M'KEAN COUNTY DEMOCRAT.

VOL. 5. SMETHPORT, M'KEAN COUNTY, PA., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER, 19, 1863. NO. 4.

M'Kean County Democrat.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING,

By J. B. OVIATT,

SMETHPORT, M'KEAN COUNTY, PA.

OFFICE, S. E. CORNER OF PUBLIC SQUARE.

TERMS: - - - - $1 50 in Advance.

Rates of Advertising.

1 Column one year	$35 00
½ " "	20 00
¼ " "	12 00
1 " six months	20 00
½ " "	12 00
One square of 12 lines or less, 3 insertions,	1 50
Each subsequent insertion,	25
Business cards, with paper	5 00

Rule or figure work will be double the above rates. Twelve lines Brevier type, or eight lines nonpareil, is rated a square.

☞ These terms will be strictly adhered to. ☜

Business Directory.

DR. W. Y. M'COY,
SOURH-EAST CORNER MAIN STREET
Smethport, Pa.

DR. L. R. WISNER,
Physician and Surgeon, Smethport, Pa., will attend to al professional calls with promptness. Office two doors north of the Democrat Office.

BENNETT HOUSE,
Smethport, M'Kean Co., Pa. E. S Mason, Proprietor —opposite the Court House. A new, large, commodious and well furnished house.

A. J. NOURSE.
Dealer in Stoves, Tin Ware, Japanned Ware, &c., west end of the Public Square, Smethport, Pa. Custom work done to order on the shortest notice, and in the most substantial manner.

W. S. BROWNELL.
Dealer in Dry Goods, Groceries, Crockery, Hardware, Boots, Shoes, Hats, Caps, Glass, Nails, Oils &c., &c. East side of the Public Square, Smethport, Pa.

BYRON D. HAMLIN.
Attorney at Law, Smethport, M'Kean County, Pa., Agent for Messrs. Keating & Co's Lands. Attends especially to the Collection of Claims; Examination of Land Titles; Payment of Taxes, and all business relating to Real Estate. Office in Hamlin Block.

THE PRIDE OF NEW YORK.

1863's Specialty.

GRAND MIRROR OF AMERICAN GENIUS.

"Correct with spirit, eloquent with ease,
Intent to reason, or polite to please."

THE NEW YORK MERCURY.
FOR THE NEW YEAR.

It is with no fear of War's effect upon their literary fortunes, that the publishers of The New York Mercury acknowledge the unwavering loyalty of their two hundred thousand subscribers, and announce to them, and to all, that The New York Mercury for this year (1863) will be richer in every luxury of Polite Literature than ever before. It is no upstart speculation, no temporary "sensation," but a first class literary weekly, which has been familiar to the United States for a quarter of a century; and while the wishy-washy mushroom prints of yesterday are cutting down their talent even while they raise their subscription-price, The New York Mercury maintains all its great Staff of Romancers, Poets, Humorists, Essayists, Story-Tellers, and Editors, and promises to make it still greater for 1863.

It is the one paper for every home. Its forty columns of reading matter per week constitute an unparalleled

CONSERVATORY OF THE ENTERTAINING

and its Novels, Miscelaneous Tales, Beauties of Verse, Gossip, Feuilletons, Broadsides of Humor, and polished Editorials, combine to epitomize all the charms of

WIT AND SENTIMENT!

The husband reads it to his wife, the mother to her children, the lover to his sweet-heart, the soldier to his comrades, and the village school master to the circle around the stove.—It is familiar to the sight of every man, woman and child in our country, and has regular subscribers in several countries in Europe. The New York Mercury is also identified with the grandest patriotism of the age, for several members of its brilliant Staff hold high rank in our noble army, and have made themselves as famous with the Sword as with the Pen. The great illustrating artist of The New York Mercury, the inimitable Darley, gives the paper the highest attributes of Fine Art; and yet this largest literary weekly of the day promises to surpase itself in all these respects during the New Year!

The first New York Mercury Novelette for the New Year, to be commenced in the issue of January 3, 1863, is called

VICTORIA;
OR,
The Heiress of Castle Cliffe.

