# LEWISBURG CHRONICLE.

BY O. N. WORDEN & J. R. CORNELIUS.

AN INDEPENDENT FAMILY NEWS JOURNAL.

LEWISBURG, UNION CO., PA., FRIDAY, DEC. 3, 1858.

ESTABLISHED IN 1843....WHOLE NO, 764.

AT $1,50 PER YEAR, ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.



## The Lewisburg Chronicle,

AN INDEPENDENT FAMILY NEWSPAPER,

*Issued Fridays, at Lewisburg, Union Co. Pa.*

*TERMS.*—$1.50 per year, 75 IF PAID IN ADVANCE—and at the same rate for a longer or shorter period. Thus, 50 cts will pay for four months, 75 cts for six months, 1 dol. for eight months, 2 dol. for sixteen months, 3 dol. for two years, $5 for four copies one year, $10 for ten copies one year, &c. Single No.'s, 5 cts. Payments by mail (paid) received in gold, postage stamps, or bank notes at their value here. Most kinds Produce received at the Office.

When the time expires, for which a paper is paid, (unless we have a running account) it is STOPPED.

ADVERTISEMENTS handsomely published, at 50 cts per square one week, 25 cts each after insertion, 3 dol. for six months, 5 dol. per year. Half a square—25 cts, 15 cts, 2 dol, 3 dol. Two squares—1.50, 4.00, 8.00. Merchants, &c. not over one-fourth of a column, 10 dol. per year. Other sizes &c. as may be agreed upon. A square is 12 lines or smallest type, or 15 of next larger. Advertisements of a demoralizing tendency, and large cuts, not admitted.

Communications desired on topics of general interest not within the range of partizan or sectarian contest, and accompanied by the writer's real name and address.

The MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH is located in the Office of the Chronicle, by which we often insert important News in advance of the Philad. Mails.

Connected with the Office are ample materials for most kinds of JOB PRINTING, which will be executed with neatness and despatch and on reasonable terms.

Casual Advertisements to be paid for when handed in, and Job Work when delivered.

OFFICE on Market Square, north side, second storey adjoining the Book Bindery.

WORDEN & CORNELIUS.


## THE CHRONICLE.

### MONDAY, NOV. 29, 1858.

The first settlement of "Derrstown" (Lewisburg) was in the neighborhood of what is now Brown's Mill and the Gas Works. The earliest burials were on the rise of ground, North, from which Market St. starts, at the Bridge. The regular laying out of the Town, the location of the Grave Yard, Market St., &c., seem to have been subsequent to this, as the workmen last week, in digging the trench for the gas pipes, in the centre of the lower end of Market St., threw up a human skull.

"How loved, how valued once, avails it not,
To whom related, or by whom begot."

Probably no one living knows whose head it was, or when it was there deposited, perhaps embalmed by the tears of mourning friends. The event reminded us of a somewhat ancient poem—the author to us unknown—which we deem worth copying in this connection.

**Reflections, on Examining a Human Skeleton.**

Behold this ruin! Here's a skull
Once of ethereal spirit full,
This narrow cell was Life's retreat,
This space was Thought's mysterious seat!
What beauteous pictures filled this spot;
What dreams of pleasure long forgot!
Nor Love, nor Joy, nor Hope, nor Fear,
Has left one trace of record here!

Beneath this mould'ring canopy,
Once shone the bright and busy eye:
But start not at the dismal void;
If social love that eye employed,
If with no lawless fire it beamed,
But through the dew of kindness gleamed,
[illegible]

Here, in this [illegible], hung
Perhaps, the ready tuneful tongue!
If falsehood's honey it disdained,
And, where it could not praise, was chained,
If bold in virtue's cause it spoke,
Yet gentle concord never broke,
That tuneful tongue shall plead for thee
When death unveils eternity!

Perhaps the heart pulsated, here,
That's often bled, to think the tear
Of widowed grief and orphan woe
So oft in this cold world should flow,
And oft alone in thoughtful mood
Hath raised a fervent prayer to God,
That he would soothe the troubled breast
With grief and penury oppressed!

