The Compiler.

A DEMOCRATIC AND FAMILY JOURNAL.

By H. J. STAHLE. "TRUTH IS MIGHTY AND WILL PREVAIL." TWO DOLLARS A-YEAR.

45th Year. GETTYSBURG, PA., MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1863. No. 29.

Terms.

The COMPILER is published every Monday morning, by HENRY J. STAHLE, at $1 75 per annum if paid strictly IN ADVANCE—$2 00 per annum if not paid in advance. No subscription discontinued, unless at the option of the publisher, until all arrearges are paid.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted at the usual rates.

JOB PRINTING done with neatness and dispatch.

OFFICE in South Baltimore street, directly opposite Wamplers' Tinning Establishment —"COMPILER PRINTING OFFICE" on the sign.

Lancaster Book Bindery.

GEORGE WIANT, BOOK BINDER AND BLANK BOOK MANUFACTURER, LANCASTER, PA.

Plain and Ornamental Binding, of every description, executed in the most substantial and approved styles.

REFERENCES.

E. W. Brown, Esq., Farmers Bank of Lancaster.
W. L. Peiper, Esq., Lancaster County Bank
Samuel. Shock, Esq., Columbia Bank.
Samuel Wagner, Esq., York Bank.
William Wagner, Esq., York County Bank.
T. D. Carson, Esq., Bank of Gettysburg.
Peter Martin, Esq., Proth'y of Lancaster co., Pa.
Geo. C. Hawthorn, Esq., Register " "
Geo. Whitson, Esq., Recorder " "
April 15, 1861.

Fresh Groceries,

NEW NOTIONS, FINE LIQUORS, &C.—The undersigned has just returned from the city with the largest stock of new goods he has yet laid in, which, having bought for cash, he is prepared to sell as low as anybody here or elsewhere. He will enumerate a portion of his stock: COFFEES, SUGARS, Molasses, Cheese, Bacon, Potatoes, Salt, Vinegar, Spices; Candles, Soaps, Brooms, Brushes, Halters, Bed Cords, Cedar and Willow Ware, SEGARS and TOBACCOS, large lots of best and common brands; with all sorts of NOTIONS.

He has a finer stock of LIQUORS than is usually found outside of the cities, viz: Imported and Domestic Brandies, four kinds, the best for medicinal uses: Old Rye, very superior, for the same purpose; Imported Wines, also Domestic Wine; Schiedam Schnapps, Rums, Whiskies, &c. Every article is warranted to be what it is sold for.

Recollect, this is the place to buy cheap.—Let such as doubt it call, and they will be convinced. GEO. F. KALBFLEISCH.

Jan. 19, 1863.

New Goods!—Large Stock!

MERCHANT TAILORING.

JACOBS & BRO. have just received from the cities a large stock o goods for Gentlemen's wear, embracing a variety of

CLOTHS, CASSIMERES, VESTINGS,

Cashmets, Jeans, &c., with many other goods for spring and summer wear.

They are prepared to make up garments at the shortest notice, and in the very best manner. The Fashions are regularly received, and clothing made in any desired style. They always make neat fits, whilst their sewing is sure to be substantial.

They ask a continuance of the public's patronage, resolved by good work and moderate charges to earn it.

Gettysburg, April 7, 1863.

Town Property

AT PRIVATE SALE.—The undersigned offers at Private Sale the Property in which he now resides, situate in East Middle street, Gettysburg, adjoining S. R. Tipton on the west and Mrs. McElroy on the east, with an alley in the rear. THE HOUSE is a two-story Frame, Weatherboarded, with Back-building; a well of water, with a pump in it, at the door; and a variety of fruit, such as apples, pears, peaches, apricots, cherries, and grapes, all the most choice.

ZACHARIAH MYERS.

Nov. 12, 1860. tf

Ready-made Clothing.

GEORGE ARNOLD has now got up his fall and winter stock of Clothing, consisting of Over Coats, in great variety, very cheap,

Dress Coats,
Business Coats,
Monkey Jackets,
Pantaloons, Vests,
Shirts, Drawers, &c. &c.

All of our own manufacture, and done up in the very best manner, and will be sold very cheap. Give us a call.

Gettysburg, Nov. 2, 1862.

Piano Tuning.

PROF. BOWER, of Littlestown, a Practical Piano Tuner, informs his friends and the musical public in general, that he gives his time, not otherwise occupied, to Tuning and Repairing Pianos, at moderate prices. He promises entire satisfaction, or no pay. Orders received at this office. [Sept. 16, 1861.

O Yes.—O Yes—O Yes.

THE under-signed would most respectfully announce to the people of Gettysburg and its vicinity, that he intends to continue SALE CRYING, in its various branches, having taken out License for that purpose. Goods taken on commission and sold at as moderate charges as can be expected. H. G. CARR.

