The Louisiana Democrat.

E. R. BIOSSAT] THE WORLD IS GOVERNED TOO MUCH [EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOLUME 24.] ALEXANDRIA, LOUISIANA, WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1868. [NUMBER 1.

The Democrat.

TERMS:

"THE DEMOCRAT" is published Weekly, at FIVE DOLLARS per annum, THREE for six months, payable in advance. No Subscription taken for a less period than Six Months.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted at the rate of $1 50 PER SQUARE for the first insertion and 75 CENTS for each subsequent one. Eight lines or less, constitute a square. The following are our rates to yearly Advertisers:

One Column	$300 00
Half Column	175 00
Third of Column	130 00
Fourth of Column	100 00
Cards, (occupying space of eight lines, or less,)	20 00

Obituary Notices, Marriages, Public Meetings, Cards of Thanks, etc., to be paid for as advertisements.

☞ Personal cards, when admissibe, charged double the usual advertisements.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW.

WM. A. SEAY,
ATTORNEY AT LAW, ALEXANDRIA, La., Will practice in the Courts of Rapides and adjoining Parishes.

CULLOM & KILPATRICK,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, ALEXANDria, La.

THOS. C. MANNING,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT Law, Alexandria, La.

H. S. LOSEE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW, OFFICE FRONT Rooms, up stairs, in Jas. W. Osborn's Brick store, Front Street, Alexandria, La.

H. NEWTON SHERBURNE. H. L. DAIGRE
SHERBURNE & DAIGRE,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, ALEXANDria, La.

E. C. LECKIE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW AND NOTARY Public, Alexandria, La.

R. A. HUNTER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW, ALEXANDria, La.

MAURICE GRIVOT,
ATTORNEY AT LAW, OFFICE 38 Natchez Street, corner of Bank Place, up stairs, New Orleans.

MISCELLANEOUS.

IMPORTANT
—TO—
STOCK RAISERS & DRIVERS!

RED RIVER LANDING, Mississippi River, La., June 1st, 1868.—At the solicitation of many influential parties in Texas, I have established an Agency at this place, for the purpose of selling and purchasing cattle and sheep for the New Orleans and Western Markets. Your attention is invited to the advantages this route possesses over all others on the Mississippi, as a Stock Landing. Cattle can be driven here cheaper, on good roads, with abundant grass and water. It is here you can find good pastures, plenty of water and ample accommodation for drivers.

It is here you will find the best and fastest boats on the river, prepared at reduced rates, to convey your cattle fresh from the pasture, to the New Orleans Market, in 15 hours; and it is here you will also find Western dealers, prepared to purchase at fair prices such of your stock as is unfit for the New Orleans Market.

A native of the South, a resident planter in this vicinity for over 30 years, and familiar with stock and its varied interests, I feel no hesitation in saying, I know your interest. Charges will be moderate.

With these assurances on my part, I respectfully solicit your patronage, and promise to do all in my power to protect the interest of those who may extend to me their favors.

Inviting attention to the annexed references, I remain, very respectfully, your servant, B. B. SIMMES.

REFERENCES:
General T. N. Waul, Galveston.
James Sorley, Esq., Galveston.
J. C. & S. R. Smith & Co., Galveston.
Benjamin A. Botts, President Houston Insurance Company.
Cushing & Cave, Stationers, Houston.
B. A. Shephard, President National Bank, Houston.
C. S. Longcope, Esq., Houston.
Governor Lubbock, Houston.
Hon. Thomas Devine, San Antonio.
T. & S. Gibbs, Merchants, Huntsville.
Dr. Rawlings, Huntsville.
Judge Richard Coke, Waco.
General Thomas Harrison, Waco.
General James E. Harrison, Waco.
Flint & Chamberlain, Bankers, Waco.
June 17, 1868—1m.

TRY ST. JOHN'S COUGH Expectorant.

MRS. MULCAHY,
MILLINERY AND LADIES' FASHIONABLE STORE,
ST STREET, ALEXANDRIA, La.
Cruikshank & Hynson's Old Stand.
BONNETS, Ribbons, Silks, Trimmings, Laces, Gloves and all and every variety of Ladies' Furnishing Goods constantly on hand and received weekly from New Orleans. Prices Moderate.
July 17, '67—tf.

PRINTING OFFICE FOR SALE.
I WILL SELL, CHEAP FOR CASH ONly, the BOSSIER BANNER office entire, books, material, &c. I am in earnest, and will give any one a good bargain. Apply
W. H. SCANLAND, Proprietor,
Bellevue, La.