Say, did these fingers delve the mine,
Or with the envied rubies shine?
To hew the rock, or wear the gem,
Can nothing now avail to them;
But if the page of Truth they sought,
Or comfort to the mourner brought,
Those hands shall meed a richer claim
Than all that waits on wealth and fame!

Avails it whether bare or shod
These feet the path of duty trod?
If from the bowers of joy they fled,
To soothe affliction's humble bed;
If grandeur's guilty bribe they spurned,
And home to virtue's lap returned;
These feet with angels' wings shall vie,
And tread the palace of the sky!

## READ IT,

**Then Pass It Along for your Neighbors to Read.**

During the late election canvass in New York State, Ex-Gov. SEWARD made a number of public addresses—a custom of his, every year, no matter how more or less "important" may be the issue. One of these speeches was devoted to the subject of Slavery, and its publication has called forth an assault upon him—from old time political and personal opponents, from rivals, and from every friend or apologist of the Slave Power. The magnitude of this concerted demonstration—and the bitterness and severity with which it has been characterized—have induced us to look back and find the Speech, which we think worthy of universal perusal. We have no more able, sagacious, well-informed Statesman than Senator SEWARD, on the stage of action; and since John Q. Adams and Thomas H. Benton have departed, we have no man of more general knowledge, or of more keen, unwearied observation of not only *effects*, but *causes*. He is learned, persistent, independent, and bold. A part of his early life was spent in a hot-bed of Slavery, and he has been for many years in daily intercourse with leading Slaveholders. For these reasons, his most profound, eloquent, political, and philosophical speech—carrying the thoughtful mind to the past, the present, and the future—is well worthy of being read without prejudice and weighed with the profoundest seriousness. Demagogues, the timid, and those of no penetration, may not like its fearlessness, or may dissent from some of his propositions and conclusions; yet all must admit that there is a mass of WHOLESOME TRUTH in his speech.

Mr. Seward argues that, in the ceaseless battle between Oppression and Freedom, Freedom must triumph, yet it will be seen that he contemplates no aggression upon Slavery [illegible] of its real Constitutional refuges. It has been *falsely* charged that he wished a [illegible] crusade against Slavery in the States, [illegible] agitation; whereas, he would only restore to Freedom what has been wrongfully and illegally taken from her; and natural causes would finish the work of gradual emancipation.

Last week, we gave Senator DOUGLAS' creed, defending Slavery in full—scoffing at the "abstractions" of the Declaration of Independence—and anticipating an eternity of the Slave System. To-day, we present Senator SEWARD'S views of the same subject. In a short time, doubtless, President BUCHANAN will appear in his own defence, in mitigation of the *sentence* just pronounced upon him, for his "sectional" course, by the great mass of the American people.

## SPEECH OF WILLIAM H. SEWARD

### Rochester, N.Y., Oct. 25, 1858.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: The unmistakable outbreaks of zeal which occur all around me, show that you are earnest men—and such a man am I. Let us, therefore, at least for a time, pass by all secondary and collateral questions, whether of a personal or of a general nature, and consider the main subject of the present canvass. The Democratic party—or, to speak more accurately, the party which wears that attractive name—is in possession of the Federal Government. The Republicans propose to dislodge that party and dismiss it from its high trust.

The main subject then is, whether the Democratic party deserves to retain the confidence of the American people. In attempting to prove it unworthy, I think that I am not actuated by prejudices against that party, or by prepossessions in favor of its adversary; for I have learned, by some experience, that virtue and patriotism, and vice and selfishness, are found in all parties, and that they differ less in their *motives*, than in the *policies* they pursue.

Our country is a theater, which exhibits in full operation, two radically different political systems; the one resting upon the basis of servile or Slave Labor; the other on the basis of voluntary labor of freemen.