York St., Gettysburg, Dec 29, '62. 3m

Coopering.

JOHN CHRISMER is carrying on the Coopering business, in all its branches, in York street, Gettysburg. FLOUR BARRELS, in any desired quantity, made to order, at short notice, and at low profits. REPAIRING, of all kinds, attended to, promptly and cheaply.—Every effort will be made to render satisfaction to customers.

Dec. 29, 1862. 6m

New Fall and Winter

GOODS.—A. SCOTT & SON have in store and are now selling as cheap as the cheapest a good assortment of Dry Goods, consisting of Ladies' Dress Goods, such as

Merinoes, Cobergs, Delaines, Travelling Mixtures, Alpaccas, &c. Also—Cloths, Cassimeres, Satinetts, Over-coatings,
Tweeds, Jeans, Flannels, &c.,

to which we invite the attention of buyers.—All we ask is an examination before purchasing elsewhere. A. SCOTT & SON.

Nov. 3, 1862.

Coal! Coal! Coal.

SHEADS & BUEHLER are now prepared to supply COAL, of superior quality, in any quantity desired. Terms, Cash.

Come One! Come All!

☞ They also request those indebted to them to call and pay up, as funds are much needed. Who will be the first to call? Office open from 7 to 7.

Feb. 24, 1862.

John W. Tipton,

FASHIONABLE BARBER, North-east corner of the Diamond, (next door to McClellan's Hotel,) Gettysburg, Pa., where he can at all times be found ready to attend to all business in his line. He has also excellent assistance and will ensure satisfaction. Give him a call. [Dec. 3, 1860.

Highly Important

INFORMATION.—A RARE CHANCE FOR A FORTUNE. READ! READ!! READ!!!

THE EASTERN ART UNION ASSOCIATION have now ready for distribution to subscribers their beautiful chrono lithograph of

"THE UPRISING OF THE SPIRIT OF THE NORTH,"

a splendid national picture, size 24x36, of the great uprising of the North, when the telegraph brought the electric news that Fort Sumpter had fallen. No parlor should be without this superb engraving. Price only THREE DOLLARS, and sent securely sealed, on rollers, post-paid on receipt of the price. Every person who purchases one of these engravings is entitled to a prize varying in value from one dollar to *three hundred dollars*. Send in your orders early, to A. W. CAREY,

Box 270, Lancaster, Pa.

March 16, 1863. 6t

STATIONERY, of all kinds, at Dr. R. HORNER'S New Family Drug and Prescription Store.

Miscellaneous.

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM HOPKINS,

OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 9, 1863,

On Joint Resolutions on the state of the country.

MR. SPEAKER: The magnitude of the issues involved in the question before us must be my apology for trespassing upon the indulgence of the House at this late hour of the session. Before proceeding to the discussion of the resolutions, I desire to strip the subject of the mists thrown around it by the political harangue delivered on last night by the learned and eloquent gentleman from Allegheny, (Mr. Shannon.)—Whatever may be said of the length of that speech, or of its applicability to the subject under discussion, all will agree that its *logic* was irresistible. It would be impossible to remember all that was said in the course of a three hours' speech; and I regret that an opportunity was not afforded me to reply to him at the time, when his remarks were more fresh in my memory.

Had a stranger chanced to enter this hall during the first two hours of the gentleman's speech, he would have supposed that a political gathering of partisans was assembled here, and that the orator was arraigning the great Democratic party upon a charge of inconsistency, especially upon the slavery question. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that my powers of perception did not enable me to see the relevancy of this part of the gentleman's speech to the question under discussion. Suppose, sir, we concede that the Democratic party has been inconsistent upon this question, or that it has been even as variable upon all questions as the opposition party (with which the gentleman himself is *now* identified) with its varied names, how would that affect the present condition of our country? Sir, in the present sad and trying hour, when the pillars of our glorious Republic seem to be crumbling, and the temple of our liberties rocking on its foundation stones, it would be more patriotic and statesmanlike to strive to prevent its utter overthrow, rather than to indulge in tirades about party consistency.

But to the *logic* of the gentleman from Allegheny. He told us that a Democratic convention was held in the city of Pittsburg in 1849, at which a resolution was adopted "against the further extension of slavery," and therefore, by the gentleman's logic, every subordinate of the administration has a right to arrest and imprison for months a private and peaceable citizen in a loyal State, "without due process of law," or without even any information or accusation being made according to the requirements of the Constitution. Is not that clear?

Again—the gentleman told us that Floyd, Thomson and Cobb had defrauded the government out of large sums, consisting of arms, bonds, &c., and therefore he would have us believe that the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been plundered from the Treasury during the present administration, was all right; and not only so, but the man who questions the integrity of these public robbers, is "in sympathy with the rebellion." Is not this equally clear?