Fresh Garden Seed.
GET THE MOST RELIABLE.
LANDRETH and SHAKER!
—AT—
H. ST. JOHN'S.
Jan 2 tf

SPEECH OF SENATOR DOOLITTLE

A Thorough Exposure of the Crimes and Blunders of the Radical Party—The issues of the Coming Campaign Discussed, &c., &c., &c.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF NEW JERSEY, I stand before you to-night, in plain and simple language to discuss some of the great questions which are involved in the coming canvass. In all human probability, no greater responsibility has ever rested, or ever will rest, upon the American people than the decision of the coming election. All that we prize most dear in constitutional liberty is involved. The rights of the States, the equality of the States under the Constitution are involved in the struggle. And let it be borne in mind that whatever men may say or profess, there is none, and there can be no liberty for the individual citizen unless the State can be guarded in its rights and liberties under the Constitution. (Applause.) It is impossible to suppose that I, as a single individual, can maintain my liberties against the usurpations of the Government if the State of Wisconsin, is not able to defend her rights and her independence and her equality under the Constitution of the United States. (Applause.) I think we very often overlook the great and all-important fact that the great mass of our personal liberty is guarded and defended by the States under which we live. Take, for instance, that which we all hold most dear—our homes, our families—what guards them against invasion? Certainly it is not Congress (Laughter.) (A voice—"you are right, there.") It is the State under which we live that alone protects us, guards us against arson, guards us against burglary, against trespass by day or by night, all the relations which are most dear to men; the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, teacher and scholar, guardian and ward, all come under the protection of the State government and the laws which the State enacts. If a man seeks to oppress me here in the State of New Jersey, to whom do I appeal for my defence, not to the laws of Congress. (A voice.—"Good.") I appeal to the laws of New Jersey, to those who execute and administer the laws of New Jersey, to defend me. That is the consideration which I think is often overlooked in the public mind—that our closest, dearest rights and interests, our families, reputation, all that is dear and honored to us are protected and defended by the laws of the States in which we live, and therefore it is essential that we should defend these rights and liberties, that we should guard and defend the rights and dignity, and equality of the States under the Constitution. (Applause.) Without dwelling longer on that topic, I pass on to the consideration of other questions.

THE IMPEACHMENT.

You know, fellow citizens, that we have just passed through, in Washington, a very important crisis—I mean the impeachment of the President of the United States. I shall not now go into a discussion of the questions involved upon that trial any further than simply to say that when the present excitement shall have passed away, as pass it will, and the great mass of the American people come to look upon the trial and the facts which were there produced, they will be utterly astonished to know that any respectable Senator of the United States could have dreamed for one moment of convicting the President of high crimes. (Applause.) The evidence discloses the fact that the Managers on the part of the prosecution put the messages and statements of the President in evidence themselves, and according to these statements it appears that the President was advised by every member of his Cabinet that the Tenure-of-Office Law, as it is called, was unconstitutional, and therefore no law at all; that Mr. Stanton joined in giving that advice, as well as Mr. Stanberry, the Attorney-General. And they all agree in another thing: that if the Tenure-of-Office law, was constitutional, that it did not apply to Mr. Stanton's case at all, because the law itself only referred to those members of the Cabinet during the term of the President by whom they were appointed; and Mr. Stanton was not appointed by Mr. Johnson at all. (Applause.) All the members of the Cabinet advised Mr. Johnson that the law did not apply to Mr. Stanton at all, and his Attorney-General so advised him. Is it not a monstrous proposition that the President of the United States should be held "guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors" because he followed the advice of every member of his Cabinet, including the Attorney General, on a disputed question of law. You know that many of these laws that are passed by Congress are passed hurriedly through, they are ambiguous in their terms, and difficult to be comprehended often. I tell you that there are questions arise of this nature, upon which the best lawyers of the land differ in opinion as to the Construction to be put upon them. But the President of the United States is of necessity compelled, when he comes to execute the law, to look into it and see what it means. Is it not most monstrous then to say that if the President makes a mistake when his cabinet advises him, and he is taking their advice; is it not a monstrous proposition that the President should be impeached as guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors? Why there is not a court in all this land—the humblest court of a justice of the peace here in New Jersey—that would for one moment tolerate any such doctrine, and it never could be tolerated. It seems that the pressure of partisan fever and excitement has driven the mind of man almost mad on this question of impeachment. (Applause.) Take the case—it is always fair to illustrate a case by what may possibly happen. General Grant is nominated for President by the Radical party. It is possible he will be elected, though I don't believe he will be. (Applause.) General Grant is no lawyer—we all know that. (A laugh.) All the reputation he has is that of a soldier—a military man. He does not profess to be a lawyer. Suppose it should so happen that General Grant should be elected, and that Mr. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, who is a man of some distinction in that State, should come before General Grant, and General Grant should ask the opinion of Mr. Frelinghuysen, and he in good faith should construe a law and tell him that he should do this or should do that under the provisions of the statute, and General Grant should follow the advice of his Attorney-General, is there any Democrat in New Jersey who is so lost to the sense of al decency and fair dealing as to say that if General Grant should in good faith follow the advice of the Attorney-General he would be guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor? (Voices—"No, no.") I don't suppose that a Democrat could be found in this whole land, not one that would have suffered himself to be led to believe that such an act on the part of General Grant could be construed into a "high crime and misdemeanor," and that is precisely the case of Mr. Johnson. Advised by all of his Cabinet, including Mr. Stanton, who was then a member of the Cabinet—advised by his Attorney-General, Stanberry, that the Tenure-of-Office law was unconstitutional, and more than that, advised that even if it were constitutional it did not prevent the removal of Stanton at all, nor prevent the appointment of Thomas *ad interim*. There is the whole gravamen of the charge against the President. But, fellow-citizens, I feel that I am dwelling too long upon an issue that is of the past. (Voices—"Go on.")