The laborers who are enslaved are all negroes, or persons more or less purely of African derivation. But this is only accidental. The principle of the system is, that labor in every society, by whomsoever performed, is necessarily unintellectual, grovelling and base, and that the laborer, equally for his own good and for the welfare of the State, ought to be enslaved. The white laboring man, whether native or foreigner, is not enslaved, only because he can not, as yet, be reduced to bondage.

You need not be told now that the [illegible] pation of our own ancestors, Caucasians and Europeans, as they were, hardly dates beyond a period of 500 years. The great melioration of human society which modern times exhibit, is mainly due to the substitution of the system of voluntary labor for the old one of servile labor, which has already taken place.

This African slave system is one which, in its origin and in its growth, has been altogether foreign from the habits of the races which colonized these States, and established civilization here. It was introduced on this new continent as an engine of conquest, and for the establishment of Monarchial Power by the Portuguese and Spaniards, and was rapidly extended by them over all South America, Central America, Louisiana and Mexico. Its legitimate fruits are seen in the poverty, imbecility and anarchy which now pervades all Portuguese and Spanish America.

The Free Labor system is of German extraction, and it was established in our country by emigrants from Sweden, Holland, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland. We justly ascribe to its influences the strength, wealth, greatness, intelligence, and freedom which the whole American people now enjoy.

One of the chief elements of the value of human life, is freedom in the pursuit of happiness. The Slave system is not only intolerant, unjust, and inhuman toward the laborer, whom, only because he is a laborer, it loads down with chains and converts into merchandise, but scarcely less so to the freeman, to whom, only because he is a laborer from necessity, it denies facilities for employment, and whom it expels from the community because it can not enslave and convert him into merchandise also. It is necessarily improvident and ruinous, because, as a general truth, communities prosper and flourish or droop and decline in just the degree that they practice or neglect to practice the primary duties of justice and humanity. The free labor system conforms to the divine law of equality, which is written on the hearts and consciences of men, and therefore is always and everywhere beneficial.

The Slave system is one of constant danger and distrust, suspicion, and watchfulness. It debases those whose toil alone can produce wealth and resources for defense, to the lowest degree of which human nature is capable, to guard against mutiny and insurrection, and thus wastes energies which otherwise might be employed in national developement and aggrandizement.

The Free labor system educates all alike, and by opening all the fields of industrial employment, and all the departments of authority, to the unchecked and equal rivalry of all classes of men, at once secures universal contentment, and brings into the highest possible activity all the physical, moral and social energies of the whole State. In States where the slave system prevails, the masters, directly, or indirectly, secure all political power, and constitute a ruling aristocracy. In the States where the free labor system prevails, universal suffrage necessarily obtains, and the State inevitably becomes, sooner or later, a republic or a democracy.

Russia yet maintains Slavery, and is a despotism. Most of the other European States have abolished Slavery and adopted the system of Free Labor. It was the antagonistic political tendencies of the two systems which the first Napoleon was contemplating, when he predicted that Europe would ultimately be either "all Cossack or all Republican." Never did human sagacity utter a more pregnant truth. The two systems are at once perceived to be incongruous. But they are more than incongruous, they are incompatible. They never have permanently existed together in one country, and they never can. It would be easy to demonstrate this impossibility, from the irreconcilable contrast between their great principles and characteristics. But the experience of mankind has conclusively established it. Slavery, as I have already intimated, existed in every State in Europe; Free Labor has supplanted it everywhere except in Russia and Turkey. State necessities, developed in modern times, are now obliging even those two nations to encourage and employ Free Labor, and already, despotic as they are, we find them engaged in abolishing Slavery. In the United States, Slavery came into collision with Free Labor at the close of the last century, and fell before it in New England, New York, New-Jersey and Pennsylvania, but triumphed over it effectually, and excluded it for a period yet undetermined, from Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia. Indeed, so incompatible are the two systems, that every new State which is organized within our ever extending domain makes its first political act a choice of the one and an expulsion of the other, even at the cost of civil war if necessary. The Slave States, without law, at the last national election, successfully forbade, within their own limits, even the casting of votes for a candidate for President of the United States supposed to be favorable to the establishment of the Free Labor system in new States.