The gentleman, also, told us that James Buchanan, in 1819, offered a resolution against the introduction of slavery into Free territory, and therefore, according to the gentlemen's logic, President Lincoln had an undoubted right to issue his proclamation freeing the slaves in the revolted States. Who will fail to be convinced by such cogent reasoning as this?

Having thus disposed of the gentleman's political declamation, of which I cannot see the pertinency, I proceed, Mr. Speaker, to notice his argument upon the resolutions. The only reference he made to these, was to the third, fourth and seventh. The third reads thus:

"*Third*, That this General Assembly recognizes a manifest difference between the administration of the government and the government itself; the one is transitory, limited in duration to that period of time for which the officers elected by the people are charged with the conduct of the same; the other is permanent, intended by its founders to endure forever."

This resolution the gentleman was pleased to stigmatize as worthy only of the notice of a school-boy. Mr. Speaker, it does not so strike me; and, inasmuch as there have been found in this House but three persons to vote with the gentleman against this resolution, I am safe in saying that there are many who recognize here a sentiment and a principle that merits something more than a sneer—and amongst those who think so are many upon the gentleman's own side of the House, who are almost as old and as learned as himself. There are many in this land who confound the government with the administration. If this is not so, why are men denounced as traitors who, while unwavering in their fidelity to the Constitution—which is the life of the government—feel it their duty to denounce some of the measures of Mr. Lincoln, his Cabinet, and the Republican Congress, who compose the administration? Why, sir, when was it ever supposed that fealty to the government required blind and passive acquiescence in the policy of the party who, for the time being, might have control of the administration? If this dogma were true, our country has always been cursed with a prolific brood of traitors. For the time has never heretofore been when those out of power did not freely discuss, and even bitterly denounce, the measures of the party in power—if we except the days of the elder Adams, when it was attempted, by the then opponents of the Democratic party, to make it seditious and treasonable to speak disrespectfully of the President.—Can it be that those days are to return again?

The fourth resolution is in these words:

"*Fourth*, That this General Assembly, in the exercise of its right to differ with the Federal Executive, enters its solemn protest against the proclamation of the President of the United States, dated the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, by which he assumes to emancipate slaves in certain States, holding the same to be unwise, unconstitutional and void."

In regard to this resolution, I shall have something to say hereafter. For the present, I pass on to the consideration of the seventh resolution, which is as follows:

"*Seventh*, That this General Assembly deem it proper further to declare, that it, together with all the truly loyal people of the State, would hail with pleasure and delight any manifestation of a desire on the part of the seceded States to return to their allegiance to the government of the Union, and would, in such event, cordially and earnestly co-operate with them in the restoration of peace and the procurement of such proper guarantees as would give security to all their interests and rights."

And this, Mr. Speaker, is the resolution which the gentleman from Allegheny treated with such scorn and contempt; and concerning which he even used the polite and classic expression, that he would "spit upon it." I venture to say, sir, that this resolution embodies the spirit of every prayer that is offered to the Throne of Grace by every *truly* christian man. Yes, sir, go with me to yonder sanctuary of the living God, and listen to that devoted servant of the Prince of Peace, whose mission was to preach "peace on earth, good will to man," and hear him as he invokes the "Great God of Battles to restore once more to our beloved and bleeding country the inestimable blessings of peace." What think you, Mr. Speaker, would be the response of a gentleman who would *sneer* at such a resolution as this? Would it be a hearty "amen?"—No, sir; no. It would be "blood," "blood," "blood." Or, Mr. Speaker, go with me, if you please, to yonder humble cottage, and as you approach tread lightly, for it is the abode of a widow, whose husband has fallen on the battle field, in defending the "glorious ensign of the Republic, *once* known and honored throughout the world." See her as she meekly bows, surrounded by her little ones; hear her as she implores Him who has promised to be "a father to the fatherless and a husband to the widow;" see her gushing tears, as she whispers, "O, Father, I would humbly beseech Thee to put it into the hearts of those who have taken up arms against the government to return to their allegiance, 'and thus stay the further ravages of this cruel war, that others may not be spared from my sad fate."—What would be the response of the gentleman from Allegheny and those who applauded his sentiments on that side of the House, and in the gallery. Would it be a cordial "amen?" No, sir; I suppose it would be, "we spit upon it." Because, Mr. Speaker, such a prayer is the very essence of this seventh resolution. Nothing, it seems, will satisfy these gentlemen but blood, more blood. Or in the language of a reverend gentleman, whom I shall notice by and by, the extermination of every man, woman and child in the revolted States.—In the exhuberance of the gentleman's desire to present the resolutions, and those who voted for them, in as odious a light as possible, he ignored the eighth altogether. That resolution reads thus:

"*Eighth*, That the soldiers composing our armies merit the warmest thanks of the nation. Their country called, and nobly did they respond. Living, they shall know a nation's gratitude; wounded, a nation's care, and dying, they shall live in our memories, and monuments shall be raised to teach posterity to honor the patriots and heroes who offered their lives at their country's altar. Their widows and orphans shall be adopted by the nation, to be watched over, and cared for as objects truly worthy a nation's guardianship."