RADICAL CORRUPTION

I will now, for a short time, call your attention to other considerations, aside from the merits of the controversy, and these are the partisan pressure which was brought to bear upon certain Senators to force them to vote for the conviction of the President. You have read, perhaps, during the last three or four days, a letter published by the Hon. Mr. Trumbull, Senator of Illinois, to Governor Kiernan. In that letter Judge Trumbull states to his personal friends that he does not know—the people don't know—what pressure was brought to bear upon Senators to compel them to vote for conviction of the President. He denies, in his letter, that any pressure was brought to bear upon the other side. The pressure of which complaint has been made was all pressure to force a conviction. One of the Senators stated, in open Senate, the other day, that threats had been made of assassination of Senators who would refuse to vote for conviction. Mr. Ross, of Kansas, who is charged by some with having succumbed to influence on his vote for acquittal. (Applause and cheers for Ross.) Mr. Ross, of Kansas, has received telegram upon telegram, letter after letter, threatening him with assassination if he should vote for the acquittal of the President. So have other Senators. Now, fellow-citizens, what does all this show? It shows that in this party which now has control of both branches of Congress; this party which is supported and sustained by the press throughout the country, there is so much radicalism, and so little reason, so much fanaticism and such a wild and reckless disposition to override the Constitution, and override justice, and override the impartiality of the highest judicial tribunal in the land, that the people of the United States must arise in their majesty and overthrow that party. (Applause.) The Constitution and Constitutional liberty cannot live if this party—if these principles control it with this partisan fury which is driving it on with unreasoning madness. Unless this party can be dispossessed from power the Constitution, and the rights of the States, and the liberties of the people, will perish. Therefore I say, fellow-citizens, as I said in the beginning, no greater responsibility has ever rested upon the American people than rests upon them in the coming contest. They must arise and take the government of this country out of the hands of those men and this party.

THE RADICALS IMPEACHED.

There are, fellow-citizens, other reasons. something has been said about impeachment—much has been said of late about impeachment. I propose here to-night to bring forward another kind of impeachment. I propose to appeal from the decision of the party caucus to the people of this country—that high tribunal to whom they are all responsible—(applause) and, before you, fellow-citizens of New Jersey, I arraign and impeach the radical policy of this Congress. (Great applause and cries of "good! good!")

MISCEGENATION.