Hitherto, the two systems have existed in different States, but side by side within the American Union. This has happened because the union is a confederation of States. But in another aspect the United States constitute only one nation. Increase of population, which is filling the States out to their very borders, together with a [illegible] which daily becomes more intimate, is rapidly bringing the States into a higher and more social unity or consolidation.—Thus these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results.

Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested and fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a Slaveholding nation, or entirely a Free Labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by Free Labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the Slave and Free States, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, vain and ephemeral. Startling as this saying may appear to you, fellow-citizens, it is by no means an original or even a modern one. Our forefathers knew it to be true, and unanimously acted upon it, when they framed the Constitution of the United States. They regarded the existence of the servile system in so many of the States with sorrow and shame, which they openly confessed, and they looked upon the collision between them, which was then just revealing itself, and which we are now accustomed to deplore, with favor and hope. They knew that either the one or the other system must exclusively prevail.

Unlike too many of those who in modern time invoke their authority, they had a choice between the two. They preferred the system of free labor, and they determined to organize the Government, and so to direct its activity, that that system should surely and certainly prevail. For this purpose, and no other, they based the whole structure of the government broadly on the principle that all men are created equal, and therefore free—little dreaming that within the short period of one hundred years their descendants would bear to be told by any orator, however popular, that the utterance of that principal was merely a rhetorical rhapsody; or by any Judge, however venerated, that it was attended by mental reservations which render it hypocritical and false. By the ordinance of 1787 they dedicated all of the national domain, not yet polluted by Slavery, to free labor immediately, thenceforth and forever, while by the new Constitution and laws they invited foreign free labor from all lands under the sun, and interdicted the importation of African slave labor at all times, in all places and under all circumstances whatsoever. It is true that they necessarily and wisely modified this policy of freedom by leaving it to the several States, affected as they were by differing circumstances, to abolish Slavery in their own way, and at their own pleasure instead of confiding that duty to Congress, and that they secured to the Slave States, while yet retaining the system of Slavery, a three-fifths representation of slaves in the Federal government, until they should find themselves able to relinquish it with safety. But the very nature of these modifications fortifies my position that the fathers knew the two systems could not endure within the Union, and expected that within a short period slavery would disappear for ever. Moreover, in order that these modifications might not altogether defeat their grand design of a Republic maintaining universal equality, they provided that two-thirds of the States might amend the Constitution.

It remains to say on this point only one word to guard against misapprehension.—If these States are again to become universally slaveholding, I do not pretend to say with what violations of the Constitution that end shall be accomplished. On the other hand, while I do confidently believe and hope that my country will yet become a land of universal freedom, I do not expect that it will be made so otherwise than through the action of the several States, co-operating with the Federal Government and all acting in strict conformity with their respective Constitutions.

The strife and contention concerning Slavery, which gently disposed persons do habitually deprecate, is nothing more than the ripening of the conflict which the Fathers themselves not only thus regarded with favor, but which they may be said to have instituted.

It is not to be denied, however, that thus far the course of that contest has not been according to their humane anticipations and wishes. In the field of Federal politics, Slavery, deriving unlooked for advantages from commercial changes, and energies unforseen from the facilities of [illegible] slaveholding class and between that class and other property classes, early rallied, and has at length made a stand not merely to retain its original defensive position, but to extend its sway throughout the whole Union. It is certain that the slaveholding class of American citizens indulge this high ambition, and that they derive encouragement for it from the rapid and effective political successes which they have already obtained. The plan of operation is this: By continued appliances of patronage, and threats of disunion, they will keep a majority favorable to these designs in the Senate, where each State has an equal representation. Through that majority they will defeat, as they best can, the admission of Free States and secure the admission of Slave States. Under the [illegible] Slavery into all the Territories of the United States now existing and hereafter to be organized. By the action of the President and the Senate, using the treaty-making power, they will annex foreign slave holding States. In a favorable conjuncture they will induce Congress to repeal the act of 1808, which prohibits the foreign slave-trade, and so they will import from Africa, at the cost of only $20 a head, slaves enough to fill up the interior of the continent. Thus relatively increasing the number of Slave States, they will allow no amendment to the Constitution prejudicial to their interest, and so, having permanently established their power, they expect the Federal Judiciary to nullify all State laws which shall interfere with internal or foreign commerce in slaves.