And this is one of the series of resolutions which the gentleman calls "miserable trash," and this, notwithstanding the gentleman himself voted for this particular one. I undertake to say, sir, that every Democrat in the Commonwealth would cordially endorse the sentiment herein contained.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of the most terrible civil war that history records. We are surrounded by circumstances the most extraordinary that this or any other country has ever witnessed. Does it not then become the true patriot to pause and inquire, where are we? and whither are we drifting? Some two years since a wicked and unjustifiable rebellion was inaugurated in a number of the States of this Union, under which an armed force of from four to six hundred thousand men arrayed themselves against the authority of the Federal government, while the government itself has marshalled a much larger force to compel obedience to its Constitution and laws, and save both from overthrow. In the incipiency of this unnatural and deplorable strife, there *seemed* to be but one object on the part of the government, and that was to restore the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws over the revolted States. This may be seen by reference to the resolution of Congress, passed in July, 1861, which was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the Southern States, now in arms against the Constitutional Government, and in arms around the Capital; that in this National emergency, Congress, banishing all feeling of mere passion or resentment, will recollect only its duty to the whole country; that this war is not waged on their part in any spirit of oppression, or for any purpose of conquest or subjugation or purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease."

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was regarded at the time, and for many months afterwards, as the true test of loyalty, throughout all the loyal States, and it was adopted by a Republican House of Representatives, with, I believe, but three dissenting votes.

Thus we find the immediate representatives of the people, in the most solemn and unequivocal manner, defining what the purposes of the war, on our part, were.—With the object of the war thus defined, the patriotic citizens throughout the country, without distinction of party, rallied to the support of the government by hundreds of thousands, and to their credit be it said, they did not stop to inquire who occupied the Executive chair, and, sir, with a patriotism rarely if ever equalled, and a courage never surpassed, tens of thousands of these brave men have laid down their lives on the altar of their country. Yes, sir, the land has been deluged with blood in this fratricidal war, and much of it the best blood of the country, and it is not, perhaps, an exaggeration to say that a hundred thousand widows, and five hundred thousand orphan children, are to-day wailing the loss of husband and father, to say nothing about fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, who have lost loved ones. But all this was submitted to with becoming resignation.—The heart stricken bowed to their sad fate, under the assurance that the terrible sacrifice was made in attempting to sustain the Constitution and Union, as they were bequeathed to us by our fathers. But alas, how delusive was this fondly cherished hope, based, as it was, upon the plighted faith of the government. In an evil hour the President yielded (as I solemnly believe against his own better judgment) to the seductive influences of the radicals who surrounded him, or in his own language, to the "outside pressure," and did that which in his inaugural address, as well as on several subsequent occasions, he declared he had no power to do. Is this allegation true?—Let the President be his own witness. In his inaugural he said, in speaking of slavery in the States:

"I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of Slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. Those who nominated and elected me did so with the full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolutions which I now read."

And in reply to a committee of his political friends from Chicago, who urged him to proclaim liberty to the slaves, he used the following truthful and significant language:

"What would a proclamation of emancipation from me do, especially as we are now situated? I do not want to issue a document that the whole world will see must necessarily be inoperative like the Popes' bull against the comet. Would my word free the slaves, when I cannot even enforce the Constitution in the rebel States? Is there a single court or magistrate, or individual that would be influenced by it there? And what reason is there to think that it would have any greater effect upon the slaves than the late law of Congress, which I approved, and which offers protection and freedom to the slaves of rebel masters who come within our lines? Yet I cannot learn that the law has caused a single slave to come over to us. And suppose they could be induced by a proclamation of freedom from me, to throw themselves upon us, what should we do with them? How can we feed and care for such a multitude?—Gen. Butler wrote me a few days since, that he was issuing more rations to the slaves who have rushed to him than to all the white troops under his command. They eat, and that is all; though it is true, Gen. Butler is feeding the whites also by thousands, for it nearly amounts to a famine there."

Now, sir, I submit whether I am not fully sustained in the allegation, that the President's convictions were against the proclamation, and yet in the face of these solemn asseverations, and in defiance of the clearly expressed will of Congress, he issued his celebrated proclamation, abolishing slavery in all the States and parts of States, that were in rebellion on the first day of January, 1863, as well the slaves of loyal as disloyal masters. And here, sir, commenced discontent both in the north, and in the border slave States. All the energies of the administration seem now to be directed towards the consummation of the proclamation, and I think I do not misrepresent, either the administration or Congress, when I affirm that those who fall in battle hereafter, fall, not in a war for the restoration of the "Constitution as it is, and the Union as it was," but in a war for the abolition of slavery.

