
Pamphlet Collection

1863

Our Country Before Party

Harrison G.O. Blake

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/pamphlet_collection

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Cedarville, a service of the Centennial Library. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pamphlet Collection by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Cedarville. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@cedarville.edu.

4.50

OUR COUNTRY BEFORE PARTY.

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. G. BLAKE, OF OHIO, ON THE STATE OF THE UNION.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEB. 28, 1863.

The House having under consideration the Miscellaneous Appropriation Bill, Mr. BLAKE said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The state of the Union being under consideration, I claim the indulgence of the House while I consider that question in general, and some other things in particular.

Sir, on the 5th day of last January I offered for adoption, the following resolutions:

"Resolved. That this House earnestly desires the most speedy and effectual measures to be taken to put down the rebellion; that any proposition for peace or cessation of hostilities at this time, on any terms other than an unconditional submission of the rebels now in arms against the Government, to the requirements of the Constitution and laws, would be pusillanimous and traitorous; that the members of this House do hereby give the most earnest assurances to the people of the United States, that they will cheerfully co-operate with the President as Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy in any measures he may deem proper, sanctioned by the Constitution and the laws of civilized warfare, to strengthen the military power of our gallant soldiers in the field defending the Government, and to weaken that of the enemy laboring to destroy it."

"Resolved, That the only alternative Government can or ought at this time to offer to rebels, is 'submit or be conquered!'"

When these resolutions were introduced for the consideration of the House, I supposed they were of such a character that every member would gladly vote for them. In this, however, I was mistaken, for no sooner were they presented, than my colleague from the Dayton district, [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] interposed his objection, and under the rules they had to go over. Why this objection? Is there anything in the resolutions that any man loyal to the Constitution, and wishing to put down the rebellion, could not vote for? If there is, I have failed to discover it. I must say, however, whatever I may think of the policy pursued by my colleague, that he has been from the first a consistent opposer of every measure for the suppression of the rebellion. From the raising of troops to defend the Capital, the providing of money to pay our gallant men in the field in defense of their Government and ours, to the confiscation of rebel property, all have alike received his unqualified opposition. No measures of the President and his Administration to put down the rebellion, have ever commanded the support of the gentleman, but have at all times received his warm denunciation. *Consistency*, therefore, is a jewel, that

my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] can wear, whether honestly or dishonestly, I will not say. It is claimed by him that he is honest in his course of action. It may be that he is. *Judas* claimed to be honest, but he betrayed the *Son* of man with a kiss :—*Saul*, “yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord,” claimed to be honest ; but mankind have very generally come to the conclusion, that if these men were honest, they were honestly in the commission of a very great crime. *Now*, my colleague appears, as the angel of peace. On the 15th day of December, 1859, while the contest for Speaker was going on in this House, my colleague said :

“Sir, I was as good a Western fire eater as the very hottest member from the South.”

No talk of peace then. *War! war!* was the music that entertained our ears from the gentleman. And again he says in the same speech :

The controversy in this hall has been of a character, and sentiments have been avowed, which have caused the North and South to stand arrayed in hostility against each other, and disunion has been threatened. I occupy between these parties a position of armed neutrality. I am not a Northern man. I have no sympathy with the North, and very little good feeling with the North, and I am bound to it by no tie whatever. But I am bound to the South ; I am identified with the South and her slave institution, and at this particular time, when she is in the midst of insurrection and murder, and when she is threatened with the torch of the incendiary, and has the knife of the assassin suspended over her, I am with her, heart and soul.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. Do I understand my colleague to quote that as an extract from a speech delivered by me in this House?

Mr. BLAKE. I do, sir, from a speech delivered by you in this House, and as reported in the New York Herald. I have the Herald now before me.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. It is not true. It is taken from the false report of a newspaper, sent out from this House. It was never delivered in the House and is not in the Globe.

Mr. BLAKE. The gentleman is entitled to his denial ; but I know that the speech was reported correctly, I heard it delivered.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. Well, take the Globe, I will furnish it to you now.

Mr. BLAKE. Keep cool till I get through, I have but just commenced.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. I will not keep cool when a falsehood like that is attempted to be palmed off as true, and a forgery too.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not the first time the gentleman has denied his own speech. I have the speech as published in the New York Herald at the time, before me. The speech was withheld by the gentleman for several days after it was delivered, for revision, and in the revised copy as it appears in the Globe, it is true, that the language is not precisely the same in all parts of the speech as that taken down at the time by the Herald reporter, but it is substantially the same in sentiment ; and the language the gentleman then used, as reported in the Herald, but expressed the sentiments that have guided his action ever since the rebellion began. Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. One moment. The speech was prepared before and was published substantially as prepared.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will find if he looks at the Globe, for I have examined it, that he retained his speech against the protest of the reporters for the Globe, and because of that protest, he maintained that he had a right to keep it as long as he pleased. He rose to a question of privilege upon this floor, and claimed that he had a right to keep it back, and he did keep the speech for revision, and did revise it.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. And so, also, I kept a speech which I read on the 3d of July, 1862, (the only one I ever did read here,) for a few days, in order to prepare it for publication. I want no more forgeries read to the House.

Mr. BLAKE. This is not a forgery, sir.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. It is. It is a false report absolutely.

Mr. BLAKE. I heard the gentleman make that speech, and there are many present who heard it.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. Not a member present. You did not hear it. It never was uttered.

Mr. BLAKE. I did hear it, and it was uttered as is known by many members now here.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. It is absolutely false. When you come to quote my speech, take the record.

Mr. BLAKE. I may take the record, and I find precisely the same sentiment uttered in the Globe as is uttered here; and where the language does not agree with the report in the Herald, it is a false record made by the gentleman himself.

Sir, I said my colleague had been consistent, but truth compels me to say that a man holding such sentiments, would appear far more consistent in the rebel Congress at Richmond, than in this Hall. Again, my colleague in the speech from which I have quoted said :

"Do you ask me when the hour of disunion will come! I tell you never, never while it is possible to prevent it—never while we can secure the just constitutional rights which the Union was made to secure—never, at least, till the time shall come wherein to vindicate the glorious rights of revolution. Do you ask me when that hour will come! Of that every State and every people must judge for themselves, before God and the great tribunal of history."

What Southern rebel ever claimed more than this? It is the very doctrine of secession and revolution which South Carolina has asserted ever since 1832, and upon which she and the other rebel States, are now acting in their efforts to destroy the Government of the United States. This speech, then, of my colleague, was to misrepresent the people of the free States on the subject of slavery, its only tendency to precipitate the North and the South into a conflict; and now that the conflict has come, the only result of his efforts will be to prolong the war, and endanger the lives of our gallant men in the field confronting the rebel army.

Sir, it was in the direct line of my colleague's [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] consistency, that he a few days since, said in a speech at Newark, New Jersey :

"Shall the Democratic party be induced for one moment to strike hands with those who desire to change the purposes of the Administration, and bring it back again to a war for the Union, when the whole people united cannot accomplish anything before the 4th of March, 1865! *Will the war continue that long?* [*'Never, never!'* from all parts of the room.] *Will you send your sons again to the battle-field?* [*Overwhelming, enthusiastic, and unanimous cries, 'No, no! 'Never, never! 'God forbid! 'Not if I know myself!'*] *Shall they*

be conscripted to carry on this war for two years more, and for the negro? [Tremendous outbursts. Yells, cheers. Cries of 'No, never.' 'Let them try it.' 'See them d—d first.' 'We defy them.'"]

This, sir, is a bold declaration of treason against the Government, which ought to bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every American citizen. Sir, can it be possible that this is the American Congress, and that a man who utters such sentiments at this time of national peril, is permitted to hold a seat here? This, sir, is the way the rebels are encouraged to fight and protract the contest.

But for such speeches, and the aid and support the rebels have received from the sympathisers, the war would now be at an end.

The Richmond Dispatch, the organ of Jeff Davis, of February 20th, referring to this speech of my colleague, says:

"This speech looks something like a 'lucid interval' in the Northern mind. Their army will be 300,000 only in June. Let us keep ours up to 500,000 and dictate peace at Washington or Alexandria.

The Constitution declares that treason against the United States "*shall consist in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.*" If this is not giving the enemies of our country "*aid and comfort,*" I would like to know what is? This is its natural result, and therefore, it should be regarded as treasonable by every honest man in the nation. Sir, in this same Newark speech, my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] said:

"I remember that it was in the city of Newark, a little more than two years ago, that I first gave the pledge to any portion of the people of the United States that I never would contribute, by my words or acts, to the shedding of one drop of American blood in a civil war. (Great applause.) How far and consistently I have kept that pledge, let you—a part of my countrymen—determine."

I have endeavored to defend the consistency of my colleague, from the commencement of this war; but there is one pledge which my colleague gave about the time to which he refers in his Newark speech, that he has not redeemed. I refer to a meeting of the Ohio delegation in this city, called for the purpose of forming a union of all parties against the rebellion. At that meeting, my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] declared, "*that if any attempt was made to march troops through his district for the purpose of coercing the South, they would have to march over his dead body before they could go through the district.*" Sir, troops have marched through his district for the purpose of coercing the rebels, and they found nothing of the *dead body* of my colleague.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. That is false, and the member knows it is false when he utters it.

Mr. BLAKE. On that point I will send to the Clerk's desk a letter to be read, and the statement of several members of Congress who were present at the meeting.

The Clerk read as follows:

Letter from the Hon. T. C. Theaker.

WASHINGTON, June 2d, 1862,

HON. S. EDGERTON,

SIR: I was present at a meeting of the Ohio members of Congress called by the Hon. Thomas Corwin, for the purpose of giving a united expression against the doctrine of secession, and in favor of all loyal men uniting to put down the rebellion. Said meeting was in the month of December, 1860, or the month of January following. The Hon. C. L. Vallandigham was present at that meet-

ing, and declared that if any attempt was made to march troops through his district, for the purpose of coercing the South, they would have to march over his dead body before they could go through the district.

Yours Truly,

T. C. THEAKER.

We, the undersigned members of the 36th and 37th Congress, were present at the meeting alluded to by the Hon. T. C. Theaker, in the foregoing letter of the date of June 2d, 1862, and we hereby endorse the statement therein made concerning the declaration of the Hon. C. L. Vallandigham, at that meeting.

SIDNEY EDGERTON,

JOHN A. GURLEY.

I remember the statement, substantially, as made by Hon. Mr. Theaker.

J. M. ASHLEY.

I remember that Mr. Vallandigham at the meeting referred to, declared his hostility to and his purpose to resist any attempt to march troops through Ohio to coerce the people of seceding States, to submit to the authority of the Federal Government.

JNO. A. BINGHAM.

I concur in the statement of Mr. Bingham.

JOHN HUTCHINS.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. Now, Mr. Speaker, one moment about this. I have already explained this subject long ago, and shown how this idea came into the mind of anybody. Here are my colleagues, [Mr. PENDLETON and Mr. COX,] who heard every word I said, and have repeatedly joined me in the denial that I ever uttered such a sentiment. The manner in which it originated was this: The very evening after that on which that caucus was held, after this House adjourned, Mr. Theaker, the member before me, [Mr. BLAKE,] my colleague, [Mr. COX,] myself and others, went into the Senate just as Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee had concluded his speech. The Senator from Oregon, General Joseph Lane, rose and, during his reply, used that language, as follows: "If it (civil war) should come unfortunately upon this country, inaugurated by a tyrant who would like to hold American citizens as vassals, then I will say to that coward who would do it, 'you will walk over your humble servant's body first.'"—*Cong. Globe*, 1860-'61, p. 144.