BY COUSIN MAY CARLETON,
Author of "Gipsy Rower," "Sybil Campbell," "Ermine," "Lamasque," &c., &c.

The productions of this distinguished authoress need no eulogy. Public opinion has long since pronounced them superior to any other novelettes published on this side of the Atlantic; and the true test of their merit is found in the fact that they are eagerly reproduced, after their publication in the Mercury, by the English press. We may add that the new tale "Victoria," is fully equal in interest and depth of plot to either of those which have secured so large a share of public approval, and we can earnestly recommend it to all story-readers.

The New York Mercury is sold by all news men and periodical dealers in America. To subscribers, it is regularly mailed every Saturday morning, for $2 a year; three copies for $5; six copies for $9; eight copies for $12, with an extra copy, *free*, to the getter up of the club. Six months' subscriptions received. *Always write plainly the name of your Post Office, County and State.* We take the notes of all solvent banks at par. Payment must invariably be in advance.

☞ Specimen copies sent free to all applicants.

Address all letters and remittances, post paid to
CAULDWELL & WHITNEY,
Proprietors of the New York Mercury,
113 Fulton street, New York City.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

The Abolition Leaders Convicted out of their own Mouths of Disunion-Abolitionism—Of Insurrectionary Doctrines—A Design to Change the Government, Override the Constitution and Form a Central Despotism—Of Falsehood, Corruption and Treason.

"SIR, THE ABOLITION PARTY IS A DISLOYAL ORGANIZATION. ITS PRETENDED LOVE FOR FREEDOM MEANS NOTHING MORE OR LESS THAN CIVIL WAR AND A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION. HONEST MEN OF ALL PARTIES SHOULD UNITE TO EXPOSE THEIR INTENTIONS AND ARREST THEIR PROGRESS."—[Andrew Jackson.

"If these infernal fanatics and abolitionists ever get the power in their hands, they will override the Constitution, set the Supreme Court at defiance, change and make laws to suit themselves, lay violent hands on those who differ with them in opinion, or dare question their fidelity, and finally bankrupt the country and deluge it with blood."—[Daniel Webster.

In the Senate Mr. Clay said in relation to Abolitionism:

"To the agency of their power of persuasion, they now propose to substitute the power of the ballot box; and he must be blind to what is passing before us, who does not perceive that the inevitable tendency of their proceedings is, if these should be found insufficient, to invoke finally, the more potent powers of the bayonet."

FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF ABOLITIONISM—HIGHER LAW.

"I have always hated slavery, I think, as much as any Abolitionist. I have always been an old line Whig. I have always hated it, but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska bill again. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction.

"We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed; a house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided; It will become all one thing or the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."—[Abraham Lincoln—campaign edition of his speeches.

Afterwards, commenting on this, he says:

"I only said what I expected would take place. I made a prediction only; it may have been a foolish one, perhaps. I did not even say that I desired that slavery should be put in course of ultimate extinction. I do say so now, however; so there need be no longer any difficulty about that."

"Correct your own error, that slavery has any constitutional guarantee which may not be released, and ought not to be relinquished. Say to slavery, when it shows its hand, (that is the Constitution,) and demands its pound of flesh, that if it draws one drop of blood, its life shall pay the forfeit. * * Do all this, and inculcate all this in a spirit of moderation and benevolence, and not of retaliation and fanaticism, and you will soon bring the parties of the country into an effective aggression upon slavery."—[W. H. Seward, Cleveland, 1848.

"Send it abroad upon the wings of the wind, that I am committed, fully committed to the fullest extent, in favor of the immediate and unconditional Abolition of slavery, wherever it exists under the authority of the Constitution of the United States."—[Senator Wilson of Massachusetts.

In the year 1857, an individual named Hinton Rowan Helper, who had been forced to leave his native State, North Carolina, in disgrace, published a book, of which he was the reputed author, entitled "The Impending Crisis," The book recommended *direct*, warfare on Southern society, "be the consequences what they might." It was so extravagant in tone and so diabolical in its designs, that it was at first generally supposed to be the work of a fool or a madman. What, however was the surprise of the public when the book was actually adopted by the Republican party as a campaign document, and its attrocious principles endorsed by SIXTY-EIGHT Republican Members of Congress and all the influential members of the party! Below will be found an abstract of the principles it advocated, taken from the large edition of the work, published by A. B. Burdick, No. 145 Nassau street, N. Y., 1860.