And here, permit me to inquire, what new light has been shed upon the President, since he told his countrymen, under the solemnities of his oath of office, that he had no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with slavery in the States? I pause for an answer. Do I hear some one say, "he did it under the war power?"—The war power, sir! Why if the President may do that which the Constitution forbids, under the plea of "Military necessity," what is it he may not do? Sir, he may, under the same *pretence*, usurp all the powers of the Government, Legislative and Judicial, and proclaim himself Military dictator, and thus, with one fell swoop, blot out every vestige of constitutional liberty, for which our Revolutionary Fathers offered up their lives. Whose heart does not throb with patriotic indignation, at the bare suggestion of such an indignity to the memory of our departed heroes and statesmen?—Who does not tremble for our own freedom, when such a doctrine receives the popular approval? Could the spirit of Washington visit our distracted land to-day, he would doubtless exclaim, in agony of soul, "O, my countrymen, did I not warn you to frown indignantly upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of the country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts?" And, "did I not admonish you to beware of the formation of political parties upon geographical discriminations, Northern and Southern?" etc.

Mr. Speaker, until something of the same spirit which prompted these utterances, be cultivated now, as well on the part of the rulers as the ruled, we can have but little hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I will not believe that any further advance will be made in the direction I have indicated—I will cling to the hope that better counsels will prevail, and that the administration may yet be brought back to a realization of the fact that this war was "not waged, on our part, for the purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of any of the States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired," &c.

Mr. Speaker, I can regard the Abolition proclamation of the President in no other light than as "an assumption of power, not delegated by the Constitution and laws of the country, but in derogation of both."—This may seem like strong language to employ in reference to the "powers that be," which, inspiration teaches us, "are ordained of God," but, in the fear of *Him*, I believe it to be true—and if, in times like these, I should fail to utter it, I should deem myself unworthy of a seat upon this floor. Am I not fully sustained in the allegation, that the proclamation was a usurpation of power, not warranted by the Constitution and laws, by the official declarations of the President himself, as quoted above? But, for the sake of argument, suppose it be conceded that under the plea of "Military necessity" the President had the power to issue the proclamation, what practical good can result to either race from its exercise? For my life I cannot see how either can be benefitted, but, on the contrary, I can see nothing but "evil, and only evil, and that continually."—Why, sir, look at it for a single moment.—Here are some three or four millions of unfortunate beings, thrown upon their own resources, many of them without sufficient intelligence to appreciate the blessings of liberty, and wholly incapable of taking care of themselves. This, I admit, may be their misfortune, rather than their fault, but it is, nevertheless, true, and hundreds and thousands of them, when left without a protector, would be obliged either to subsist on the cold charity of the world, or go down to premature graves from absolute starvation. Then again, those of them who would be able and willing to work, would come in direct competition with the labor of white men and women, and consequently reduce their wages below the subsisting point; and thus, while you would not, in the remotest manner, improve the physical condition of the former, you would inaugurate a policy ruinous to the latter, and create a jealousy and bitter strife between the two classes, which would lead to the most disastrous consequences. But, sir, let me not be misunderstood here. I am not now, nor have I ever been, the advocate of slavery. On the contrary, I could wish that there was not one of the race, either bond or free, within the limits of the United States; that they were somewhere by themselves, to enjoy all the liberty they are capable of. But I have always maintained, and do still maintain, that neither Congress nor the President has any right to interfere with it in the States, either by civil or military power. This is one of the reserved rights of the individual States, and they, and they *alone*, can exercise it. I cannot sustain a policy which would change so suddenly, and so radically, their present relation, even if the power existed, until convinced that it would benefit either them or ourselves. "Better far to bear the ills we have than flee to others that we know not of." And, above all, I am opposed to such a change being brought about by a total disregard of constitutional obligations.

Sir, if this power that is now claimed by the administration be acquiesced in without, at least, protesting against it, then indeed is the pertinency of the interrogatory, "Whither are we drifting?" most apparent. We have it recorded in the book of books, that he who offends in one particular is guilty of the whole, and the same principle is applicable to our form of government.—If the Executive may disregard with impunity one provision of the Constitution, which he has sworn to support, he may set at naught the entire instrument, and usurp the whole functions of the government, and dispose of property, life and liberty, as to him seemeth meet. Mr. Speaker, it has been said, here and elsewhere, that those who take exceptions to this extraordinary exercise of power on the part of the President, "are in sympathy with the rebellion." The same is said of those who condemn the enormous frauds that have been perpetrated upon the treasury, which have amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars, much of which has been exposed by committees of the friends of the administration.