We had met the evening before, as I have said, in the rooms occupied by my colleagues [Mr. PUGH, Mr. MARTIN and Mr. PENDLETON] and myself. Some four or five months afterward, and not before—it was after the war broke out—it was asserted that it was I who had used that language. I happen to have hostile record evidence, made at the time, of what I said, and it has been republished. The report in the Cincinnati Commercial (a Republican paper) next morning, sent by telegraph by its correspondent, Mr. Bickham, contained what I did say, and it was the very reverse of that. More than that, Mr. Bickham, in his letter transmitted by mail the next day, and published about the 22d December, 1860, in that same Commercial, repeats the language more at length. It is that Mr. VALLANDIGHAM said that "if any army undertook to march down South from the northern part of the State, they should have a free passage through the Miami valley, provided they did not disturb anybody." Now, that is the fact; and the member, instead of discussing the great questions of the hour, has no right to undertake to single me out for his dirty personal attacks.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I should not pursue this policy with my colleague, if his conduct was not consistent entirely with that lan

guage, and such as to command the attention of all loyal men. Now the time to which I refer was when Thomas Corwin was chairman of a meeting in this city, called when the Southern States were about going out of the Union, and when, perhaps, some of them had gone out, to see if we could not unite on the proposition that secession was rebellion, and that rebellion must be crushed; and to see if all parties would not unite for that purpose. We met at the room of Mr. Pugh. The Ohio delegation was present. The Ohio delegation in this House, all, did agree on that proposition, with the exception of my colleague, [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM.] I cannot be mistaken about this. It was talked over at the time, and since, between members; and I remember very well the manly position of Mr. Howard, of Ohio on the subject. I remember well, that he gave all men to understand that troops would be marched anywhere through Ohio, to put down a rebellion, if it became necessary.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. He never said any such thing. It is a downright falsehood.

Mr. BLAKE. You can call it what you please. I let it go to the country with the evidence I have given. Your denial and my statement may go for what they are worth.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. Very well; they may.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not stand on my statement alone. It is in consistency with the conduct of my colleague ever since the war commenced. It stands on record evidence of men who have ears to hear, and who were present on that occasion as well as myself, and who did hear, and they do confirm the statement I have made. I am very willing the country should decide who has told the falsehood. I say my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] did say, at the meeting referred to, substantially what the Hon. T. C. Theaker declares he said, and I believe he made use of that very language. Mr. Theaker is well sustained by several other members of Congress who were present. Some of my colleagues say they did not hear the language said to have been used by the gentleman. I am not surprised that all present did not hear it, for there was much "noise and confusion" there about that time. Sir, the fact that some gentlemen did not hear it, and say they did not, can in no way invalidate the testimony of those who did hear it, and say they did.

Mr. PENDLETON. If my colleague will allow me a moment, I desire to say this. I was present at the meeting of the Ohio delegation referred to by my colleague. I recollect very well what transpired there. The scene that occurred, I am sure, will never be forgotten by any of us that were present. I desire now to say, once for all, that I believe I heard every word which was spoken during the whole of that meeting. I heard the speech of my colleague, [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM,] from beginning to end, and I did not hear and I do not believe that there was uttered any such language as has been here to night, and repeatedly heretofore, attributed to my colleague, [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM.]

Mr. BLAKE. I appeal to my colleague, [Mr. ASHLEY,] who was present, and there were others present, but who are absent from the House at this time, I will furnish their statement to the reporter.

Mr. ASHLEY. I was present, sir, at that meeting. The occurrences of that night are fresh in my memory. During the evening the con-

versation became somewhat excited. If I do not mistake, the then Senator from Ohio [Mr. PUGH] remarked, and directed his remarks to me, smiting upon his breast and saying, that we would have to march over his dead body before we could march an army into the South to coerce her. I replied that we would march over it if it was necessary. He said he could raise Irishmen enough in my district to put me down. And I understood my colleague from the Dayton district [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM,] to approve and endorse this sentiment, and to say that we would have to march over the Democrats of the Miami district also, before we should be permitted to invade sovereign States for the purpose of coercing them.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. So it was Mr. Pugh, then, who made the remark, was it?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I think there is not a member of this delegation who has a more distinct recollection of what occurred at that meeting than myself. It was on the 18th of December, 1860. I have some memoranda about it by which I am enabled to refresh my recollection. I recollect very well, and I have recurred to it since I have been here, that we were talking over some propositions by which we were of opinion that, through the action of Congress, we could close up these difficulties with the South without war. That was the way in which this conversation commenced. I myself offered a resolution which was not agreed to at that meeting. The gentleman says that we were all agreed on one policy.

Mr. BLAKE. Except one member of the House, my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM,] and one member of the Senate, [Mr. PUGH,] to the proposition that secession was rebellion, and the rebellion must be crushed out.

Mr. COX. Now, sir, I have here a resolution which I offered in that meeting, and which was rejected by the Republicans who were there. I have that resolution here now in the very language in which it was offered. I wrote in pencil at the time and I have preserved it thinking it might possibly be of some sort of use as a historical thing. Here it is:

Resolved, That the Representatives of Ohio request the members of the Ohio Legislature, to abrogate all laws in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, for the return of fugitives from justice, and to vote down all pending laws to impede the execution of the fugitive slave law.

Well sir, one thing led to another in that discussion, I may not recollect everything that took place, but I certainly remember no remark of my colleague from the Dayton district of the tenor of that reported by my colleague over the way, [Mr. BLAKE.] I remember distinctly that a member of Congress from Ohio [Mr. HOWARD] declared something about being willing to shoulder his musket and go to war, as he has since gone to the war, but I remember nothing of the kind in reference to my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM,] such as my other colleague imputes to him.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course I can have no controversy in respect to this question of veracity with my other colleagues from Ohio. The version I have quoted from, has been published two years and I have never heard it controverted until now.

Mr. COX. It was denied at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not aware of it. I was present when my colleague [Mr. EDGERTON] made his speech last session in this House,

and no man on the floor then denied it.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM, The same version was quoted in a speech of Mr. EDGERTON in this House, and was denied at the time. I denied it in a card soon after it was first stated, eighteen months ago.

Mr. DIVEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BLAKE. This is purely an Ohio matter, I hope the gentleman will not interfere in it.

Mr. DIVEN. I merely wanted to ask a single question.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIVEN. The question I proposed to ask of some member of the Ohio delegation who was present at this meeting is, what time in the evening it was? (Laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE. It was early in the evening I assure the gentleman. As I said before, I have no question of veracity with any other colleagues upon this point. I did not know that it was a matter of controversy; I never heard it questioned. I wish to say that my memory upon this subject I think cannot be at fault; but at the same time I do not wish to charge as treacherous the memory of any other gentleman. I am confident of the accuracy of my recollection because of other circumstances in connexion with it which are fresh in my mind. I remember the Hon. Mr. Theaker, whose letter has been read at the clerk's desk, had, standing in the corner of the room, a cane, and when my colleague made the remark to which I have referred, Mr. Theaker started to get his cane, and said: "I will march over your dead body now, if necessary." I must believe the statement to be true, I cannot doubt the word of the Hon. T. C. Theaker and the other members who corroborate him.

Upon this point, however, my colleague is entitled to his denial, and I give him the benefit of it for I have no desire to do him any injustice.

Again: I find in the Charleston Mercury, a rebel organ of the South, the following:

[Correspondence of the Charleston Mercury.]

"RICHMOND, January 26.

"Yesterday a New-Yorker, who left Washington last Friday, arrived here and sought an interview with the President. He was well accredited by letters to prominent southern gentlemen. He says the war cannot last ninety days; that the Yankee finances are in an inextricable confusion; the soldiers in all their armies mutinous, and only waiting to be paid off to disband. Then, says he, will come the hanging of the Lincolnites—and there will be a clean sweep. This, like other such statements, should but make us more vigorous in pushing on the war. You may rest assured there is something in the story about important matters in secret session, which I have been repeating from day to day. It is a treaty, or a loan, or both, with France."

Sir, this is the way and manner the rebels are sustained in their efforts to destroy the lives of our gallant men, and encouraged to resist the authority of the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws. And yet, with these facts before us, we hear men complaining of arrests! Sir, I complain that we have not had more of them.

Sir, the men who are thus aiding the rebels, ought not only to be arrested; they ought to be shot.

But not only has my colleague been consistent in his sympathy for the rebels, and his opposition to every measure to put down the rebellion and maintain the Constitution, but he has also been consistent in his abuse of New England and his threats of a western confederacy.

I am somewhat troubled to know how to reconcile the consistency of my colleague in his position of the "Constitution as it is, and the Union as it was," with his great idea of the formation of a confederacy with "New England left out in the cold." No doubt, however, the gentleman can do it—at least, to his own satisfaction, if not to that of the "rest of mankind." "New England must be sacrificed," cries Jeff Davis, the great bull-dog of the southern traitors, and thereupon every sympathizing cur in the free States, with his mouth frothing with treason, barks out, "New England must be humbled." Now, sir, what does all this mean?

What has New England done that demagogues should now threaten to drive her out of the Union? Has she failed or faltered in the least in this great struggle for constitutional freedom? Her soldiers are found in every battle; and every field of conflict has been whitened with the bones and fertilized with the blood of her most patriotic children.

Mr. Speaker, I shall enter upon no encomium upon New England; in the language of her immortal Webster, "She needs none. There she is. Behold her, and judge for yourselves. There is her history; the world knows it by heart. The past, at least, is secure. There is Boston, and Concord, and Lexington, and Bunker Hill; and there they will remain forever. The bones of her sons, falling in the great struggle for independence, now lie mingled with the soil of every State from New England to Georgia; and there they will lie forever. And, sir, where American liberty raised its first voice, and where its youth was nurtured and sustained, there it still lives, in the strength of its manhood and full of its original spirit." Sir, leave New England out of the Union, and what a Union would be left to us! But gentlemen say they don't contemplate this. Why, then, talk about it? Is all this tirade against New England a mere rhetorical flourish? Does it mean nothing? Why, sir, this cry commenced in Richmond, and soon thereafter, we find honorable gentlemen leaving their places in this House to harangue the multitude in the city of New York, representing the people of the West as saying, "New England fanaticism and speculation have made *disunion*! *New England* stands in the way of *re-union*! *Perish New England*, that the Union may live." Can any man fail to see that all such attacks, at this time, upon any of the loyal States can have but the one effect—to cause dissensions among those who should be friends? These attacks on New England, sir, can have no other purpose than to produce a division at the North, for the object, and the only object of aiding the rebels of the South in this struggle. This, sir is the only hope of the rebels in this contest against the Union. General Johnson, commander of one of the rebel armies, said some months since, that he *did not expect to "conquer the North by force of arms," but he did expect to conquer by the force of northern dissensions.*" This is the expectation all through rebeldom, and keeps the war spirit up in the South. The Richmond Despatch says:

"Illinois is a powerful State of the great Northwest, whose real interests are just as hostile to Puritan New England as our own. That she should take this decided stand against the Abolitionism, fanaticism, and malignity of New England is a sign of the times at the North that is full of significance. It cannot but be regarded as the outgiving of the impatience of the Puritan rule that must ultimately terminate in a more formidable resistance to it, and separation from the detestable portion of the Union, which has been the source of all the troubles among the States, as it has been of all the new schools of philosophy and religion which have so fearfully demoralized society at the North."