1. We unhesitatingly declare ourselves in favor of the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery.—Page 26.

2. We cannot be too hasty in carrying out our designs.—Page 33.

3. No man can be a true patriot without first becoming an Abolitionist.—Page 116.

6. Slaveholders are more criminal than common murderers.—Page 140.

7. All slaveholders are under the shield of a perpetual license to murder.—Page 141.

8. It is our honest conviction that all the pro-slavery slaveholders, who are alone responsible for the continuance of the baneful institution among us, deserve to be at once reduced to a parallel with the basest criminals that lie fettered within the cells of our public prisons.—Page 158.

9. Were it possible that the whole number (of slaveholders,) could be gathered together and transferred into four equal gangs of licensed robbers, ruffians, thieves and murderers, society, we feel assured, would suffer less from their attrociiies than it does now.—Page 158.

10. Once and forever, at least so far as this country is concerned, the inferual question of slavery must be disposed of. A speedy and absolute abolishment of the whole system is the true policy of the South, and this is the policy which we propose to pursue.—Page 121.

WE UNFURL OUR BANNER TO THE WORLD.

Inscribed on the banner which we (W. H. Seward, Horace Greeley, and the other endorsers,) herewith unfurl to the world, with the full and fixed determination to stand by it or die by it, unless one of more virtuous efficacy shall be presented, are the mottoes which, in substance, embody the principles as we conceive should govern us.

THE MOTTOES ON OUR BANNER.

1. Thorough organization and independant political action on the part of non-slaveholding whites of the South.

2. Ineligibility of slaveholders; never another vote to the trafficker in human flesh.

3. No co-operation with slaveholders in politics, no fellowship with them in religion, no affiliation with them in society.

4. No patronage to slaveholding merchants; no bequest to slave waiting-hotels; no fees to slaveholding lawyers; no employment to slaveholding physicians; no audience to slaveholding parsons.

5. No recognition of pro-slavery men, except as ruffians, outlaws and criminals.

6. Immediate death to slavery, or if not immediate, unqualified proscription of its advocate during the period of its existence.—Pages 155 and 156.

7. Thus, terror endgenderers of the South, have we fully and frankly defined our position, we have no modifications to propose, no compromises to offer, nothing to retract. Frown, sirs, fret, foam, prepare your weapons, threat, strike, shoot, stab, bring on civil war, dissolve the Union, nay annihilate the solar system if you will—do all this, more, less, better, worse, anything—do what you will, sirs, you can neither foil or intimidate us; our purpose is as firmly fixed as the central pillars of Heaven; we have determined to abolish slavery and so help us God, abolish it we will.—Page 187.

Wendell Phillips, shortly after the organization of the Republican party, speaking of that party said:

"No man has a right to be surprised at this state of things. It is just what we (Abolitionists and Disunionists) have attempted to bring about. It is the first sectional party ever organized in this country. It does not know its own face, and calls itself national; but it is not national—it is sectional. The Republican party is a party of the North pledged against the South.

"No act of ours do we regard with more conscientiousness approval or higher satisfaction, none do we submit more confidently to the tribunal of Heaven and the moral verdict of mankind, that when, several years ago, on the 4th of July, in the presence of a great assembly, we committed to the flames the Constitution of the United States."

"I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."—[Abraham Lincoln.

"The master not only governs the slave without his consent, but he governs him by a set of rules altogether different from those which he prescribes for himself. Allow all the governed an equal voice in the government."—[Howell's Life of Lincoln, page 279.

"Our Legislatures, State and Federal, should raise the platform upon which our free colored people stand; they should give to the full political rights to hold office, to vote to sit on juries, to give their testimony, and to make no distinction between them and ourselves. The instrument called the Constitution, after pronouncing all men equal, and having equal rights, suffers slavery to exists, a free colored person to be denied all political rights, and after declaring that all persons shall enjoy a free intercourse with the States, suffers the free negro to be driven out of all, and excluded from such rights. Deliver me from such an instrument thus unjust, that can be thus perverted, and made to sanction prejudices and party feelings, and note the accidental distinction of color.—[Cassius M. Clay.