When the Free States shall be sufficiently demoralized to tolerate these designs, they reasonably conclude that Slavery will be accepted by those States themselves. I shall not stop to show how speedy or how complete would be the ruin which the accomplishment of these slaveholding schemes would bring upon the country.—For one, I should not remain in the country to test the sad experiment. Having spent my manhood, though not my whole life, in a Free State, no aristocracy of any kind, much less an aristocracy of Slaveholders, shall ever make the laws of the land in which I shall be content to live.—Having seen the society around me universally engaged in agriculture, manufactures and trade, which were innocent and beneficent, I shall never be a denizen of a State where men and women are reared as cattle, and bought and sold as merchandize. When that evil day shall come, and all further effort at resistance shall be impossible, then, if there shall be no better hope for redemption than I can now foresee, I shall say with Franklin, while looking abroad over the whole earth for a new home: "Where Liberty dwells there is "my country."

You will tell me that these fears are extravagant and chimerical. I answer, they are so, but they are so only because the designs of the slaveholders must and can be defeated. But it is only the possibility of defeat that renders them so. They can not be defeated by inactivity. There is no escape from them compatible with non-resistance. How, then, and in what way, shall the necessary resistance be made? There is only one way. The Democratic party must be permanently dislodged from the Government. The reason is, that the Democratic party is inextricably committed to the designs of the slaveholders, which I have described. Let me be well understood. I do not charge that the Democratic candidates for public office now before the people, are pledged, much less that the Democratic masses who support them really adopt those atrocious and dangerous designs. Candidates, may and generally do, mean to act justly, wisely, and patriotically, when they shall be elected; but they become the ministers and servants, not the dictators, of the power which elects them. The policy which a party shall pursue at a future period, is only gradually developed, depending on the occurrence of events never fully foreknown. The motives of men, whether acting as electors, or in any other capacity, are generally pure. Nevertheless, it is not more true that "Hell is paved with good intentions," than it is that earth is covered with wrecks resulting from innocent and amiable motives.

The very constitution of the Democratic party commits it to execute all the designs of the slaveholders, whatever they may be. It is not a party of the whole Union, of all the Free States and of all the Slave States; nor yet is it a party of the Free States in the North and in the North-west; but it is a sectional and local party, having, practically, its seat within the Slave States, and counting its constituency chiefly and almost exclusively there. Of all its representatives in Congress and in the Electoral Colleges, two-thirds uniformly come from these States. Its great element of strength lies in the vote of the slaveholders, augmented by the representation of three-fifths of the slaves. Deprive the Democratic party of this strength, it would be a helpless and hopeless minority, incapable of continued organization. The Democratic party being thus local and sectional, acquires new strength from the admission of every new Slave State. A party is in one sense a joint stock association, in which those who contribute most direct the action and management of the concern. The slaveholders, contributing in an overwhelming proportion to the capital strength of the Democratic party, they necessarily dictate and prescribe its policy. The inevitable caucus system enables them to do so with a show of fairness and justice.—If it were possible to conceive for a moment that the Democratic party should disobey the behests of the slaveholders, we should then see a withdrawal of the slaveholders, which would leave the party to perish. The portion of the party which is found in the Free States is a mere appendage, convenient to modify its sectional character without impairing its sectional constitution, and is less effective in regu[illegible] of the comet is in determining the appointed though apparently eccentric course of the fiery sphere from which it emanates. To expect the Democratic party to resist Slavery and favor Freedom is as unreasonable as to look for Protestant Missionaries from the Catholic Propaganda of Rome.