The Despatch adds, as explanatory of its interest in this attack of its allies on New England :

"The only means of securing our independence is the sure one of increasing the discord among our enemies, and rendering certain the breaking up of the Federal Union. This event is necessary to the just completion of that horrid drama now being enacted, by the punishment, the isolation in misery, of that race of men whose villainies have conjured up all the national woes which now fill this continent."

And again : The Charleston (S. C.) Courier hails the disunion movement with great joy. It says :

"They hate the sniveling, intolerant, sordid, mean Yankees as heartily as we of the South do ; and such a people can and must appreciate the fine and noble qualities we have exhibited during this bloody war. Conscious of their ability to maintain a separate and independent nationality—disgusted with the malignity, fanaticism, and sordid spirit of New England—convinced that the South will accord them the free navigation of the Mississippi, and that they can never obtain that boot by force of arms—we are hopeful that the States of the Northwest will speedily imitate the example of their southern brethren, and come out of the disgraced, enfeebled, and bankrupt Union."

At this very time, sir, while New England is generously furnishing men and money to carry on the war, to the suppression of the rebellion, and while her brave troops are standing as a breastwork between us and the rebels, protecting this capital of the nation, men holding the highest positions are to be found who denounce that whole section. Why, sir, if we did not know these men, we would be justified in the conclusion that they are in the pay and employ of the southern confederacy.

Mr. Cox. Before my colleague takes his seat I should like to know from what he reads ?

Mr. BLAKE. I read from the "*Caucasian*." I have put the extract in quotation marks. I will do no injustice to my colleague. These remarks are what my colleague [Mr. Cox] represents as the sayings of the people in the northwest.

Mr. Cox. I have no fault to find with my colleague for reading it. I however denounce some of the language there used. Now, on this subject of western hostility to New England, I have here a statement which I should like my colleague to explain along with his comments on my New York speech. The statement is this :

"WENDELL PHILLIPS in his speech at Plymouth Church last week, alludes to a recent conversation with a Republican member of Congress from Ohio, which looks as if even Ohio would go with the South if there should be a division. 'One of the best men from Ohio,' said Mr. PHILLIPS."

Mr. BLAKE. That could not mean me. (Laughter.)

Mr. Cox. I do not know but that means you. "One of the best men from Ohio," said Mr. Phillips, representing one of the most advanced districts."

Mr. BLAKE. That is my district.

Mr. Cox. That is yours—"Republican to the very core." Is that yours ?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, sir, that is mine.

Mr. Cox. But they elected a Democrat to the next Congress from that district. (Laughter.)

"Himself the vanguard of the party."

Mr. BLAKE. That is not me. I occupy a position pretty far in the rear. (Laughter.) My district elected a Democrat because some

eight or ten thousand men had gone from it to the war. It is Republican still, whenever the soldiers are permitted to vote.

Mr. Cox. Well, I will read the statement.

"One of the best men from Ohio, said Mr. Phillips, Republican to the very core, representing one of the most advanced districts, Republican to the very core, himself the vanguard of the party, assured me that in case of separation or anything that looked like it, every town in his district would be divided, he would not say to blood, but the next door to it, upon the question whether they should go with the South and not with New England or New York. So deeply has that lesson of northern and western jealousy penetrated the very best elements of western politics. Under such circumstances we have no time to lose."

Wendell Phillips said that. Now which one of my colleagues had that conference with him? Was it the gentlemen from the western part of the State? Whoever it was he goes farther than I went. He not only goes further in warning New England against this growing feeling in the west, but he seems to predict the disintegration of the Union, against which we on this side have constantly protested. Who was he?

Mr. BLAKE. In the first place Wendell Phillips is not a Republican.

Mr. Cox. Does he tell the truth?

Mr. BLAKE. I believe Wendell Phillips to be a talented and honest man, but he, in my judgment, is frequently in error, and one grave one is that he is not a Republican. He never has belonged to the Republican party. He ignores that party, to which all honest men ought, in my opinion, to attach themselves.

Mr. Cox. Then there are some honest, truth-telling men who do not belong to your party? (Laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, sir, there are many, I am sorry to say; I think they ought all to belong to my party.

Mr. Cox. I suppose so; the question now is, however, did Wendell Phillips tell the truth or a falsehood, and if he told the truth, who is the man among my colleagues, in the "van of the Republican party," who said what was never even charged against me in my New York speech?

Mr. BLAKE. Not me, certainly. I repeat what I have already said that Wendell Phillips has no connexion with the Republican party. I know nothing of any such conversation with any man on our side of the House, nor do I believe any such conversation ever took place.

In the next place, I say to my colleague, that whether Wendell Phillips said so or not, there is no such sentiment in the West. It is not true that there is any such prejudice as that against New England among the people of Ohio. There is an effort being made to bring about this state of feeling in the State, but it will never succeed. We look upon New England as a part of our country, and feel honored by her high position. We look upon her as the great light-house of our country, and it is not true, I repeat, that any respectable portion of the people of the West ever have been, or ever can be induced to join in this tirade against New England. It is true that among the party of sympathisers with the rebels, you may find men who will join in such a cry, for the purpose of aiding Jeff Davis, but no where else. You cannot find it among any respectable class of people. I repudiate and protest in the name of the people, against any such sentiment being attributed to any portion of the people of Ohio, or of the West. That is what I say, sir.

Mr. Cox. The gentleman does not answer my question. Wendell Phillips states that such a conversation was held with a Republican member of this House from Ohio. Now, what I want to know of my colleague is, who is the Republican member that furnished that sort of testimony.

Mr. BLAKE. In the first place, the whole statement is merely an irresponsible newspaper report. No authority is given for it. The gentleman will not himself vouch for its correctness, and I protest against bringing in here such vague, irresponsible newspaper statements as the ground of a charge against members of this House. The gentleman brings in here such a report and then wants to know which one of my colleagues made the statement. Sir, I do not believe any one of them made it, and it is not true whether it was made or not.

Mr. Cox. I merely wanted to know whether any of my colleagues had made it.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not believe any one of them made it. I tell the gentleman there is no such sentiment among the people of Ohio; and if any one asserted such a thing to me, I would tell him he was mistaken; if he persisted in it, I would tell him it was a falsehood.

Mr. Cox. And then there would be a fight I suppose. (Laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose so, unless, as is probable, the man who made the assertion would be too cowardly to fight. Mr. Speaker, I am admonished by my time being limited that I can submit to no further interruption—I trust therefore, gentlemen will excuse me.

I said sir, this cry against New England first made its appearance in Richmond, the so-called Capital of the Southern confederacy; and from that point it has spread to the sympathising friends of that nest of traitors in the free States. But a few months since, and General G. T. Beauregard, the rebel general commanding in the South, issued an order to all his men to call our troops by no other name than *abolitionists*; and thereupon, every man in the loyal States, and in the United States Army everywhere, who is in favor of sustaining the Government, maintaining the Constitution, enforcing the laws, and using all the means, justified by civilized warfare, which God and nature have placed within our reach to put down the rebellion, was denounced by every sympathizing traitor in the North as an *abolitionist*.

Now sir, what means all this? Is it possible that Jeff. Davis has extended his dominions into the loyal States, and that these men have taken the oath of allegiance to his government, and forsaken our own, with all of its hallowed memories? Has Davis a branch of his government established in the free States? I cannot account for the striking agreement between the rebels and their sympathizers in sentiments and actions upon any other hypothesis, than that there is, a full understanding on both sides on these questions. If the rebels of the South and their sympathizers in the North, are not acting in concert, they are at least in harmony.

Sir, the sons of New England, scattered as they are, all over the West, will yet make these gentlemen who live in their midst, and who are known to give publicity to such sentiments only for the purpose of discord, feel their power. What has made the great West, but New England enterprise? Talk about a union without New England! Sir, you might as well talk about a solar system without a sun.

Why sir, under other circumstances, it would be amusing to hear my friend from Ohio [Mr. Cox] descant on the qualities of the Yankee. I am not surprised that his congregation in New York were convulsed with laughter at his delineations of Yankee character. With all the *nasal twang* of the Yankee, and with many of those peculiarities by which he is known in all countries, they must have readily come to the conclusion, that if the gentleman was not born in Yankee land, there was a live Yankee around, near the place of his birth. (Laughter.) How could they help their mirth on such an occasion, and with such a specimen before them? It is no wonder then, they felt great merriment at the exhibition they were having of the Yankee on that occasion.

Sir, being of the Hibernian stock, although born in the State of Vermont, I am unable to appreciate this cant about Yankees, and New England. I am not ashamed of my origin, nor the place of my birth. Vermont has never done anything that I am aware of, to disgrace me; and God being my helper, I will *try* to do nothing to disgrace her.

My colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] in his able and extraordinary speech the other day, says:

It is now two years, sir, since Congress assembled soon after the Presidential election. A sectional anti-slavery party had just succeeded through the forms of the Constitution. For the first time a President had been chosen upon a platform of avowed hostility to an institution peculiar to nearly one-half of the States, there was an irresistible conflict because of that institution between the States; and that the Union could not endure "part slave and part free." Congress met, therefore, in the midst of the profoundest agitation, not here only but throughout the entire South. Revolution glared upon us. Repeated efforts for conciliation and compromise were attempted in Congress and out of it. All were rejected by the party just coming into power, except only the promise in the last hour of the session, and, that, too, against the consent of a majority of that party, both in the Senate and House, that Congress—not the Executive—should never be authorized to abolish or interfere with slavery in the States where it existed. South Carolina seceded; Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas speedily followed. The Confederate Government was established. The other slave States held back. Virginia demanded a Peace Congress. The Commissioners met, and, after some time, agreed upon terms of final adjustment. But neither in the Senate nor the House were then allowed even a respectful consideration.

Sir, what are the facts? The gentleman here seeks to convey the impression that the war was brought on the country by the Republican party, when every man knows, that for months before the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln the war had commenced. On the 21st day of January, 1861, Judge David A. Smalley in his charge to the grand jury of the United States District Court for the southern district of New York said:

"It is well known that war, civil war, exists in portions of the Union; that persons owing allegiance to the United States have confederated together, and with arms, by force and intimidation, have prevented the execution of the constitutional acts of Congress, have forcibly seized upon and hold a custom house and post office, forts, arsenals, vessels, and other property belonging to the United States, and have actually fired upon vessels bearing the United States flag and carrying United States troops. This is a usurpation of the authority of the Federal Government; it is high treason by levying war. Either one of those acts will constitute high treason. There can be no doubt of it."

This was while the patron saint of all the sympathizers with the rebellion, James Buchanan, was President of the United States. What was the action of this man Buchanan at this time when war was upon

the country? Why sir, from the first outbreak, with traitors for his Cabinet counsellors, he aided and abetted the rebels in arms against their country—against your Government and mine.