When questioned in the House Representatives, the Hon. P. Banks, afterwards elected Speaker of the House, and Governor of Massachusetts, by the Black Republicans, declared his inability to decide whether the white or black was the superior race, but would leave the question to be decided by absorption or amalgamation! He said:

"So far as he had studied the subject of races, he had adopted the idea that when there is a weaker race in existence, it will succumb to, and be absorbed in, the stronger race. This was the universal law as regarded the race of men in the world. In regard to the question whether the white or the black was superior, he proposed to wait until time should develop whether the white race should absorb the black, or the black absorb the white."

And Horace Greeley, while admitting that the abolition of slavery in the States is the real object of the Republican party, explains the reason why they did not then openly advocate the doctrine. We quote from his paper (the *Tribune*) of July 25, 1854:

"We contend that the abolition of slavery in the States is the real object of the Republican party.

"Admit that Abolition in the States is what all men ought to strive for, and it is clear to our mind that a large majority are not prepared for this, and the practical question is this—shall we politically attempt what will certainly involve us in defeat and failure? or shall we not rather attempt that which a majority are ripe for, and thus, by our consequent triumph, invite that majority to go further? Shall we insist on having all the possible eggs now, or be content to await their appearance day by day? The latter seems to us the only rational, sensible course. We care not how fast Messrs. Birney & Co., may ripen public sentiment in the North for emancipation; we will aid them to the best of our ability; but we will not refuse the good now within our reach out of deference to that which is yet unattainable. My. Briney's 'ultimatum' may be just what he sees fit; we have not proposed to modify or meddle with it. We only ask that he shall not interdict or prevent the doing of some good at once, merely because he would like to do more good, as we shall, also, whenever it shall have become practicable."

W. P. Cutler, another Republican member of Congress from Ohio, in a speech in the House, said:

"Slavery has caused the present rebellion, and there can be no permanent peace and Union in this Republic, as long as that institution exists."

At the same session Owen Lovejoy, a Republican Congressman from Illinois, said:

"There can be no Union till slavery is destroyed."

DISUNION SENTIMENTS OF ABOLITION LEADERS—"LET THE UNION SLIDE"—"THE LEAGUE WITH HELL AND COVENANT WITH DEATH."

"The Union is not worth supporting with the South."—[Horace Greeley.

"I am willing, under a certain state of circumstances, to let the Union slide."—[General Banks!

"In case of the alternative being presented of the continuation of slavery or a dissolution of the Union, I am for a dissolution, and I care not how soon it comes."—[Rufus B Spalding.

"I detest slavery, and say unhesitatingly, that I am for its abolition by some means, if it should send all party organizations in the Union, or the Union itself, to the devil."—[H. M. Addison of the American Advertiser.

"By all her regard for the generations of the future, by her reverence for God and man, the North is bound to dissolve her present Union with kidnappers and murderers, and form a Northern Republic on the basis of 'No Union with slaveholders.'"—[Hon. Henry C. Wright, of Ill., June 9, 1856.

This treason was preceded by Senator Hale, who presented a petition in the Senate for a dissolution of the Union, and boasted that he had already "presented Eight petitions for the Dissolution of the Union." See Congressional Globe, Feb. 8, 1850, the same year in which Senator Henry Clay declared that, "the great question before the country was whether abolitionism should put down the Union, or the Union should put down abolitionism."

To those New England disunionists, Senator Dayton of New Jersey, said: "Sir, I have yet to know that the right of petition has ever been extended to the distruction of the Government to which it is addressed. It is not the right of any party to petition the sovereign power to destroy itself. This petition (presented by Hale,) comes here and asks us to dissolve the Union. It asks us to put an end to the Federal Government; it asks us to destroy the Constitution. Why, the first thing I did when I came here was to take an oath to support the Constitution which those men ask me to destroy. Sir! who wants argument, who wants debate in answer to such memorials?"