Yes, sir, the test of loyalty set up by certain partisans, army contractors and others, is *unqualified* approval of every enormity committed, whether it be the robbery of the treasury by hundreds of millions, or the arbitrary arrests of private citizens at the mere caprice of some vindictive subordinate, without due process of law. But, sir, the only emotion that the attempt to establish *such* a test excites in my bosom is pity for the *miserable* creature who would thus attempt to deter the freemen of this country from an honest expression of their detestation of fraud, corruption and tyranny, wherever found to exist. Let not this "stop thief" cry of "disloyalty," or "sympathy with the rebellion," deter any from expressing his convictions on questions of public policy. The allegations of "sympathy with the rebellion," for such a reason, are as unfounded and false as are the miscreants who make them shameless and dastardly. Why, sir, there is not a battle-field since the inauguration of this unhappy strife that does not give the lie direct to such allegations, and that does not send up a cry to Heaven for vengeance on the heads those who make them. Sir, the whole land has been saturated with the blood of tens of thousands of just such "sympathizers," while the wretches who pour forth such vile slander have taken good care to keep out of harm's way themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, true loyalty consists in the citizen rendering to the government, in time of war, either foreign or domestic, his hearty co-operation in all legitimate measures that may be adopted for its successful prosecution, and at the same time to express, in a proper spirit, his disapproval of all frauds upon the treasury and palpable infractions of the Constitution. By this standard I am willing to be judged, and stand or fall. If I may be pardoned for an allusion to one so humble as myself, I will state that from the hour of the attack on Fort Sumter, down to the issuing of the emancipation proclamation, my voice was always for sustaining the administration, and I may add, I trust, without subjecting myself to the charge of egotism, that I made more speeches, such as they were, than did many of the *disinterested* patriots who are now so ready to talk about "sympathy with the rebellion."—While this is true, I would be wanting in candor did I fail to say, in my place here, that the proclamation has never for a single moment received the approval of my judgment. When it is remembered that the President himself has repeatedly declared that he had no power to issue such a paper, and that Congress affirmed that the war was waged for no such purpose as is therein avowed, is it any wonder that I, or any one else, should hesitate in endorsing it? But, aside from the absence of power, I could not approve it, because I believe (whether so intended or not, it matters but little) it was an invitation to the slaves to rise in servile insurrection, and engage in an indiscriminate slaughter of men, women and children. A measure calculated to lead to such atrocity can never receive my approval, and I thank God for having given me a heart that revolts at even such a suggestion. I will go further, and say that the commanding officer who would stand by and permit such a *fiendish* work, without using his utmost efforts to prevent it, would deserve, while living, to be "whipped naked round the world," and when dead, should spend an eternity in *hopeless remorse*. But, sir, I have too high a respect for the courage and gallantry of our brave officers to believe that they would become so far lost to every manly impulse, so cowardly, as to tolerate such a *hellish* work.

Think of it for a moment, millions of these half civilized creatures, instigated by unbridled passion, backed by the pledge of the "executive branch of the government, including the army and navy, to do no act, or acts, to repress any effort they may make to accomplish their perfect freedom." I quote from memory, not having the proclamation before me, but believe that it is substantially correct. O, sir, go with me to that once peaceful and happy southern home. See that devoted and happy mother, surrounded by her innocent children—see the exasperated slave approach with weapon of death in his hand—see her as she clasps tightly to her bosom her darling infant, and flees for refuge, she knows not where—hear the shrieks of her other loved ones, as they cry, "O, dear mother, save us"—see her, as she becomes faint from fright and exhaustion, as she turns with a piteous look towards her once dutiful, but now ferocious, pursuer, and prostrates herself at his feet, and exclaims, "O, spare me, and my darling children." But, ah, no, she is doomed by the teachings of fanaticism, to butchery, and with eyes upturned to Heaven she receives the fatal blow, after first, perhaps, witnessing the murder of her dear ones—and *this* is patriotism. With profound reverence, I pray God to deliver *me* from *such* patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, is this a mere flight of the imagination? Is the picture overwrought, through partisan prejudices, or for partisan purposes? Let us see. On the 23d day of March, 1863, a certain Alfred R. Gilbert, who has the title of "*Rev.*" prefixed to his name, addressed a "Union League" in Philadelphia, on which occasion he uttered the following *christian* sentiments, which were *applauded* by a *Philadelphia* Republican audience. I read from the report of the address as published in the Philadelphia *Inquirer*, whose fidelity to the administration will not be doubted by any one; and, I may add, that I believe this respectable journal published this *infamous* speech without a word of disapproval. If I am mistaken in this I will be most happy to be corrected.—But to the extract:

"Advocating the 'Proclamation of Freedom,' he said:

"But its inhumanity is urged. There are many. We know they speak the truth when they say that the negro slays everything within his reach when he rises in rebellion. We have all learned the history of St. Domingo, and it would be terrible to have a St. Domingo massacre re-enacted upon our soil. But the President has declared this a military necessity, and if blood must flow, we must not dread the consequences. Blood must flow in this war.

