempt to run one, the rivers and mountains cross your purpose. Both the land and water oppose the division. There is no disunion outside the wicked hearts of these disloyal men. I can see no resemblance, then, between our patriot fathers, who toiled through a seven years' war to establish this beneficent Government, and the traitors who drench the land in blood in an attempt—I trust in God a vain one—to destroy it.

Again, sir, in what respect do the apologists of the present rebellion in this House resemble the advocates of our great Revolution in the British Parliament? Conceding they are their equals in statesmanship, learning, eloquence, and wit, I submit that they fall far below them in the merit of their respective causes. Chatham defended the cause of the colonists as set forth in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—the honorable gentleman from New York pleads for slavery, the auction block, the coffle, the lash. With slavery he cures all national troubles. He begs for harmony among ourselves. How shall we be united? "Restore slavery," says he. He is opposed to war. How then shall rebels in arms be subdued? "Revive the traffic of blood." He is opposed to taxes. How then shall our exhausted treasury be replenished? "Raise more children for the market." Slavery, more slavery, still more slavery, is the only prescription of the Opposition doctors. If we are to look for the representatives of these great men on this side of the Atlantic I would not select them from among those who, born and raised in the free States, with all their moral and educational advantages, had not yet quite virtue enough when the struggle came to be patriots, nor quite courage enough to be rebels, but I would rather select them from such men as Johnson of Tennessee, or Davis of Maryland, who, born and educated amid the influences of slavery, still stood up for the Union cause at first almost alone. But, sir, the representatives of these men are to be found now as they were then on the other side of the Atlantic, the leaders of the liberal party in the British Parliament.

There is another party that figures largely in the history of the revolutionary struggle that the gentleman omitted entirely to name. He gave them no place in his caste of parts. The ommission may be attributed to either modesty or forgetfulness. Prior to the Revolution the members of this party had filled all the places of honor and profit in the colonies, and when the war came they heartily espoused the cause of the king, though they did not generally join his armies. Their principal business was to magnify disaster, deprecate success, denounce the currency, complain of the taxes, and denounce and dodge arbitrary arrests. To the patriot cause they were ever prophets of evil. Failure was their word. The past was a failure, the future would be. In the beginning of the war this party was in the majority in some of the colonies, and constituted a large minority in all, but as the war progressed their numbers constantly diminished. Many of the leaders were from time to time sent beyond the "lines" and their estates confiscated. Most of these settled in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, right handy to the place where the gentleman informs us he was born. This party was called tories, and if this war is but a repetition of the war of the Revolution, as the gentleman intimates, where are their present representatives?

Again exclaims the gentleman, "You cannot subjugate eight million people." I know not which most to condemn in this expression, (I speak of course without personal application,) its insinuation of falsehood or its confession of cowardice. The United States does not propose to subjugate any portion of its people, but only to exact obedience to law from all. It is this misrepresentation of the purpose of the Government that still keeps alive the dying flames of the rebellion. I can go further with perfect truth, and say that it was this misrepresentation that lighted those flames at first. The slaveholders were told that it was the purpose of the Administration to destroy their personal and political rights; next they were reminded that they were proud, brave, chivalric men, and then tauntingly asked if they were going to submit. They were thus fairly coaxed and goaded into rebellion. Except for this misrepresentation the Union people would have been in a large majority in all the slave States, and despite it they are in a majority in more than half of them to-day if they could be heard. But they are gagged, bound hand and foot by a despotism so cruel and so mean, so thorough and so efficient, that even the gentleman from New York has no fault to find with it. The country is too much engaged now with the immediate actors in the drama to look behind the screens for the authors and promptors of the play. But when these actors have disappeared from the stage, gone down to graves never to be honored, or wandering among strangers never to be loved; in the peaceful future, when inquisition shall be made for the authors, abettors, aiders, and abettors of this great crime, the two classes so often coupled in denunciation in this Hall, the Abolitionists of the North, and the fire-eaters of the South, will be scarcely noticed, but the quiet historian will "point his slow, unmoving finger" at those northern leaders who for fifteen years have deceived the South and betrayed the North. They will stand alone. The large majority that now gathers around them, moved thereto more in hopes to escape the severe hardships of the war than from any love of them or their position, will have melted away from their support like dissolving ice beneath their feet, and well will it be for their posterity if they can manage them, like Byron's wrecks, to sink into the

"Depths with bubbling groan,
Without a grave, unknelled, uncoffined, and unknown."

Subjugate the South! No, sir; it is the purpose as it is the duty of the Government to liberate the South, to drive out the usurpers, and to restore to the deluded and betrayed masses the blessings of a free Republic.

But the gentleman not only misrepresents the purpose of the Government to inflame the insurgents, but also misrepresents the extent of the rebellion to discourage the people in their efforts to subdue it. Where does he find his eight million hostile people? Allowing for West Virginia and East Tennessee, the whole white population of the eleven States that pretended to secede does not exceed one half that number. A large portion of these are now within the Union lines, professing no more hostility to the Government than the gentleman himself. Of those that remain under the power of the usurper a considerable number, in some localities more than half, do not desire a separate Government, but would gladly accept the protection and privileges of the United States if sure that they were beyond the reach of their present oppressors. Where then I ask again, does the gentleman find his eight million people? Does he mean to include the colored population of those States? I suppose not; they are to be tolerated only as brutes. He would not of course include them under the head of *people*. I do not suppose he intended to include any portion of his own party. I have a right to conclude, then, that this number was only a slashing estimate to make a bad case. With half the white and all the black population in these seceded States, it would be very strange if the Government were not strong enough to compel submission from the rest. The gentleman himself gives some little encouragement. The little State of Maine (in which he tells us just in this connection he was born) is a match for England, France, and Russia, and he finally adds for all Europe combined.