James Buchanan in his message to Congress on the 3d day of December, 1860, declared:

"This Government, therefore, is a great and powerful Government, invested with all the attributes of sovereignty over the special subjects to which its authority extends. *Its framers never intended to implant in its bosom the seeds of its own destruction; nor were they, at its creation, guilty of the absurdity of providing for its own dissolution.* It was not intended by its framers to be the baseless fabric of a vision, which, at the touch of the enchanter, would vanish into thin air; but a substantial and mighty fabric, capable of resisting the slow decay of time, and of defying the storms of age. Indeed, well may the jealous patriots of that day have indulged fears that a Government of such high powers might violate the reserved rights of the States; and wisely did they adopt the rule of a strict construction of these powers to prevent the danger. *But they did not fear, nor had they any reason to imagine, that the Constitution would ever be so interpreted as to enable any State, by her own act, and without the consent of her sister States, to discharge her people from all or any of their Federal obligations.*"

And again he says, in strict accordance with the spirit that has inspired all those who oppose the present Administration in its efforts to put down the rebellion and maintain the Constitution:

"The question fairly stated, is: Has the Constitution delegated to Congress the power to coerce a State into submission which is attempting to withdraw or has actually withdrawn from the Confederacy? If answered in the affirmative, it must be on the principle that the power has been conferred upon Congress to declare and make war against a State. *After much serious reflection, I have arrived at the conclusion that no such power has been delegated to Congress or to any other department of the Federal Government.*"

At this time no loyal man attempted to justify this monstrous doctrine, and it was generally denounced by one shout of universal indignation from the people. This, as every patriotic man knew was a deliberate invitation to treason, and if acted upon must destroy the Republic. But not so with my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] he approved of this message of the persecutor of Douglas; and at a convention of his friends in Columbus, Ohio, on the 23d day of January, 1861, was passed the following resolution, sustaining Mr. Buchanan in his traitorous course:

"*Resolved*, That the two hundred thousand Democrats of Ohio, send to the people of the United States, both North and South greeting: and when the people of the North shall have fulfilled their duties to the Constitution and the South, then, and not until then, will it be proper for them to take into consideration the question of the right and propriety of coercion."

Our country then had been at war for some time; men had confederated together to prevent the execution of the laws; they had forcibly seized upon custom houses, post offices, forts, arsenals, vessels, and other property belonging to the United States, and had actually fired upon vessels bearing the United States flag and carrying United States troops. But my colleague, and his friends at this time, were not prepared to consider even, the question of coercion. Mr. Buchanan would not, and did not consider it. The rebels persisted in their work of destroying the Union, without any effort being made to put them down. Mr. Lincoln was inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1861; and because he would not pursue the policy of my colleague, and his friend James Buchanan, and not even consider the question of coercion; because he dared to lay his strong hand upon the slaveholders

rebellion, he is now maligned, proscribed and his record falsified. Mr. Lincoln is assailed by traitors, because he has done what Buchanan should have done, but shrunk from, upon the cowardly plea that it could not be done under the Constitution. For believing that the Constitution could not be perverted to its own destruction; acting on that belief, and punishing treason promptly and fearlessly, Mr. Lincoln is now held up as an object of opprobrium. If the advice given on the 3d day of December, 1860, by James Buchanan, and sanctioned by the leading rebel sympathizers ever since, had been followed by Mr. Lincoln, he would not have responded to the popular acclaim of the people against the rebellion, after the fall of Sumter; he would have allowed Washington and Baltimore to fall into the hands of the traitors, and these cities would now be occupied by the rebel armies; he would have permitted traitors all over our country to revel in their work of riot and bloodshed; he would have encouraged clandestine correspondence with the public enemy; and he would have taken to his confidence the men, who have, ever since the war began, in every possible way, labored to embarrass the Government in its efforts to put down the rebellion. But because he would not do this, and has labored night and day, in season and out of season, to save the Union, and to preserve the Government, he is assailed by every disloyal man in the country, as a violator of the Constitution, an assailant of the rights of the people, of freedom of speech and the freedom of the press, and as unworthy of his high position. Sir, there is one very remarkable fact about the men who assail the President and his Administration. They can never find anything unconstitutional the rebels have done, and have no terms of opprobrium for the men who have been killing our brothers, fathers, and children, and are still seeking the life blood of the nation. All their denunciation is carefully preserved for Mr. Lincoln and the friends of the Government.

Sir, my confidence is unshaken in the mass of the people, and the time is not distant, when these men will be made to feel their indignation. The soldiers in the field who have left all to serve their country, are already beginning to speak out on this subject; and soon the people will take up the spirit that is breathed by our gallant troops. The brave, unconquered and unconquerable troops of Illinois have spoken as follows:

CORINTH, MISS., *January 30.*

At a meeting of the officers of the different Illinois regiments stationed at this post, the following proceedings were had. The meeting being called to order, Lieutenant Colonel Philips, of the Ninth Illinois regiment, was elected President, and Adjutant Letton, of the Sixty-Ninth Illinois, Secretary.

Colonel Chetlain, of the Twelfth Illinois, stated that the object of calling the Illinois officers together was to adopt resolutions to show Governor Yates and the other officers of Illinois, and all our friends at home, that we are still in favor of the vigorous prosecution of the war, and that we will uphold our President and Governor in all their efforts to put down this rebellion.

On motion, a committee on resolutions was elected, consisting of the following officers:

Colonel Chetlain, Twelfth Illinois, commanding post; M. M. Bane, Fiftieth Illinois, commanding Third brigade; Lieutenant Colonel Wileox, Fifty-second Illinois; Colonel Burke, Sixty-sixth Illinois; Colonel A. J. Babcock, Seventh Illinois; Colonel Mersey, Ninth Illinois, commanding Second brigade; Lieutenant Colonel Morrill, Sixty-fourth Illinois.

The committee on resolutions submitted the following, which were unanimously adopted:

Whereas our Government is now engaged in a struggle for the perpetuation

of every right dear to us as American citizens, and requires the united efforts of all good, true, and loyal men in its behalf; and

Whereas we have beheld with feelings of sadness and deep regret the bitter partisan feeling that is becoming dangerously vindictive and malicious in our State, the tendency of which is to paralyze and frustrate the plans of the Federal and State authorities in their efforts to suppress this infamous rebellion; therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That having pledged our most cherished earthly interests to the service of our common country, in this hour of national peril, we ask our friends and neighbors at home to lay aside all petty jealousies and party animosities, and, as one man, stand by us in upholding the President in his war measures, in maintaining the authority and dignity of the Government, and in unfurling again the glorious emblem of our nationality over every city and town of rebellion.

* * * * *

3. *Resolved*, That we have watched the traitorous conduct of those members of the Legislature of the State of Illinois who, misrepresenting their constituencies, have been proposing a cessation of the war, avowedly to arrange terms of peace, but really to give time to the nearly exhausted rebels to recover their strength, and plotting to divest Governor Yates of the rights and authority vested in him by our State constitution and laws, and to them we calmly and firmly say:

"Beware of the terrible retribution that is falling upon your coadjutors at the South, and that, as your crime is tenfold blacker, will swiftly smite you with tenfold horror, should you persist in your damnable deeds of treason."

4. *Resolved*, That in tendering our thanks to Governor Yates, and assuring him of our cordial support in his efforts to crush this inhuman rebellion, we are deeply and feelingly in earnest. We have left to the protection of the laws he is to enforce all that is dear to men—our wives, our children, our parents, our homes; and should the loathsome treason of the madmen who are trying to wrest from him a portion of his just authority render it necessary, in his opinion, for us to return and crush out treason there, we will promptly obey a proper order so to do, for we despise a sneaking traitor in the rear much more than an open rebel in front.

5. *Resolved*, That we hold in detestation and will execrate any man, who in this struggle for our national life offers factious opposition to either the Federal or State authorities, in their efforts for the vigorous prosecution of the war, for the suppression of this Godless rebellion.

6. *Resolved*, That we are opposed to all propositions for a cessation of hostilities, or a compromise, other than those propositions which the Government has constantly offered: "Return to loyalty, and obedience to the laws, on a common level with other States of the Union, under the Constitution as our fathers made it."

Lieutenant Colonel Morrill, of the Sixth Illinois, not being able to attend, sent the following dispatch, which the meeting decided to have inserted in the proceedings:

GLENDALÉ, MISS., January 30, 1863.—*To Colonel Chetlain*:—Colonel: I am sorry to say that indisposition makes it impossible for me to attend on the committee, but I will authorize the committee to sign my name to any resolutions expressive of our utter abhorrence of the treasonable sympathy shown to southern traitors at the North, and especially those who may have found their way into the legislative halls of our noble State.

Respectfully,
JOHN MORRILL,
Lieutenant Colonel Commanding Glendale.

Colonel Bane, Fiftieth Illinois; Lieutenant Colonel Philips, Ninth Illinois; Lieutenant Wilcox, Fifty-second Illinois; and other officers present, then addressed the meeting. On motion, it was decided to have a copy of the resolutions sent to the commanding officer of each Illinois regiment in this district, to be read on dress parade to-morrow evening, and be voted upon by the men of each regiment; also, that copies of the proceedings be sent to Governor Yates, the Speaker of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of Illinois, and to the Chicago and Springfield papers.

Three rousing cheers were then given for our National and State Government, three for our old flag, and three for the army and navy, after which the meeting adjourned *sine die*.

HEADQUARTERS SEVENTH ILLINOIS INFANTRY. *Adjutant T. W. Letton, Secretary:*
Sir: The resolutions were read on dress parade and adopted by the men of this command by a unanimous vote—not a dissenting voice.

S. E. LAWYER.

HEADQUARTERS NINTH REGIMENT ILLINOIS INFANTRY. The resolutions were read this evening to the enlisted men of the respective companies of my command, without any commissioned officer being present, and the first sergeants have reported that the resolutions were approved and unanimously adopted without a single dissenting voice.

Your obedient servant, JESSE J. PHILLIPS,
Lieut. Col. Comd'g Ninth Illinois Infantry.

HEADQUARTERS TWELFTH ILLINOIS INFANTRY. The resolutions adopted at the meeting last evening, were read at dress parade this afternoon, and they were unanimously adopted. The regiment which I have the honor to command can be depended upon to put down rebels in their front or traitors in their rear.

JAMES R. HUGUNNIN,
Major Commanding Twelfth Illinois Infantry.

HEADQUARTERS FIFTIETH ILLINOIS INFANTRY. The resolutions were read on dress parade this afternoon, and were unanimously adopted by all without a dissenting voice.

T. W. GAINES,
Major Commanding Fiftieth Illinois Infantry.

HEADQUARTERS FIFTY-SECOND ILLINOIS INFANTRY. I have the honor to report that the Fifty-second regiment Illinois volunteers, after listening attentively to the reading of the resolutions at dress parade, and without word or comment from any one, adopted them unanimously, (with the exception of ten men,) as their sentiments.