"But so impressed am I with the greatness of the interests engaged in this rebellion, and its suppression, so satisfied of the inconceivable importance of the struggle that opens up before us in the suppression of this rebellion, that I speak it meaningly, and as a Christian, deliberately, and calmly, that I would rather see every woman and child in the South perish than that the Southern Confederacy should succeed in attaining the objects of its leaders. [Applause.] Men sometimes are placed in crises, where to choose for any side would be fraught with terrible consequences, and this is one of them."

Sir, this occurred in the land of Penn, in the "City of Brotherly Love," in the beautiful metropolis of our great old Commonwealth, and I blush to know that such fiendish sentiments could receive *applause* in such a place, even amongst Republicans; but I rejoice to know that neither there, or elsewhere, could a *Democrat* be found *base* enough to countenance such brutality.—And I am glad, also, to know that there are very many Republicans who would *despise* the *miserable wretch* who uttered them.—And this fellow, Gilbert, you will observe, tells the audience that he is a christian.—May the Lord have mercy on his hypocritical soul! I doubt not but that there are thousands of *such* christians in perdition to-day, and there will be at least *one* more, unless he repents and obtains forgiveness for the above outrage upon decency and the common instincts of humanity.

Sir, contemplate the scenes that I have attempted feebly to describe, and then tell me if you please, that to establish my "loyalty," I must approve of a proclamation which would lead to such attrocities, however foreign it may have been from the intention of its author, and I will tell you in reply, "Never, no, never!" Rather would I be stigmatized the balance of my days as a "sympathizer," than sacrifice my manhood, by sanctioning a measure from which every impulse of my heart recoils with loathing and horror. Yes, sir; rather than endorse such atrocity, I would seek eternal banishment from the face of man, and drag out a miserable existence in perpetual exile. But I have no fears that my countrymen will ever regard me as a "sympathizer" for expressing my abhorrence of such a *monstrosity*. I am perfectly willing that my opinions on this subject shall go before the country in juxtaposition with those who differ from me.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is asked what we, on this side of the house, propose to do in reference to the prosecution of the war. I answer for myself and say, that so long as it continues, or until some mode of adjustment can be devised, I am for sustaining the government in all proper measures for the suppression of the rebellion, within the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof; and I am for condemning all palpable usurpations of power, whether by the executive, legislative or judicial departments of the government. We are engaged in a terrible civil war, which in its origin was intended, on our part, to restore the authority of the Federal government over the revolted States, and "not for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, or purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to enforce and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired." Let the administration then come back to this clearly defined policy, and to this end let the war be prosecuted, and let all yield a willing co-operation, and all may not yet be lost.

Mr. Speaker, we are standing on the very verge of a yawning gulf of irremediable ruin, with scarce a hope left for escape. Those scenes which the lamented Webster prayed God might never fall upon his vision, have fallen upon ours. Do we not "behold States dissevered, discordant, belligerent?" Do we not see "a land rent in civil feuds and drenched in fraternal blood?" And for what, I ask? Why, sir, it is the natural result of causes which have been at work for many years, chief among which may be mentioned the *ultraism* of men North and South. If these *extremists* were the only sufferers it would not matter so much. But unfortunately the conservative men of the country, those whose voices have uniformly been raised against fanaticism on the one hand and on the other, are equally involved with those who brought the calamity upon us. Crimination and recrimination, however, can do no good. I suppose the best we can do is to support the right and condemn the wrong in the future, until by the peaceful and legal instrumentality of the ballot-box, we can produce a change in our rulers, and consequently a change of policy. Let us do this, and let all unite in humbly invoking the great God of battles, that he may graciously vouchsafe to restore once more to our distracted, our bleeding, our beloved country, the inestimable blessings of peace, harmony, and fraternal regard.

WHY NO TERMS OF PEACE HAVE BEEN PROPOSED TO THE SOUTH.

Do the Radicals really desire a Restoration of the Union?