The history of the Democratic party commits it to the policy of Slavery. It has been the Democratic party, and no other agency, which has carried that policy up to its present alarming culmination. Without stopping to ascertain, critically, the origin of the present Democratic party, we may concede its claim to date from the era of good feeling which occurred under the Administration of President Monroe. At that time in this State, and about that time in many others of the Free States, [illegible] and it has pertinaciously continued this disfranchisement ever since. This was an effective aid to Slavery, for while the slaveholder votes for his slaves against Freedom, the freed slave, in the Free States, is prohibited from voting against Slavery. In 1824, the Democracy resisted the election of John Quincy Adams—himself before that time an acceptable Democrat—and in 1828 it expelled him from the Presidency and put a slaveholder in his place, although the office had been filled by slaveholders thirty-two out of forty years. In 1836, Martin Van Buren—the first non-slaveholding citizen of a Free State to whose election the Democratic party ever consented—signalized his inauguration into the Presidency by a gratuitous announcement that under no circumstances would he ever approve a bill for abolishing Slavery in the District of Columbia. From 1838 to 1844, the subject of abolishing Slavery in the District of Columbia and in the national dockyards and arsenals was brought before Congress by repeated popular appeals. The Democratic party thereupon promptly denied the right of petition, and effectually suppressed the freedom of speech in Congress, as far as the institution of Slavery was concerned.

From 1840 to 1843, good and wise men counseled that Texas should remain outside of the Union until she should consent to relinquish her self-instituted Slavery; but the Democratic party precipitated her admission into the Union, not only without that condition, but even with a covenant that the State might be divided and re-organized so as to constitute four Slave States instead of one.

In 1846, when the United States became involved in a war with Mexico, and it was apparent that the struggle would end in the dismemberment of that Republic, which was a non-slaveholding power, the Democratic party rejected a declaration that Slavery should not be established within the Territory to be acquired. When in 1850, governments were to be instituted in the Territories of California and New Mexico, the fruits of that war, the Democratic party refused to admit New Mexico as a free, and only consented to admit California as a free State on the condition, as it has since explained the transaction, of leaving all of New Mexico and Utah open to Slavery, to which was also added the concession of perpetual Slavery in the District of Columbia, and the passage of an unconstitutional, cruel and humiliating law, for the recapture of fugitive slaves, with a further stipulation that the subject of Slavery should never again be agitated in either chamber of Congress. When, in 1854, the slaveholders were contentedly reposing on these great advantages, then so recently won, the Democratic party unnecessarily, officiously and with superserviceable liberality, awaked them from their slumber, to offer and force on their acceptance, the abrogation of the law which declared that neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude should ever exist within that part of the ancient territory of Louisiana, which lay outside of the State of Missouri and north of the parallel of 36° 30′ of north latitude, a law, which with the exception of one other, was the only statute of Freedom then remaining in the Federal code.

In 1856, when the people of Kansas had organized a new State within the region thus abandoned to Slavery, and applied to be admitted as a free State into the Union, the Democratic party contemptuously rejected their petition and, drove them with menaces and intimidations from the Halls of Congress, and armed the President with military power to enforce their submission to a slave code, established over them by fraud and usurpation. At every subsequent stage of the long contest which has since raged in Kansas, the Democratic party has lent its sympathies, its aid, and all the powers of the Government which it controlled to enforce slavery upon that unwilling and injured people. And now, even at this day, while it mocks us with the assurance that Kansas is free, the Democratic party keeps the State excluded from her just and proper place in the Union, under the hope that she may be dragooned into the acceptance of slavery.

The Democratic party finally has procured from a Supreme Judiciary, fixed in its interest, a decree that slavery exists by force of the Constitution in every Territory of the United States, paramount to all legislative authority either within the Territory or residing in Congress.