E. A. BROWN,
Major Commanding Fifty-second Illinois Infantry,

HEADQUARTERS FIFTY-SEVENTH ILLINOIS INFANTRY. Resolutions passed at the meeting of Illinois officers last night, were read to the Fifty-seventh Illinois infantry, on dress parade to-night and heartily indorsed by every man in the regiment, and three hearty cheers given for them, Governor Yates and the army.

E. FORCE,
Major Commanding Fifty-seventh Illinois Infantry.

The Sixty-fourth and Sixty-sixth regiments Illinois infantry being on outpost duty, have not sent in their reports.

JESSE J. PHILLIPS,
Lieutenant Colonel Ninth Illinois, President.

T. W. LETTON,
Adjutant Fiftieth Illinois, Secretary.

The Journal of this city has received a letter from a prominent citizen of this State, now an officer in General Grant's Department, dated at Memphis, Tennessee, January 30, 1863. In it occurs the following passage:

"General John A. Logan says he would like to take his division up to Illinois, and annihilate the traitors there. The army generally would like to send those traitorous scoundrels in our State and Indiana to that place where a drop of cold water would be more agreeable to them than the sign of the Golden Circle."

Here is proof coming from a gentleman whose opportunities of obtaining information are unsurpassed, which not only corresponds with the statement already given of Gen. Logan's views, but which goes farther, and shows what sort of feeling prevails in the army also. It agrees precisely with the statements received here from all quarters. There is indubitable evidence that the army is loyal in spite of the "stay-at home peace men hereaway," who have neither the courage nor the patriotism to enter the army, but who are trying to demoralize and discourage the army by a dastardly "fire in the rear."

The equally gallant troops of Indiana have also spoken in the same spirit and to the same effect. They say:

To the Democrats of Indiana:

Having a deep interest in the future glory and welfare of our country, and believing that we occupy a position in which we can see the effects of the po-

litical struggles at home, upon the hopes and fears of the rebels, we deem it to be our duty to speak to you openly and plainly in regard to the same.

The rebels of the South are leaning on the Northern Democracy for support, and it is unquestionably true, that unjustifiable opposition to the Administration, is giving aid and "comfort to the enemy." Whilst it is the duty of patriots to oppose the usurpation of power, it is alike their duty to avoid captious criticisms, that might create the very evils which they attempt to avoid.

The name of Democrat, associated with all that is bright and glorious in the history of the past, is being sullied and disgraced by demagogues, who are appealing to the lowest prejudices and passions of our people. We have nothing to expect from the South, and nothing to hope without their conquest. They are now using their money freely, to subsidize the press and politicians of the North, and with what effect, the tone of some of our journals, and the speeches of some of our leaders, too plainly and painfully testify.

We see, with deep solicitude and regret, that there is an undercurrent in Indiana tending towards a coalition of the Northwest with the South, against the Eastern States. Be not deceived. Pause, for the love you bear to your country, and reflect. This movement is only a rebel scheme in disguise, that would involve you alike with themselves in the crime of rebellion, and bring to your own hearthstones the desolation of a French revolution. Separation on either side, with peace in the future, is impossible, and we are compelled by self-interest, by every principle of honor and every impulse of manhood, to bring this unholy contest to a successful termination.

What? Admit that we are whipped! That twenty-three millions of Northern men are unequal to nine millions of the South! Shame on the State that would entertain so disgraceful a proposition! Shame upon the Democrat who would submit to it, and raise his cowardly voice and claim that he was an Indianian! He and such dastards, with their offspring, are fit "mud sills," upon which should be built the lordly structure of their Southern aristocracy! And with whom would this unholy alliance be formed? With men who have forgotten their fathers, their oaths, their country, and their God—with guerillas—cotton burners—with those who force every male inhabitant of the South, capable of bearing arms, into the field, though starving wives and babes are left behind!

Men who persecute and hang, or drive from their lines, every man, woman and child, who will not fall down and worship their Southern God. And yet, free born men of our State will sympathise with such tyrants, and dare to even dream of coalition! Indiana's proud and loyal legions, numbering at least seventy thousand effective men in the field, and as with one great heart, we know they would repudiate all unholo combinations, tending to the dismemberment of our Government.

In this dark hour of our country's trial, there is but one road to success and peace, and that is, *to be as firmly united for our Government as the rebels are against it.* Small differences of opinion amount to nothing, in this grand struggle for a nation's existence. Do not place even onestraw in the way; and remember that every word you speak to encourage the South, nerves the arm that strikes the blow which is aimed at the heart's blood of our brothers and kindred.

ALVIN P. HOVEY, BRIG. GEN.
WM. T. SPICELY, COL. 24TH IND.
WM. E. McLEAN, COL. 43D IND.
GEO. F. MCGINNIS, COL. 11TH IND.
JAS. R. SLACK, COL. 47TH IND.

HELENA, ARK., Feb. 2, 1863.

The gallant General R. H. Milroy, who has met the enemy on many a hotly contested field during this war, and has never failed to perform his duty, in a recent letter says:

GEN. MILROY AND OTHER INDIANA OFFICERS ON THE ARMY RESOLUTIONS.

[From the Indianapolis Journal.]

WINCHESTER, EAST VIRGINIA, January 30, 1863.

EDITOR JOURNAL: I have just read the noble resolutions of my brother officers of Indiana in the gallant army of Rosecranz, who, having assisted by their heroism in achieving the splendid victory over the traitor army under Bragg, turn round to rebuke the more vile and cowardly traitors at home, who having

taken advantage of the absence of over one hundred thousand patriot soldiers to steal into power, are disgracing our State by their treasonable acts.

I desire to thank these brave officers, who, knowing no party save that for the Union, have adopted these resolutions, which meet my most hearty approval.

Any man, or set of men, who, in times like these, when our Government is engaged in a deadly struggle for its existence, a struggle which involves not only the fate of free government in our own country, but for all the world, would attempt to disgrace and prostitute the name of Democrat by organizing a party under that name to oppose the Government and divide and distract the people of the loyal States, are traitors, and much meaner than those in arms, who boldly and directly seek the destruction of the Government, for these pretended Democrats sneakily and indirectly seek the same end by exciting prejudice against the Government and division among the people.

Let these traitors of the Indiana Legislature, and the Copperheads, Butter-nuts, and K. G. C.'s throughout the State, who are giving aid, comfort and encouragement to armed treason in the South, read in the odium that has followed the memory of the Blue Light Federalists and Hartford Conventionists of 1812, something of the execration and detestation that will follow their memory down the stream of time.

I join with my fellow soldiers of the Union everywhere in warning these traitors at home that when we have crushed armed treason at the South and restored the sovereignty of the Government over these misguided States, (which, under God, we surely will do,) we will upon our return, while our hands are in, also exterminate treason at the North, by arms, if need be, and seal, by the blood of traitors, wherever found, the permanent peace of our country and the perpetuity of free government to all future generations.

R. H. MILROY.

We, the undersigned, Indiana officers at this place, most cordially subscribe to the sentiments expressed in the above letter of General Milroy.

MARK L. DEMOTTE, Captain and A. Q. M.

DANIEL MEEKER, Division Surgeon.

JOHN O. CR. VENS, A. D. C.

Z. BAIRD, Captain and A. D. C.

The brave soldiers of Ohio are responding to the soldiers of Indiana and Illinois; and from our whole army there is but one sentiment of detestation for those men who talk peace, when they know there can be no peace until the rebel armies are conquered and destroyed. The people will soon respond to the sentiment which comes from the army, and the sympathisers with the rebels will find themselves in the position of the cow-boys of the Revolution. The gallant and noble Ohio boys, now facing the enemy, and willing to endure all to save their country, say in their address to the people of Ohio, and which ought to be read by every man in the nation, as follows:

BATTLE FIELD OF STONE RIVER, February 1.

To the People of Ohio:

The Ohio soldiers of the western army, your friends, brothers, and sons, address you from this field of renown in urgent entreaty, upon matters of such grave import to them and to the country, as to demand your calm and patient audience. Exiles from home for long, weary months, away from the petty strife of local politics, and the influence of selfish demagogues and party leaders, with the pure and steadfast faith in the holy cause of defending our Government, which brought us into the field, and has sustained us in perils, hardships, toils and exposures, which have scarcely a parallel in history, we feel none of the acrimonious bitterness that now enters into the ignoble contentions of home politics, and calmly view the condition of the country from that only true stand-point, the soldier's and patriot's devotion to the great Republic—once blessed of all nations.

We ask, what means this wild, shameless party strife at home? why any opposition to this war of self-preservation? why any but political demagogues should wish a severance of the Republic? wherefore a foolish cry for a cessation of hostilities on our part, to give time to the traitor rebels to strengthen their defences and discipline their armies? why should the brave, true men of

the great army of the United States, war-broken, toil-worn, and battle-stained, be left without sympathy or aid from you men of Ohio, now enjoying the blessings of peace, careless of dangers of invasion, war's dread terrors, only because we, your brothers and sons, stand "between your loved homes and war's desolation?"

Are we not in war? Is not the whole force of the Government employed in defending the nation against a gigantic effort to destroy it? Has not blood flowed like water, and treasure expended enough to make rich a nation? Is it not worth preserving? Can two or more States be carved out peacefully from the present loved Republic? Can we give away its rivers, lands, and loyal people to its destroyer? Can we afford to divide the Republic into contending petty States, and be forever the victim of internecine wars between small principalities? Can we quietly, calmly, even complacently, sit by and see the grand Republic of the world thus cut off and destroyed by innate weakness? No honest citizen of Ohio is willing that such should be our fate.

What matters now the cause of the war? By whose fault, or by the adoption of what mistaken policy? It exists! It must be fought out, or ended by giving up all that it is waged for. For the sake of peace; to be rid of the burdens of taxation; for the fear of the shedding of blood; would any basely give up his nation, and become the citizens of a ruined and dishonored land?

Then, wherefore opposition to the war? Because a particular party is in power? Because its policy is obnoxious? Because it has committed errors? Because it has thrown to its surface and given prominence to bad or incompetent men, or adopted political theories and sought to make them practical which are condemned by many good men? No! the remedy for all these evils, if they exist at all, may be sought in the quiet but powerful means of the ballot, which has power in our Government to change dynasties, where the armies of the world would fail.

Is it thought that peace and a voluntary restoration of the Union may be effected by compromise? All that has been tried. Disdainfully the rebels flung back in our faces every proffered olive branch before peaceful men became armed soldiers, and the booming of Fort Sumter's cannon, with its terrible alarm, called a nation to arms. And now, insolent and defiant, they laugh to scorn all thoughts of peace on any other terms than recognition of their false nationality. They are stronger now than then. The despots and money-changers of Europe have given them substantial aid to destroy a Republic; they have more powerful armies, abler generals, and a firmer determination than when the rebellion began. They know their strength, and *appeal to it*—not to the poor demagogues of the North, who are their allies. They condemn and despise *them*. Read their proclamations, addresses, army orders and newspapers. At no time have they ever spoken of their Northern friends, except as *allies in the war*! They deride the foolish appeals of their northern allies for peace and compromise, and preclude all hope of the restoration of the Union on any terms.

What incalculable mischief is being done by these Northern allies—their speeches and newspapers are quoted, and results of elections reported in Southern papers, as evidence not of any hope of restoring the Union, but to show that the loyal people of the North are becoming willing to submit to any dishonorable and humiliating terms of peace, based even on the full recognition that this fiendish rebellion was right, and that it was well to destroy this Government.