Massachusetts' most noble Senator, who for his reverence for the Constitution, and his deep love for the Union—Daniel Webster, for his integrity, honor, truth and justice, was stricken down by Massachusetts. Senator Webster said: "I am much obliged to the member from Michigan, (Mr. Cass,) for the clearness with which he has expressed his opinion against this petition. I am quite sorry that such a petition has been presented, and shall be quite surprised if there shall be any vote in the Senate for receiving it. I think the substance of this petition is this: You and each of you took your solemn oaths in the presence of Almighty God, and on the Holy Evangelists, that you would support the Constitution of the United States, now therefore we pray you take immediate steps to break up the Union, and overthrow the Constitution as soon as you can, and as in duty bound we will ever pray." Said Senator Cass, "That's first rate." This petition for the dissolution of the Union was instantly and indignantly rejected, every senator voting against it, except three.

Massachusetts, because of the admission of Louisiana, sent her representative to Congress to declare the Union of the States dissolved.

Massachusetts, on the admission of Texas voted herself out of the Union, and has never voted herself in again.

To follow up the course of history, look at the facts:

Massachusetts was foremost in the party, which, in 1856, raised the sectional flag of disunion, blotting out one half of the stars from our glorious flag, and striking boldly for disunion, as that State has always, done and is now doing.

Massachusetts, in 1860, bent on carrying out her deep laid conspiracy against the Union, reorganized the party which was announced as the party of the free States against the Slave States, the North against the South.

James S. Pike, long editorially connected with the New York *Tribune* and now Minister to the Netherlands, said:

"I have no doubt that the free and slave States ought to separate. The Union is not worth supporting in connection with the South.

The Republican party is moulding public sentiment in the right direction for the specific work the Abolitionists are striving to accomplish, viz: The dissolution of the Union, and the abolition of slavery throughout the land."

The present Assistant Secretary of the Treasury—Francis E. Spinner—during the Fremont campaign said:

"Should this (the election of Fremont) fail, no true man would any longer be safe here from the assaults of the arrogant slave oligarchy who then would rule with an iron hand. For the free North would be left the choice of a peaceful disolution of the Union, or a civil war which would end in the same.

"I will not stullify myself by supposing that we have any warrant in the Constitution for this proceeding.

"This talk of restoring the Union as it was, under the Constitution as it is, is one of the absurdities which I have heard repeated until I have become about sick of it. The Union can never be restored as it was. There are many things which render such an event impossible. This Union never shall, with my consent, be restored under the Constitution as it is with slavery to be protected by it."—[Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, the Administration leader in Congress.

"Whenever any portion of this Union, large enough to form an independent, self-subsisting nation, shall see fit to say authentically, to the residue, 'we want to get away from you,' we shall say—and we trust self-respect, if not regard for the principle of self government will constrain the residue of the American people to say—Go!"—[N. Y. Tribune, Dec., 1860.

"Not a few of the Republican jounals of the interior are working themselves up to the belief that they are endeavoring to impress upon their readers that the seceded States, be they few or many, will be whipped back into the Union.—We caution all such that in language of that sort they are adding new fuel to the flame which is already blazing so fiercely; and that the probabilities now are that the result will prove them to be false prophets. No man knows what public policy may demand of the incoming administration; but the drift of opinion seems to be that, if peaceable secession is possible, the retiring States will be assisted to go, that this needless and bitter controversy may be brought to an end."—[Chicago Tribune, December, 1860.

As proof of what we assert, we quote from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas, delivered in the United States Senate, January 3d, 1861, on the compromise measures then pending before that body;

"I believe this to be a fair basis of amicable adjustment. If you of the Republican side are not willing to accept this, nor the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Crittenden,) pray tell us what you are willing to do?

"I address the inquiry to Republicans only, for the reason that in the Committee of Thirteen, a few days ago, every member from the South, including those from the cotton States, (Messrs. Toombs and Davis,) expressed their readiness to accept the proposition of my venerable friend from Kentucky, (Mr. Crittenden,) as a final settlement of the controversy, if intended and sustained by the Republican members.