Such is the Democratic party. It has no policy, State or Federal, for finance, or trade, or manufacture, or commerce, or education, or internal improvements, or for the protection, or even the security of civil or religious liberty. It is positive and uncompromising in the interest of slavery—negative, compromising and vacillating in regard to everything else. It boasts its love of equality, and wastes its strength and even its life in fortifying the only aristocracy known in the land. It professes fraternity, and so often as slavery requires, allies itself with proscription. It magnifies itself for conquests in foreign lands, but it sends the national eagle forth always with chains and not the olive branch [illegible]

This dark record shows you, fellow citizens, what I was unwilling to announce at an earlier stage of this argument—that of the whole nefarious schedule of slaveholding designs which I have submitted to you, the Democratic party has left only one yet to be consummated—the abrogation of the law which forbids the African slave-trade.

Now, I know very well that the Democratic party has, at every stage of these proceedings, disavowed the motive and the policy of fortifying and extending slavery, and has excused them on entirely different and more plausible grounds. But the inconsistency and frivolity of these pleas prove still more conclusively the guilt I charge upon that party. It must indeed necessarily excuse such guilt before mankind, and even to the consciences of its [illegible] inhering love of Freedom, in the human heart, which render palliation of such gross misconduct indispensable. It disfranchised the free African on the ground of a fear that if left to enjoy the right of suffrage, he might seduce the free white citizen into amalgamation with his wronged and despised race. The Democratic party condemned and deposed John Quincy Adams because he expended $12,000,000 a year, while it justifies his favored successor in spending $70,000,000, $80,000,000, and even $100,000,000 a year. It denies emancipation in the District of Columbia, even with compensation to masters and the consent of the people, on the ground of an implied constitutional inhibition, although the Constitution expressly confers upon Congress sovereign legislative power in that District, and although the Democratic party is tenacious of the principle of strict construction. It violated the express provisions of the Constitution, in suppressing petition and debate on the subject of slavery through fear of disturbance of the public harmony, although it claims that the electors have a right to instruct their representatives, and even demand their resignation in cases of contumacy. It extended slavery over Texas and connived at the attempt to spread it across the Mexican territories, even to the shores of the Pacific Ocean, under a plea of enlarging the area of freedom. It abrogated the Mexican slave law and the Missouri Compromise prohibition of slavery in Kansas, not to open the new Territories to slavery but to try therein the new and fascinating theories of Non-Intervention and Popular Sovreignty: and finally it overthrew both these new and elegant systems by the English Lecompton bill and the Dred Scott decision, on the ground that the Free States ought not to enter the Union without a population equal to the representative basis of one member of Congress, although Slave States might come in without inspection as to their numbers.

Will any member of the Democratic party now here claim that the authorities chosen by the suffrages of the party, transcended their partizan platforms, and so misrepresented the party in the various transactions I have recited? Then I ask him to name one Democratic statesman or legislator, from Van Buren to Walker, who either timidly or cautiously, like them, or boldly and defiantly, like Douglas, ever refused to execute a behest of the slaveholders, and was not therefore, and for no other cause, immediately denounced, and deposed from his trust, and repudiated by the Democratic party for that contumacy.

I think, fellow citizens, that I have shown you that it is high time for the friends of freedom, to rush to the rescue of the Constitution, and that their very first duty is to dismiss the democratic party from the administration of the government.

Why shall it not be done? All agree that it ought to be done. What then shall prevent its being done? Nothing but timidity or division of the opponents of the Democratic party.

Some of these opponents start one objection, and some another. Let us notice these objections briefly. One class say that they can not trust the Republican party, that it has not avowed its hostility to slavery boldly enough, or its affection for freedom earnestly enough.

I ask in reply, is there any other party which can be more safely trusted? Every one knows that it is the Rebublican party, or none, that shall displace the Democratic party. But I answer further, that the character and fidelity of any party are determined, necessarily, not by its pledges, programmes, and platforms, but by the public exigencies, and the temper of the people when they call it into activity. Subserviency to Slavery, is a law written, not only on the forehead of the Democratic party, but also in its very soul—so resistance to Slavery, and devotion to freedom, the popular elements now actively working for the Republican party among the people, must and will be the resources for its ever renewing strength, and constant invigoration.