People of Ohio! *But one alternative is left you. You must pronounce this a just rebellion. You must say that it was right and justifiable to destroy this Republic; that a Republic is a weak, helpless Government, powerless to sustain itself, and to be destroyed whenever conspirators enough can be allied for the purpose, or, you must show to the world the power of self-preservation in the great example of Confederate Republics. That it has a quiet dormant force, which aroused, has gigantic strength and energy. That it not only can protect its citizens in all their rights and privileges, but can sustain itself as well against foreign attack as internal treason.*

We are fighting for the Republic, to it we have given our hearts, our arms, our lives. We intend to stand between you and the desolating hosts of the rebels, whose most cherished hope and desire has been and is, to take possession of and ravage your own beautiful Ohio. Once already, we have stood as a living wall between you and this fate, and we may have to do it again.

Men of Ohio! You know what this Western army has suffered. You know not now the hardships and sufferings of your soldiers in their chill tents, their shelterless bivouacs, their long, weary marches, and their battle-thinned ranks. If there be honesty and purity in human motives, it must be found among your long enduring soldiers. Hear us, and for your country's sake, if not for our's, stop your wild, shameless, political strifes, unite for the common cause, and never think or speak of peace and compromise until the now empty terms mean: The Republic as it was, peacefully if it may be, but forcibly at all events. It is said, war and force cannot restore the Union! What can?

Is there anything else that has been left untried, short of national dishonor and shame? Nothing. Purely physical power has been invoked to destroy the Government, and physical force must meet it. Conquer the rebellious armies, shut in by blockades and victorious armies the deluded people of the rebelling States, and let no peace, no happiness, no prosperity dwell in their land or homes, until they rise against their own tyrants, until popular opinion with them overthrows their false Government and dooms their despotic leaders. Whip them and confine them, until "Actæon is devoured by his own dogs."

This is all that can be done, and it must be done with the determined energy of a united people. Thus feel and think the soldiers of the grand army of the United States. Are you with us, or will you now desert us, sell your national birthright for a mess of pottage, and for success in local politics barter away your country, crawl at the feet and lick the hands of the perfidious, cruel and devilish conspirators who have organized this rebellion, and who boast of their success in destroying your Government, slaying your sons and wasting your treasure, contemned, derided and despised by them, while you are humbly craving their favor! Not waiting or even hoping for returning loyalty in them, or for terms of peace to be tendered by them! Can you thus dishonor yourselves, your soldiers and your State?

We ask you now to stay, support and uphold the hands of your soldiers.

Give some of the wasted sympathy, so illy but freely bestowed upon the old political hacks and demagogues, who seek a blessed martyrdom in Lincoln Bastiles, to the suffering but bravely enduring soldiers who in the camp, the field and the hospital, bear real hardships uncomplainingly. If treason must run riot in the North, keep it there—insult not your soldiers by sending to them the vile emanations of the traitors who are riding into office, place and power, over the ruins of the Government, and making them their stepping-stones. Insult us not by letters, speeches and papers, which tell us that we are engaged as hirelings in an unholy Abolition war, which make mob idols of the hour of those whose hypocritical demagoguery takes shape in cowardly, covert treason—whose constant vocation is denunciation of their Government and its armed defenders.

The Army of the West is in terrible earnest—earnest to conquer and destroy armed rebels—earnest to meet force with force—earnest in its hearty detestation of cowardly traitors at home—earnest in will and power to overcome all who desire the nation's ruin.

Ohio's 100,000 soldiers in the field, citizens at home, potent in either capacity, ask their fathers, brethren and friends, by their firesides and in their peaceful homes, to hear and heed this appeal, and to put an end to covert treason at home, more dangerous now to our national existence than the presence of the armed hosts of misguided rebels in the field.

On the hearing and adoption of this address by the First brigade, Third division, Fourteenth army corps, Col. Walker also reported the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted. Therefore,

"Resolved, For ourselves we are resolved to maintain the honor and integrity of our Government; from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf, and between the oceans, there shall be but one supreme political power. We are able to defend our birthright; the blood of our sires is not contaminated in our veins; we are neither to be insulted nor robbed with impunity; the Government we defend was formed for noble purposes; we are the executors of a living, a dying testament, written in the blood of our fathers, which we will rewrite in our own; to preserve our Government is to us a law, unalterable in our hearts as the decrees of Heaven; we stop not now to point the finger of scorn at petty traitors who vainly seek to immortalize themselves by acts of treason—too cowardly to sin with an uplifted hand, too dastardly to stake life for life, as more

honorable traitors do—let them bear in mind that there is a time coming when the honest indignation of a loyal people will hurl them headlong into an abyss as bottomless as the pit.”

These resolutions and proceedings of the brave men now in the field, speak for themselves, and need no comments of mine. Let us hear what the brave and skillful Gen. Rosecrans says, one of the real heroes of the war, the man who saved his army from defeat at Murfreesboro, and snatched victory from the arms of the rebels by leading his columns in person, amidst a shower of iron and lead around him.

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE CUMBERLAND,
Murfreesboro, Tenn., Feb. 3, 1863.

To the Honorable the General Assembly of the State of Ohio :

The resolution of thanks passed by your honorable body of the Army of the Cumberland, its Commanding General and his staff, has been duly received and published to the troops of this command. On behalf of all I return you heartfelt thanks.

This is indeed a war for the Constitution and the laws—nay, for National existence—against those who have despised our honest friendship, deceived our just hopes and driven us to defend our country and our homes. By foul and willful slanders on our motives and intentions, persistently repeated, they have arrayed against us our own fellow-citizens, bound to us by the triple ties of consanguinity, geographical position and commercial interest.

Let no man among us be base enough to forget this, or fool enough to trust an oligarchy of traitors to their friends, to civil liberty and human freedom. Voluntary exiles from home and friends, for the defense and safety of all, we long for the time when gentle peace shall again spread her wings over our land; but we know no such blessing is possible while the unjust and arbitrary power of the rebel leaders confronts and threatens us.

Crafty as the fox, cruel as the tiger, they cried “no coercion,” while preparing to strike us. Bully-like, they proposed to fight us because they said they could whip five to one; and now, when driven back, they whine out, “no invasion;” and promise us of the West permission to navigate the Mississippi, if we will be “good boys,” and do as they bid us.

Wherever they have the power, they drive before them into their ranks the Southern people, and they would also drive us. Trust them not; were they able, they would invade and destroy us without mercy. Absolutely assured of these things, I am amazed that any one could think of “peace on any terms.”

He who entertains the sentiment is fit only to be a slave; he who utters it at this time is moreover a traitor to his country, who deserves the scorn and contempt of all honorable men. When the power of the unscrupulous Rebel leaders is removed, and the people are free to consider and act for their own interests, which are common with ours under this Government, there will be no great difficulty in fraternization. Between our tastes and social life there are fewer differences than between those of the people of the Northern and Southern provinces of England or Ireland.

Hoping the time may speedily come when the power of the perfidious and cruel tyrant of this rebellion, having been overthrown, a peace may be laid on the broad foundations of national unity and equal justice to all, under the Constitution and the laws, I remain, your fellow-citizen,

W. S. ROSECRANS, Major-General.

These, sir, are the sentiments of the patriotic men in our army without distinction of party—the Democrat and the Republican standing shoulder to shoulder in defence of the Government, the vindication of the Constitution, and the preservation of the Union. Sir, there are thousands of honest Democrats and Republicans in every section of our country who will heed the voice and example of our gallant soldiers, and know no party other than that great party of the people, who have decreed that this Government shall be maintained, and that traitors in the North, as well as the South, shall not go unpunished.

Sir, the Republican party is arraigned for not passing the Crittenden compromise at the second session of the 36th Congress, and thus saving, as these sympathisers pretend, the country from this war.

Is it possible that the men who make this charge, do not know that on the 18th day of December, 1860, the Republican party was in a minority both in the Senate and this House? It was on that day the Crittenden compromise proposition was introduced, and at that time the majority against the Republican party in the Senate was *fourteen*, and in this House *nine*. And yet it is said by my colleague, [Mr. VALANDIGHAM] "that in neither the Senate nor the House," were the terms of peace "allowed even a respectful consideration;" "all were rejected by the party just coming into power." If this is true whose fault was it? Certainly not the fault of the Republicans who had no power in either branch of Congress at that time. It must be remembered that the time spoken of was in December, 1860, months before the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln. The war commenced as I have shown, in the month of January, 1861, long before Mr. Lincoln took his seat as President of the United States. Sir, if this compromise was such a panacea for all our troubles, as some men now claim, why did not those who had the power pass it?

This same proposition was presented to the Democratic Convention at Charleston, and then again at Baltimore. Why was it not then passed?

The Hon. H. B. Payne, of Ohio, answered this question by saying to the Convention, "*we cannot recede from this ground of non-intervention without personal dishonor, and so help us God we never will.*" In the same Convention another delegate exclaimed, "*I feel, praise the Lord, that I have got through eating dirt. I have eaten my peck, and I want no more.*" Then, it was, that the Democrats of the North refused, through their delegates, to adopt the Crittenden compromise in effect; Douglas was defeated in convention, purposely defeated, by the slave aristocrats for the purpose of destroying the Democratic party first, and the union next, as they openly avowed after their return from the Convention to this city.

The Crittenden compromise provided that:

"In all the Territories south of 36° 30' slavery of the African race is recognized as existing, and shall not be interfered with by Congress; but shall be protected by all the departments of the territorial government during its continuance."

This provision applied to all future acquired territories.

The Republican party had no power to pass this proposition if it had been disposed; and I am happy to be able to say, that few, if any, had any disposition to pass it. I certainly had none. One of the very best votes that I have ever given, and one to which my friends may look with pride and pleasure, I gave against this infamous proposition. It was a Southern confederacy that the South wanted then, and no compromise; and she will be satisfied with nothing less now, until we destroy her armies and prove to her that she cannot succeed.

The Senator from Georgia, [Mr. IVERSON] said on the 5th day of December, 1860, in the United States Senate:

"Sir, the Southern States that are now moving in this matter, are not doing it without due consideration. We believe that the only security for the institution to which we attach so much importance is secession and a Southern Confederacy. You talk about concessions. You talk about repealing the personal liberty bills, as a concession to the South. Repeal them all to-morrow, sir, and

it would not stop the progress of this revolution. It is not your personal liberty bills that we dread. Nor do we suppose that there will be any overt acts on the part of Mr. Lincoln. For one, I do not dread overt acts. I do not propose to wait for them. We intend to go out."