Our readers will perceive from the European news printed in another column, that the Grand Duke *Constantine* of Russia, has not disdained to offer the Polish rebels a general amnesty, with the *promise of a charter* to secure their political rights. This offer it seems, came too late, and the Dictator felt obliged to decline it; but it goes far to prove the humane intentions of the Imperial family, and will, to a great degree, disarm the coalition which was being formed against the Autocrat, not only among the different States of Europe, but by the enlightened public opinion of the entire civilized World. There is now no State, no Potentate, no victorious General that can with impunity challenge public opinion; and the Emperor of Russia is too enlightened a sovereign to hope to escape the verdict of his contemporaries. Had the Emperor Nicholas in 1832, instead of entire *subjugation*, bethought himself of giving the Poles institutions under which they could have lived in peace, Poland would not now be in a state of revolution, and the Russian monarchy would not, at this time, be threatened by internal and external foes.—Still the Emperor Alexander has made an offer of reconciliation; he was willing to grant a general amnesty, and he was disposed to make those political concessions which the Poles claim as their right and for which they are once more resolved to wage the unequal battle of five millions against sixty-five millions.

Now if the Emperor of Russia, without forfeiting in the just consideration of his brother sovereigns, could offer the rebel Poles a general amnesty and reasonable terms of peace, why, we would ask, is it incompatible with the dignity of our Republican President, to offer terms of peace to the South? If the Czar, as hereditary sovereign of sixty-five millions, can offer terms to five millions of *subjects*, why should Abraham Lincoln, the sovereign by *election*, and the King of yesterday, "who will *not* be King to-morrow," hesitate to say a word of kindness to those who but two short years ago, were his equals, and whom, no matter what success may crown our arms, he will never have the power to treat as *subjects*? We will answer the question for him. It is because there are no terms of peace based on the Federal Constitution that President Lincoln could offer, which would be acceptable to his Abolition friends in the North, of whom, from the beginning of his Administration, he has stood more in awe, than of Jeff Davis and all his followers. Why—were it but to show the world his honest intentions—has he not offered a general amnesty? Why had he nothing but punishments—confiscation and emancipation—in one hand and no olive branch in the other?—Because the Abolitionists, from the beginning, fought, not for bringing the South back to a due recognition of the Federal authority, in which they would always have been supported by the Democratic party, but for the purpose of *abolishing slavery*. They fought for the avowed purpose of subjugating the Constitutional rights of the South, and since they cannot do that without trampling on the Constitution in all its provisions, they have also attempted to subjugate the Democratic party in the North, which has always been disposed to maintain the Constitution in its original purity.

The war, we firmly believe, could have been avoided if the Radicals had preferred the Union and the Constitution to their own advancement. Had the Crittenden Compromise been adopted—had the North shown a cordial disposition to live on terms of friendship and brotherhood with the South; there would have been no separation, or at least but a partial one. The disunionists of 1861 would have fared no better than those of 1832; for the idea of South Carolina seceding by herself, or two or three, or the whole seven Cotton States forming a separate Confederacy, would have been preposterous.

The Radicals and Abolitionists knew that, with peace and the re-establishment of Federal relations, their power was at an end; and, for that reason, they wanted first to know what they could do by *coercion*. They thought the South an easy conquest, and therefore resolved upon war.

The same reasons prevail with them now. They know that, if President Lincoln was to offer fair and just terms of peace, as an alternative of war unto subjugation, and the South were to accept these terms, no power on earth could restore the Radicals to the position they occupied in 1860. The country would not only repudiate their councils, but execrate their acts. It will not do for these men to say "it is useless to offer such terms now; they will not be accepted." We tell them to their teeth *they dare not offer them, for fear of their being accepted*. Mr. Lincoln has neither the courage nor the magnanimity of the Autocrat of Russia! He *dares* not offer terms of peace; because, by doing so, he would lose the support of the Abolitionists. Poor, mean, contemptible partizan politics sway the actions of our statesmen—not a care for the lasting interests of the country.—*Phil. Age.*

☞ The Abolition organs fail to quote the following extract from John Van Buren's war speech. He speaks thus of the Republican party:

"I agree they are unwise. I agree they are stupid. I agree they have united the South, and that they have divided the North. I agree to another thing, and you won't expect me as a Democrat to find fault with that—I agree that they prostrated the Republican party in every non-slaveholding State of this Confederacy and gave the Democrats the ascendency, and nobody will expect me to find fault with them on that account. New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, became Democratic as the result of them, and I am not the man to find fault with that."

ENFORCING THE DRAFT.—Those who are subject to conscription, and have not $300 to purchase exemption, should not forget that one object of the Union League, as confessed by the Harrisburg *Telegraph*, is to aid in "*enforcing the draft*." The men actively engaged in getting up these Leagues are most of them wealthy men, or men in good circumstances. They can purchase exemption, and they will; not one of them will go except, perhaps, as an officer, but they are determined to make all poor men toe the mark. Noble patriots, aint they?

WHEN SHALL WE FOLLOW?—The Republican press says it is *treason* to advocate the cause of peace. Even preachers continue to preach war, and yet *Christ* in His sermon on the Mount tells us that "Blessed are the peace makers; for they shall be called the children of God," and in Romans we are further told: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace." Which is safer, therefore, to follow—