"Hence the sole responsibility of our disagreement, and the only difficulty in the way of an amicable adjustment, is with the republican party.

Republicans will surely not discredit one whom they so frequently eulogize and from whom they occasionally quote. Mr. Douglas boldly charged the responsibility on them, and they had not the hardihood to deny it.

In February, 1863, Horace Greeley wrote a leader for the *Tribune*, in which appears the following:

"Speaking for ourselves, we can honestly say that for the old Union, which was kept in existence by Southern menaces and Northern concessions, we have no regrets and no wish for its reconstruction.

"Who wants a Union which is nothing but a sentiment to lacquer Fourth of July orations with?

"If by chance, in ancient times, the criminal felt the loathsome corpse, which justice had tied upon his shoulders, slipping off—he did not, we fancy, cry out: "Oh wretched man that I am! who will fasten me again to the body of this death?" If we are, in the providence of God, to be delivered from unnatural alliances—if the January of slavery is no longer to chill, by natural embraces, the May of human hope, who is there weak and wicked enough to forbid the righteous divorce?"

Dr. O. A. Brownson, whom the Abolitionists last year ran for Congress in the district of New Jersey, opposite New York City, said in his well-known *Review* for July:

"It is no secret now that the leaders of the Republican party were prepared, if they could not retain the border slave States, to let South Carolina and the Gulf States go, and form, if they chose, and independent confederacy."

"I will continue to experiment no longer, it is all madness. Let the Slaveholding Union go, and slavery will go with the Union down into the dust. If the Church is against disunion, and not on the side of the slave, then I pronounce it as of the devil. I say, let us cease striking hands with thieves and adulterers and give to the winds the rallying cry, "no union with slaveholders, socially or religiously, and up with the flag of disunion."—[Wm. L. Garrison.

Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, the Chairman, of the Judiciary Committee of the House, in a remarkable speech made by him at the same session, says:

"Who in the name of God, wants the Cotton States this side perdition, to remain in the Union, if slavery is to continue?

"The Union as it was will never bless the vision of any pro slavery fanatic or secession sympathizer, and it never ought to. It is a thing of the past, hated by every patriot and destined never to curse an honest people, or blot the page of history again."

"The fact can no longer be disguised that many of the Republican Senators desire war and disunion, under pretext of saving the Union. They wish to get rid of the Southern States, in order to have a majority in the Senate to confirm the appointments, and many of them think they can hold a Republican majority in the Northern States, but not in the whole Union; for partisan reasons they are anxious to dissolve the Union, if it can be done without holding them responsible before the people."—[Stephen A. Douglas, in the U. S. Senate, Dec, 25, 1960.

From a speech of Cassius M. Clay while the President was pursuing a conservative policy. "Better recognize the Southern Confederacy at once, and stop this effusion of blood than to continue in this ruinous policy or have even a restoration of the Union."

"If the cotton States become satisfied that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. The right to secede may be a revolutionary one, but it exists nevertheless. * * * * *

"We must ever resist the right of any State to remain in the Union and nullify or defy the laws therof. To withdraw from the Union is quite another matter; and whenever a considerable section of our Union shall deliberly resolve to go out, we shall resist all coersive measures to keep it in. We hope never to live in a government where one section is pinned to another by bayonets.—[New York Tribune, Nov. 9, 1860.

Also the following from the N. Y. Tribune, Dec. 17, 1860:

"If it (the Declaration of Independence) justified the secession from the British Empire, of three millions of colonists in 1776, we do not see why it would not justyfy the secession of five millions of Southrons from the Union in 1861. If we are mistaken on this point, why does not some one attempt to show wherein and why? For our own part, while we deny the right of slaveholders to hold slaves against the will of the latter, we cannot see how twenty millions of people can rightfully hold ten or even five millions in a detested Union with them by military force.

"If seven or eight contiguous States shall present themselves authentically at Washington, saying, 'We hate the Federal Union; we have withdrawn from it; we give you the choice between acquiescing in our secession and arranging amicably all incidental questions on one side, and attempting to subdue us on the other—we could not stand up for coercion and subjugation, for we do not think it would be right. We hold the right of self-government sacred, even when invoked in behalf of those who deny it to others.