This man, although one of the leading conspirators, did not pretend that the election of Mr. Lincoln, or the want of any compromise, was the cause of the attempt about to be made to overthrow the Government. The great complaint that I heard from southern members was that we in the North permitted our laboring men to vote, while their laborers were not allowed and were not capable of voting. They had looked carefully to the census, and found that political power had departed from them forever—that the laboring men of the North, East, and West, were hereafter to hold the power of the Government in their hands; and they had determined they would not submit to it. As early as 1850 Mr. Clay and Thomas H. Benton warned the country of their schemes for a dissolution of the Union. They then had their constitution drawn up, and the man designated for president, who was none other than Jeff. Davis, the perjured traitor, now the assumed president of the southern confederacy. But it failed then, because they were not prepared for it, and could not induce all the States they desired to take the fatal step in treason. They wanted an administration like James Buchanan's, with a Floyd, a Thompson, and a Breckinridge, to aid them to make the preparation for the establishment of their confederacy based on slavery. And they got what they wanted, a President, and a Cabinet to suit; and most diligently did they use the means thus placed in their hands for the destruction of the Government. They flattered themselves that they had destroyed it. Protection to slavery was not what they wanted, for that was never better protected than just previous to this rebellion. Sir, in the 36th Congress Senator Brown, of the State of Mississippi, introduced a bill for the better protection of slavery, which received but two votes in the Senate—the whole South declaring by their votes and speeches, with the exception of two, that they did not want any more protection to slavery. With these facts before us, can any sane man believe that the passage of the Crittenden compromise would have saved the country from the present civil war? Sir, let us hear what southern men in Congress said at the time on this subject, which may be found in the Congressional Globe of that year. Mr. Singleton, of the State of Mississippi, on the 4th December, 1860, in the House of Representatives, said:

"I was not sent here for the purpose of making any compromise or to patch up existing difficulties. I leave, sir, to the sovereign State of Mississippi to determine for herself her present Federal relations."

On the same day, Mr. Jones, of Georgia, made a similar declaration respecting his State. Messrs. Hawkins of Florida, and Clopton and Fugh of Alabama, spoke in even stronger language for their States. Hear Hawkins:

"While I am up, Mr. Speaker, I may as well say in advance, that I am opposed, and I believe my State is opposed, to all and every compromise. The day of compromise has passed."

Hear Clopton:

"Believing that a State has the right to secede, and that the only remedy for present evils is secession, I will not hold out any delusive hope, or sanction any temporizing policy."

Hear Pugh :

"As my State of Alabama intends following South Carolina out of the Union by the 10th of January next, I pay no attention to any action taken by this body."

Now, I take it, these men knew then, about as much concerning what the South wanted as the sympathizing traitors of the North now do. They were the representatives from the Southern States, and they all declared that they wanted no compromise; a southern confederacy was the only thing they did want, and that they intended to have.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have shown conclusively that compromise with the South was out of the question; they would not compromise with their own party friends at Charleston or Baltimore, and, after that, could it be expected they would in Washington?

Sir, it is charged that Mr. Lincoln was the first President who had ever been elected on a sectional platform, opposed to the "institutions peculiar to nearly one half of the States." Is there any truth in this statement? Not one word; all *false*, sir, *absolutely false*. The Republican platform, which was adopted by the party at Chicago, declared :

"That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially of the right of a State to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend."

Where is the authority for saying that Mr. Lincoln was elected on a platform of avowed hostility to the institutions of any State? Sir, no such authority can be found, for the very good reason that none such exists. No such authority was afforded by Mr. Lincoln in his numerous speeches, in all of which he repeated, in substance, what he said in his Inaugural :

"I declare that 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."

Will it be said, such authority is afforded by the Republican party opposing the extension of slavery into the Territories? Sir, in doing this, that party was endeavoring to carry out the principles and policy of Thomas Jefferson and the Democratic party, as it existed in the earlier days of the Republic, when the name of democracy was not used by demagogues to cover up treason.

Who dare charge the Republican party with seeking to destroy the sovereign rights of the States of the Union, by prohibiting slavery, a local institution, from spreading over all the territories of the United States? The Democratic party in every free State, through its legislature, and the State of Delaware, through its legislature, passed resolutions either in form or substance like the following which was passed by the Democratic Legislature of New Hampshire in 1848 :

"We are firmly and unalterably opposed to the extension of slavery over any portion of American soil now free."

This was the uniform language of every Democratic legislature in the North and West in 1848. The Democratic party of the State of Ohio, not only expressed itself against the extension of slavery, but denounced the institution itself. At the Democratic Convention held in Columbus, January 8th, 1848, the following resolutions were passed :

"Resolved, That the people of Ohio now, as they always have done, look

upon slavery as an evil, and unfavorable to the development of the spirit and practical benefits of free institutions, and that entertaining these sentiments, they will at all times feel it to be their duty to use all power clearly given by the terms of the National compact, to prevent its increase, to mitigate, and finally to eradicate the evil; but be it further

Resolved, That the Democratic party of Ohio do at the same time fully recognize the doctrine held by the early fathers of the Republic, and still maintained by the Democratic party in all the States, that to each State belongs the right to adopt and modify its own internal affairs, to hold and maintain an equal and independent sovereignty with each and every State, and that upon these rights the National Legislature can neither legislate nor encroach."

These resolutions were reaffirmed every year at State Conventions of the Democratic party up to 1854; and during all this time, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM] was a prominent member of the party, sustaining these resolutions. Could any man have believed this, who heard his speech the other day? A speech remarkable not only for its misstatements, but for its audacious attempt to hold the Republican party responsible for this wicked rebellion! Not only did the gentleman and his party sustain these resolutions, but they elected Reuben Wood Governor of the State of Ohio, who in his address to the General Assembly of that State said:—"The Democratic party ever has and ever will oppose either the *diffusion* or the *extension* of slavery into any free territory of the United States, by every legal and Constitutional means, and would rejoice if any mode, not doing violence to others, could be devised to overthrow and eradicate the evil."

On the subject of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, Governor Wood said:—"That Congress, having by the Constitution authority to legislate for the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever, may there abolish it, I entertain no doubt. Congress is by the Constitution the local legislature of the District, and all cases within the sphere of legislation are embraced within the terms 'in all cases whatsoever,' as used in that instrument. Congress appears to me to possess the same legislative power over slavery within the ten miles square, that may be exercised by the legislatures of the slave States over it within their respective jurisdictions; and that it has been considered in those States a proper subject for legislation, their history furnishes the clearest evidence. I have ever viewed the abolition of slavery in the District, not only as a matter of expediency, but of absolute right to the colored race." Such were the expressions of a man twice elected Governor of Ohio by the vote of my colleague [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM,] and his party; and these sentiments on the subject of slavery from 1848 to 1854 were endorsed by every leading paper of the Democratic party, and by every leading man of the party in the State. *Who then are the abolitionists!* The men who are now denounced by the gentleman, and those who are in sympathy with him, as abolitionists, never said anything stronger against slavery than was said by Governor Wood, and repeated in the Democratic resolutions for six years in every State and county convention held by the party in the State of Ohio. And now, after supporting the Democratic party with the resolutions I have referred to, for six years, and after having aided in the election of Governor Wood on two several occasions, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VALLANDIGHAM,] stands up before this House and declares:

"Sir, I am one of that number who have opposed Abolitionism, or the political development of the anti-slavery sentiment of the North and West from the

beginning. In school, at college, at the bar, in public assemblies, in the Legislature, in Congress, boy and man, as a private citizen and in public life, in time of peace and in time of war, at all times and at every sacrifice, I have fought against it."

Sir, the doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict," of which we have heard so much, was preached by the Democratic party of Ohio, long before the formation of the Republican party. The Republican party did make the issue before the people on the non-extension of slavery to the free territories, and the people sustained the party by the election of Mr. Lincoln. Congress, from 1789 to 1848, affirmed and exercised the right to prohibit slavery from the territories—for sixty-eight years the power of Congress over the subject of slavery in the territories was never questioned by any department of the Government.

Washington sat as President of the Convention that framed the Constitution; and he was President of the Republic eight years, and repeatedly signed bills to prohibit slavery from the Territories. *Madison*, who was the leading spirit in the construction of the Constitution, lived and died in the delusion, if it be a delusion, that slavery could rightfully be prohibited by Congress from the Territories; and as President of the United States, repeatedly acted officially on this presumption. *Jefferson*, the father of true Democracy, not the sham article, that some men now wear, for the purpose of more effectually aiding the enemies of our Government—*Jefferson*, the leading spirit of the revolution, the author of the immortal Declaration of Independence, served eight years as President of the United States, and he too, believed Congress had the power to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories. He drew up the famous ordinance of 1787, by which slavery was forever prohibited in all the territory northwest of the Ohio river. He also pressed the expediency of a measure upon Congress, by which slavery should be excluded from all the Territories of the United States. Sir, these are the doctrines of the Republican party, and they were the principles of the old Democratic party. Can any man believe that this rebellion was brought upon the country on account of the maintenance of these principles, which are as old as the Constitution? Does the gentleman from Ohio believe it? I certainly will not underrate his good sense by charging him with believing it. Mr. Clay, the great statesman of Kentucky, and of the world, the great leader of that Whig party, the dissolution of which, the gentleman from Ohio, in his speech so much deplored, very forcibly expressed his views on the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery, in his speech on the compromise measures of 1850, when he said:

"I must say, that when a point is settled by all the elementary authorities, and by the uniform interpretation and action of every department of our Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—and when that point has been settled during a period of fifty years, and never was seriously disturbed until recently, I think, that if we are to regard anything as fixed and settled under the administration of this Constitution of ours, it is the question which has been thus invariably and uniformly settled."

And again, this great statesman in the same speech, said:

"I have said that I never could vote for it myself, and I repeat that I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote, to spread slavery over territory where it does not exist."

Has the Republican party ever more emphatically denounced slavery extension than this gifted son of Kentucky? Has any public

man of that party ever opposed more strenuously the extension of slavery to the Territories, than did the gallant "Harry of the West?" If so, I confess it has escaped my observation. And yet the gentleman from Ohio would make the people believe, that the Republican party is responsible for this slaveholders rebellion, because they have faithfully adhered to the principles that Mr. Clay declared in 1850, had been settled by every department of the Government for a period of more than fifty years. And now, men are denounced as abolitionists in obedience to the orders of Gen. Beauregard, for sustaining the doctrines asserted by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Clay, and for fighting rebels seeking to destroy the best Government in the world—the only free Government on earth. And what is still worse, the men who thus stigmatise the soldiers and the statesmen of our country, call themselves Democrats! I have heard of men "stealing the livery of heaven to serve the devil in," but I believe the prince of darkness himself, would be ashamed of the men, who are now attempting to aid their friends, the rebels of the South in arms against their country, murdering our best men, sending mourning and lamentation into every neighborhood in the loyal States, by so mean a pretense as that adopted by the sympathisers of the North.

Sir, the gentleman from Ohio says, "a sectional anti-slavery party had just succeeded through the forms of the Constitution," and he seems to attribute the cause of the great calamity of civil war to this fact. What constitutes a party sectional and anti slavery? If the fact of believing with Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Clay, and the entire old Democratic party of the free States, up to 1854, that slavery should be prohibited from the free Territories, makes a party anti-slavery, then indeed, the Republican party may be justly styled anti-slavery. But why call the Republican party sectional? Is it because Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Hamlin both resided in the free States, that the party must be denounced as sectional?

Sir, this is no uncommon occurrence in the history of our country.

In 1812, *Dewitt Clinton*, of New York, was nominated in opposition to Mr. Madison, and on the ticket with him for Vice President was Jared Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania. In 1824, General Jackson and John C. Calhoun, both from the slaveholding States, and slaveholders, were on the same ticket, for President and Vice President of the United States. In 1828 they were also on the same ticket, and were elected.