Now, sir, if this little State which had only the honor of rocking his cradle, that claimed him only in long frocks and petticoats, could withstand all Europe single-handed, is it not reasonable to suppose that combined with the State of his adoption, the great State of New York, that possesses him in all the glory of pantalooned manhood, it could flog the world and the "rest of mankind," in which I suppose the rebels would be included? Maine can be relied upon for the contest, so can New York, since no perfidious hand now holds the helm, and the gentleman himself gives some hope that he may be goaded into the support of his struggling, suffering country. There is a point, he tells us, beyond which his forbearence will not go. It was not reached when the rebels seized our forts, navy-yards, arsenals, ships-of-war, mint, and custom-houses, mails and post offices. It was not reached when they fired upon Sumter. It was not reached when they raised an army, hoisted a traitors flag, and laid siege to the capital. It was not reached when they put pirates on the ocean to sieze, rob, and burn the peaceable merchant vessels from his own city. It was not reached when they raised the black flag and shot down our patriotic soldiers after surrender and then burned the hospitals over the heads of the sick and wounded. It was not reached when they murdered women and children and unarmed men, and burned the vilages on the border without military motive. It was not reached when by the slow torture of hunger and cold they murdered by the thousand our dear, brave boys, prisoners of war in their hands. But he has an ultimatum notwithstanding. He announces it from his place in this Hall, and boldly flings it in the teeth of the rebels, and has the courage to hope that they may hear him. They must not go too far nor presume too much upon his forbearance. He will not stand everything. The insults and crimes I have named he can endure, forgive, forget; but if they dare to inspect his baggage as he travels South, he "will not submit; never, never," he repeats. "Will you fight them?" inquires the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. WILSON.] Mark now the pluck of his answer. "When the day and hour come I will be ready to mark out the course I will pursue." Cambrone alone can answer that. It is fortunate for the rebels that the honorable gentleman has not yet learned that the privilege so highly prised has been denied him for three years and a half.

Again, centralization, the absorption of all local and municipal authority by the Federal Government, is another lion in the way of emancipation. What possible connection is there between centralization and emancipation? Why should one follow the other? Emancipation has been going on quite rapidly for two or three years; has the gentleman's city lost any of its municipal rights in consequence? Is it not still ruled by the "Five Points" majority, with nothing to fear but its own mobs! Does it not still elect corrupt men for judges, and thieves to the councils! Let the gentleman look at home with his fears. It is his own city that is centralizing, centralizing all the disloyalty and depravity of the North, and here he should begin his labors.

power in this country. Of late years the Government itself has been subsiduary to it. Slavery had a capital of at least $2,000,000,000, as much under the control of a few men as if it were a corporation with a president and directors. It was this investment, thus centralized, that has been so appropriately and expressively, but to some people very offensively, called the "slave power." Its control over the finances, trade, and politics of the country was almost supreme. It controlled the slave States by community of interest; by this agency it then selected the President of the United States, and through his patronage controlled the free States. It may be said without exaggeration that it owned the South, used the Government, and hired the North. Emancipation will rid the country of this centralizing power, and if the gentleman is really opposed to centralization he ought to vote for it.

The gentleman closes his remarks with an appeal to the friends of the Administration to stop the war but save the Union. If our armies are withdrawn from the territory claimed by the rebel leaders the war will be stopped undoubtedly, but the Union will be divided. South of the Ohio and Potomac there will be another Government, practically recognized by us and formally acknowledged by all other nations. But on the other hand, if the rebels can be induced to disband their armies the war will cease and the Union be preserved. Now, sir, in imitation of the honorable gentleman, I will close my remarks with an appeal to him and his political associates to aid in the accomplishment of this latter result. Do you inquire what you can do? Go and proclaim to the deluded supporters of Jefferson Davis two simple truths. First, that the United States does not now and never did seek their subjugation, but only their submission to law. Tell them that the first election of Mr. Lincoln did not involve any interference with slavery in the States where it existed, and that subsequent emancipation originated not in the virtue of the Government but in the necessities created by their own misconduct. If slavery was their motive for separation, the removal of that motive by the removal of slavery was our necessity. Whatever has been constitutionally done in that direction by congressional, State, or executive action must remain unless it is undone by authority equally constitutional. That they must submit to the Constitution in all its parts, including that which authorizes its own amendment. Second, tell them that while the United States asks nothing more from them than submission to law, it will accept nothing less; and above all, it will not consent to its own dismemberment and the creation of two Governments between the Gulf and the Lakes. Tell them that the people have the will and the power to sustain this purpose of the Government. Though they are accustomed to spend their money with economy and do not wantonly shed their blood, they have made up their minds, from high convictions of duty, to bear with patience whatever loss and sufferings the execution of this purpose may entail. Tell them that while the Government and people are thus determined, they are not vindictive. They do not raise the black flag, but constantly tender to the deluded masses pardon and protection. Go tell these two facts to the insurgent people, hitherto misinformed and misled by your untruthful allegations, and you will see them begin to drop away from their reckless leaders, and with the blossoms of the coming spring will come the sweeter blessings of peace.