"If ever seven or eight States send agents to Washington to say, 'We want to get out of the Union,' we shall feel constrained by our devotion to human liberty to say, let them go! And we do not see how we could take the other side without coming in direct conflict with those rights of man which we hold paramount to all political arrangements, however convenient and advantageous."

The same paper in February last declared, that if in the next ensuing ninety days, the rebels should not be whipped the Federal government should make with them "the best attainable peace."

When the same paper urged a barbarious warfare that would be a reproach to the nation and the age, and stir the most bitter hatred in the Southern people against the loyal States and the government, it meant disunion.

When it demanded, with unparalleled insolence, an emancipation proclamation from the President in the name of twenty millions, it meant disunion.

When it pressed the extreme measures of Abolitionism upon Congess, it meant disunion.

When it says to Jeff. Davis and the Confederate leaders, continue the struggle until the first of May and we will then separate, it means disunion.

What has the administration and Congress meant in the adoption of its policy? Were they blind? Will history be so charitable as to excuse their fatal errors on the ground that their want of comprehension absolved them from criminality? Now when the mask has been thrown asside by the Garrison Abolitionists, and they have proclaimed their ultimatum of war till May and then disunion, can the administration continue the policy of these abolition disunionists and hope to escape the criminality which that policy involves?—[Thurlow Weed—In the Albany Evening Journal.

INSURRECTIONARY DOCTRINES OF THE ABOLITION LEADERS — MASSACRE AND BLOODSHED ENDORSED AND ADVOCATED.

"I tell you, fellow-citizens, the Harper's Ferry outbreak was the legitimate consequence of the teachings of the Republican party.—*Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts—Speech at Syracuse, October 28, 1859.*

The Hon. Robt. C. Winthrop, late speaker of the National House of Representatives, on his return from Europe, uttered the following proof of the true character of John A. Andrews, who was elected Governor of Massachusetts because of his complicity with the attempted massacre of Virginia women and children; Mr. Winthrop says: "I shall not soon forget the emotions with which I received, at Vienna, last November, the first tidings of that atrocious affair at Harper's Ferry. I think there could have been no true American heart in Europe at that moment, that did not throb and thrill with horror at that announcement. But I confess to have experienced emotions hardly less deep or distressing when I read, not long afterwards, an account of a meeting in this very hall, I believe, at which the gallows at Charlestown, in Virginia, was likened to the Cross on Calvary, and at which it was openly declared that the ringleader of that desperate and wicked conspiracy was right. Sir, if it had been suggested to me then, that before another year had passed away, the presiding officer at that meeting would have been deliberately nominated by the Republican party of Massachusetts for the Chief Magistracy of the Commonwealth, I should have repelled the idea as not not within the prospect of belief—as utterly transcending any pitch of extravagance which even the wildest and most ultra members of that party had ever prepared us to anticipate.

"But the nomination is before us, (and Andrews was elected). I should be false to every impulse of my heart, if being here at all this evening—if opening my lips at all during this campaign—I did not utter my humble protest—as one to whom the cause of Christianity and social order is dear, as one who would see the word of God and the laws of the land respected and obeyed—if I did not enter my humble and earnest protest against such an attempt to give the seeming sanction of the people of Massachusetts to sentiments so impious and abominable."

John A. Andrews, Governor of Massachusetts, presided at John Brown sympathy meeting on the 19th November, 1859, at which Wendell Phillips and R. W. Emerson made speeches. He, too, made the speech above referred to; and from it we make the following extract:

"John Brown and his companions in the conflict at Harper's Ferry, those who fell there and those who are to suffer upon the scaffold, are victims and martyrs to an idea. There is an irrepressible conflict. [great applause] between freedom and slavery as old and as immortal as the irrepressible conflict between right and wrong. They are among the martyrs of that conflict. John Brown was right. I sympathize with the idea, because I sympathize with and believe in the eternal right. They who are dependant upon him and his sons and his associates, in the battle of Harper's Ferry, have a right to call upon us who have professed to believe, or who may have, in any manner or measure, taught the doctrine of the rights of man as applied to the colored slaves