Others can not support the Republican party, because it has not sufficiently exposed its platform and determined what it will do and what it will not do, when triumphant. It may prove too progressive for some, and too conservative for others. As if any party ever foresaw so clearly the course of future events as to plan a universal scheme for future action, adapted to all possible emergencies. Who would ever have joined even the Whig party of the Revolution, if it had been obliged to answer, in 1775, whether it would declare for Independence in 1776, and for this noble Federal Constitution of ours, in 1787, and not a year earlier or later?

The people of the United States will be as wise next year, and the year afterward, and even ten years hence, as we are now. They will oblige the Republican party to act as the public welfare and the interests of justice and humanity shall require, through all the stages of its career, whether of trial or triumph.

Others will not venture an effort because they fear that the Union would not endure the change. Will such objectors [illegible] a strain directly along the fibres of which it is composed? This is a Constitution of Freedom. It is being converted into a Constitution of Slavery. It is a Republican Constitution. It is being made an Aristocratic one. Others may wish to wait until some collateral questions concerning Temperance or the exercise of the Elective Franchise are properly settled. Let me ask all such persons, whether time enough has not been wasted on these points already, without gaining any other than this single advantage, namely, the discovery that only one thing can be effectually done at one time, and that the one thing which must and will be done at any one time is just that thing which is most urgent and will no longer admit of postponement or delay. Finally, we are told [illegible] querable, and the dominion of Slavery is consequently inevitable. I reply to them, that the complete and universal dominion of Slavery would be intolerable enough when it should have come after the last possible effort to escape should have been made. There would in that case be left to us the consoling reflection of fidelity to duty.

But I reply further that I know—few I think know better than I—the resources and the energies of the Democratic party, which is identical with the Slave Power. I do ample prestige to its traditional popularity. I know further—few I think know better than I—the difficulties and disadvantages of organizing a new political force like the Republican party, and the obstacles it must encounter in laboring without prestige and without patronage. But, notwithstanding all this, I know that the Democratic party must go down, and the Republican party must rise in its place. The Democratic party derived its strength originally from its adoption of the principles of equal and exact justice to all men. So long as it practiced this principle faithfully, it was invulnerable. It became vulnerable when it renounced it, and since that time it has maintained itself, not by virtue of its own strength, or even of its traditional merits, but because there as yet had appeared in the political field no other party that had the conscience and the courage to take up and avow and practice the life-inspiring principle which the Democratic party had surrendered. At last the Republican party had appeared. It avows now, as the Republican party of 1800 did, in one word, its faith and its works, "Equal and exact justice to all men." Even when it first entered the field, only half organized, it struck a blow which only just failed to secure complete and triumphant victory. In this, its second campaign, it has already won advantages which render that triumph now both easy and certain.

The secret of its assured success lies in that very characteristic, which in the mouth of scoffers constitutes its great and lasting imbecility and reproach. It lies in the fact that it is a party of one idea; but that idea is a noble one—an idea that fills and expands all generous souls; the idea of equality—the equality of all men before human tribunals and human laws, as they all are equal before the Divine tribunal and Divine law.

I know, and you know, that a revolution has begun. I know, and all the world knows, that revolutions never go backward. Twenty Senators and a hundred Representatives proclaim boldly in Congress to-day sentiments and opinions and principles of Freedom which hardly so many men even in this free State dared to utter in their own homes twenty years ago. While the Government of the United States, under the conduct of the Democratic party, has been all that time, surrendering one plain and castle after another to Slavery, the people of the United States have been no less steadily and perseveringly gathering together the forces, with which to recover back again all the fields and all the castles which have been lost, and to confound and overthrow, by one decisive blow, the betrayers of the Constitution and Freedom for ever.

Too many, in politics and everything else, *forget there is a* FUTURE.