In 1828, John Quincy Adams and Richard Rush were on the same ticket for President and Vice President of the United States. They were both from the free States.

In 1836, General Harrison and Frank Granger were nominated on the same ticket for President and Vice President of the United States. They were both from the free States.

Now, all these cases have occurred in our short history, and yet no one at that time thought that these facts were of sufficient moment to justify a rebellion; and no one believes now that the election of Mr. Lincoln was the cause of the present rebellion—the gentleman from Ohio does not believe it. Sir, there has not been a moment of time for fifty years, when disunion was not, to a greater or less extent, the ruling thought of many of the leading southern politicians; and all southern clamor about violated rights is nothing but the basest hypocrisy.

Every schoolboy knows that the attempt of South Carolina, in 1832, to nullify within her borders a law of Congress, was, to every intent and purpose, *disunion*.

Sir, the rebellion was not the work of a moment, nor the result of any injustice done to the South, or threatened to be done by the Government of the United States; but it was in pursuance of the long-cherished schemes of southern men for the destruction of the Union.

As evidence of this fact, we have only to refer to the speeches of the leading men of South Carolina in her secession convention, said :

"Mr. PARKER. Mr. President, it appears to me, with great deference to the opinions that have been expressed, that the public mind is fully made up to the great occasion that now awaits us. It is no spasmodic effort that has come suddenly upon us, but it has been gradually culminating for a long series of years, until at last it has come to that point when we may say the matter is entirely right.

"Mr. INGLIS. Mr. President if there is any gentleman present who wishes to debate this matter, of course this body will hear him; but as to delay for the purpose of a discussion, I for one am opposed to it. As my friend (Mr. Parker) has said, most of us have had this matter under consideration for the last twenty years, and I presume we have by this time arrived at a decision upon the subject.

"Mr. KERR. Sir, we are performing a great act, which involves not only the stirring present, but embraces the whole great force of ages to come. I have been engaged in this movement ever since I entered political life. I am content with what has been done to-day, and content with what will take place to-morrow. We have carried the body of this Union to its last resting place, and now we will drop the flag over its grave. After that is done, I am ready to adjourn and leave the remaining ceremonies for to-morrow.

"Mr. RHETT. The secession of South Carolina is not an event of a day. It is not anything produced by Mr. Lincoln's election, or by the non-execution of the fugitive slave law. It has been a matter which has been gathering head for thirty years. The election of Lincoln and Hamlin was the last straw on the back of the camel. But it was not the only one. The back was nearly broken before. The point upon which I differ from my friend is this: He says he thought it expedient for us to put this great question before the world upon this simple matter of wrongs on the question of slavery, and that question turned upon the fugitive slave law. Now, in regard to the fugitive slave law, I myself doubt its constitutionality, and I doubted it on the floor of the Senate, when I was a member of that body. The States, acting in their sovereign capacity, should be responsible for the rendition of fugitive slaves. That was our best security."

Thus spoke the men who took the initial step in this rebellion; and shall we believe them, or the traitors at the North, who are endeavoring to deceive the people to obtain political power?

But, sir, "the Proclamation!" "the Proclamation!" "the bloody Proclamation!" This is the specter that haunts the imagination of some gentlemen by day and by night. What would gentlemen have us do? The President declared his purpose to save the Union without destroying slavery, if he could; but, if he could not, he would destroy it. He maintained that it was his duty to *save the Union*, with or without slavery. It was found that while our soldiers were fighting the masters in front, the slaves were in the rear raising provisions for the rebel army. It was found, sir, that the slaves were being used to dig entrenchments, build fortifications, and to shoot our brave men, whenever the occasion required. It was ascertained that the most efficient help the rebels had was the labor of the unwilling slave.

Now, sir, good sense would dictate to any man, that in a contest like this, for national life, it was not only our privilege, under the law

of nations, but our most sacred duty, to detach these slaves from the service of the rebels, and attach them to our cause in the best possible way. The cause of the country demanded this, not less than the lives of our soldiers in the field. What else could the President do, and be true to the trust reposed in him by the people, and the obligations of the oath he had taken to defend the Constitution?

Sir, *I honor Abraham Lincoln for issuing that proclamation.* It has done more already to make the dynasty of Jeff. Davis tremble than any other instrumentality that has been used against the rebels. Put forth by the President as a war measure, to suppress the rebellion, to vindicate the Constitution, and maintain the Union, it is not only sanctioned by the Constitution, but by every writer on international law that has obtained any celebrity in this or any other civilized country. The proclamation was not issued for the purpose of destroying slavery, but for the purpose of re-establishing our Government—of crushing the rebellion—of saving the life of the nation. No man who claims to sustain the Administration has ever held, that the General Government had any power to interfere with slavery in any State in time of peace. But when war is upon us, and the slaveholding oligarchy are seeking to destroy our national life, then every man who loves our free institutions, and desires their preservation, maintains that the Constitution has clearly given all the necessary power to protect and defend the Government.

If slavery is destroyed by this war, and I have no doubt but what it will be, and *that it ought to be*; it will not be destroyed because that is the *object* of the war, but because that is one of its necessary results—one of the incidents of the war, under the control of a just God, who wills that slavery shall die, that the nation may live.

Sir, on the 22d day of July, 1861, this House, almost unanimously—there being but two votes against it—declared: "*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*;" and I submit, that it is not according to the record, to now, charge the war on the abolitionists. We have estopped any gentleman from doing this, by our recorded votes.

Sir, slavery produced secession, and secession made war. It caused the rebellion in 1860, also the rebellion of South Carolina in 1833; it threatened rebellion in 1844, if Texas was not annexed; in 1850 it tried to rebel again, and in 1856 it was determined to destroy the Union. Slavery has ever been aggressive, it is so, from its very nature. The South, sir, have, as I said before, carefully studied the census reports for years, and they have seen their power gradually, but certainly departing from them, never more to return.

Mr. Calhoun warned them of this in 1844, and in his letter to Mr. King our Minister at Paris, he urged the necessity for the annexation of Texas, for the purpose, as he said, of "*adjusting the equilibrium between the North and South, and giving to the South a political preponderance in the Government forever.*"

Sir, it was this apprehended loss of political power in the Government, which the South had maintained for years, by aid of the power given her by the Constitution, that enabled her to have five of her slaves counted in the ratio of representation to this House, the equ

of three intelligent white freemen of the North. Sir, if the South had her full representation in this House now, she would have about twenty-two representatives here based on her negro slaves. The North submitted to this as to States, because it is one of the provisions of the Constitution; but when it was sought to carry slavery to all the territories and thereby insure them to the slave power, and make them slave States, and thus increase this negro slave power to a preponderance over free labor forever in the Government of our country; then, the North very properly decided against slavery being extended to the free territories. Free labor demanded the territories for free men, and that demand was recognized by the Republican party in the passage of the Homestead bill, and the act excluding slavery from all the territories of the United States. With slavery as a local institution, although viewed as a very high crime against God and humanity, the people of the free States never would have sought to meddle, otherwise than by the power of truth; but to slavery as a political power, exalted above the Constitution and the country, and seeking to make every other interest in the country subservient to that, they could not fail, without being false to themselves and to their children, to affix to it, if possible, constitutional limitations. The rebels of the South have sought secession, and the establishment of a Southern Confederacy, not to protect slavery, for they declared on oath in the votes and speeches they gave against Governor Brown's bill, that they wanted no further protection for the institution. But they desired that the aristocratic and overbearing spirit which slavery engenders and stimulates, might have free scope, unchecked by the Democratic element at the ballot box, which loves country more than any material interest; always rejoices in the society of the *mud sills*, and partakes too much of the nature of true liberty to be able to comprehend how or why, in a Government like ours, an arrogant minority should lord it over an equally free and intelligent majority.

Sir, the war is upon us, and it matters little what were the causes which led to it; the rebels of the South commenced it, and have trailed the flag of our country in the dust. To talk now about peace, on any other terms than an unconditional submission of the rebels to the Constitution and the laws, is not only treasonable, but cowardly. Sir, the men who do it are traitors at heart, and lack the courage to commit the overt act. They are Jeff. Davis' reserve corps of sappers and miners, and are so far as they can, aiding the rebels in their work of murder and destruction. If it be supposed that these men are to be sustained by the people, it is a great mistake. The loyal masses of the people will rise in their might without distinction of party—the honest Democrats and Republicans will unite in solid phalanx against the traitors to their country—these men, who by their course of action are prolonging the war, and endangering the lives of thousands of our brave men now in the field fighting for the Constitution and the Union, will have a fearful account to render to an outraged people. The blood of thousands of as gallant men as ever went to the field of battle, will be found on the skirts of their garments, by their course in embarrassing the President and his Administration in his efforts to suppress the rebellion and save the Government. Sir, the man who in this time of our country's peril will not sink the partizan in the patriot, has but a poor conception of his duties as a patriot or citizen.

Let us all then, adopt the language employed by Stephen A. Douglas at Chicago in June, 1861, in one of the last speeches he made just before his death, while narrating what had been done for the South, he said :

"The return we receive is war, armies marched upon our capital, obstructions and danger to our navigation, letters of marque to invite pirates to prey upon our commerce, a concerted movement to blot out the United States of America from the map of the globe. The question is are we to maintain the country of our fathers, or allow it to be stricken down by those who, when they no longer govern, threaten to destroy ?

The slavery question is a mere excuse. The election of Lincoln is a mere pretext. The present secession movement is the result of an enormous conspiracy formed more than a year since; formed by leaders in the Southern Confederacy more than twelve months ago.

But this is no time for detail of causes. The conspiracy is now known. Armies have been raised, war is levied to accomplish it. There are only two sides to the question. Every man must be for the United States, or against it. *There can be no neutrals in this war; only patriots or traitors."*

Sir, this is not the language of a "copperhead," but of a true man, speaking for his country, who rising above all party considerations, sought only the good of his countrymen.

Sir, let all honest men emulate his example, and rally around the President, and give to his Administration a vigorous support.

This, in my judgment, will shorten the war, put down the rebellion, and save the nation.

Sir, after the authority of the Constitution is established in every State of the Union, after the old flag of our country shall float in triumph on every breeze over the whole country; after the rebellion shall be suppressed and the Union maintained, then, and not until then, will I consider any question of a party character. The man who will stand by the constituted authorities in their efforts to put down this rebellion, whether he is found in the North or the South, a Democrat or a Republican, that man is my brother, and I will stand by him—and the man that will not do this, I shall regard as a traitor to his country, to God, and humanity.

Sir, our cause is noble. It is the cause of mankind. There is no danger to be apprehended, but from our own divisions and dissensions; and the miscreants who are attempting to promote these by attacks on the Administration, and opposing every effort for the suppression of the rebellion, will yet receive their proper punishment from the people.

Sir, there is no occasion for despair; the destiny of the nation is in our hands; and if we perform our whole duty to the country, the Government is safe. The errors of the past which we have experienced, will enable us to act better in the future. A dark cloud may yet pass over our country; distress and calamity may afflict our people; but I am certain that this rebellion will be crushed out by the force of our arms; and the Constitution will be vindicated, and the laws enforced.