First of all, I arraign it as endeavoring to force on what is against the laws of nature itself—that is, they endeavor to enforce what does not exist, and what legislation cannot call into existence—a political and social equality between races that are as distinguished as ours, and the Chinese, the Mongolian upon the West Coast, and the negroes in the Southern States. Whatever may have been the origin of the great difference which exists between the types of mankind—the Caucasian race, to which we belong, the Mongolian, which inhabits Asia and India, and the negro race, which inhabits Africa—whether they are the result, as some natural philosophers maintain, of a distinct origin, or, as most persons believe who accept the Christian faith differences which have been produced since the dissimination of the race over different parts of the earth—makes no difference in the practical fact that the races, whether created originally different as they now are or whether that indifference has been produced by God himself in consequence of their dissemination, as men maintain—practically there is no difference in the fact that the races are clearly distinct. That their commingling is against the laws of nature as the very results of that commingling show. This is proved by all the observations of all the great natural philosophers and ethnologists, that it is impossible to produce any mixed race which can long endure. [Applause.] The truth is, and we may as well recognize the fact, that the negro race and the white race are both superior—not perhaps in all respects. The mixed race—the mulatto may partake of the intelligence of the white man, but he fails to possess the same vigor which the negro possesses, he has not the vitality and vigor nor the power of endurance of either the white man or the negro, and therefore it is that these laws go to show that to produce, or attempt to produce a mixed race upon voting social and political equality is against the laws of nature itself. [Applause.] I shall not dwell upon this point, but such are the observations of all the great nationalists of the world. I know it has sometimes been said by those who quote the language of the Great Apostle. "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth;" but they fail to quote the latter part of the sentence which he alters, "and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." God has just as much determined the bounds of their habitation. To the tropics he has given the tropical man, and to the temperate man he has given the temperate zone in which to dwell. The first laws also demonstrate that it is impossible for our race to dwell in the tropical regions of Africa, or the tropical regions of Asia, and maintain our strength and vigor. God has "fixed the boundaries of our habitation." Within certain limits we must dwell, or cease to exist at all. It is known by all the travellers to tropical Asia, and by the tropical travelers of Africa, that the white race hardly survives the second generation, from the effect of the climate, and its deterforating and depopulating influences that in that same climate where the Mongolian, the Indian, the Hindoo, the Negro of Africa flourish, they cannot long survive and be vigorous and strong in that climate, for it is not their own. The climate is their natural home. They are within "the boundaries of their habitation," which God himself has fixed for man to dwell in. [Applause.] This does not deny that the races in Africa in their own home, and the races of Asia whatever their home, are entitled there to the same rights of self-government for themselves which we in our home claim for ourselves. The truth is that the negro race is an exotic here. He was wrenched from his own home by the white man and brought to this country. The climate is not congenial to him. He is an exotic here, and, as an exotic plant, even when under the special protection of the white man, he will not flourish. Such is the law which governs this great question of races among us on this continent in this temperate zone. In the tropics—if the policy could have been pursued, of treating with to obtain some of the tropics—from Hayti, Yucatan, or Central America where the enterprising colored man could himself migrate to that country and form colonies there it might possibly be that under our protection, under the light of our example, they might build up in the tropical region of those countries homes for themselves as congenial to them as the homes of their own in their native Africa. Fellow-citizens, I do not rely upon my statement alone in relation to this matter. I refer to the statements of the great men in the history of this Government from the beginning. Take Mr. Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence. [Applause.] It is quoted from day to day by those persons who advocate the possibility of placing the colored man upon a footing of perfect equality political and social with the white man in this country; but what did Mr. Jefferson say, the very man who is the author of the Declaration of Independence, when speaking upon the subject of races? He said:

Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these peoples (the negroes) are to be free. Nor is it less certain that the two races—equally free—cannot live in the same Government. Nature, habit, opinion, have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them.

This, Mr. Jefferson says. I know some of these modern philosophers pretend to be much wiser than Thomas Jefferson.—They know well all the laws of races.—They know more of the distinctions which exist, or the want of distinctions which exists between these two races. But I stop not with Mr. Jefferson. I quote you the authority of a very distinguished leading man in the Republican ranks. I refer to Hon. Lyman Trumbull, the Senator from Illinois, and Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Mr. Trumbull says:

When we say that all men are created equal we do not mean that every man in organized society has the same rights. We do not tolerate that in Illinois. I know that Almighty himself has marked it upon their very faces, and, in my judgments man cannot, by legislation or otherwise, produce a perfect equality between those races so that they will live happily together. * * * There is a distinction between the white and black races made by Omnipotence himself. I do not believe these two races can live happily and pleasantly together and enjoy equal rights without one domineering over the other, and therefore I advocate the policy of separating these races by a system which shall rid the country of the black race as it becomes free.

He says there is a distinction between the white and black races, made by Omnipotence himself—precisely what I have stated, and Jefferson states, what every President of the United States, beginning with Washington and ending with Mr. Johnson, has always held and maintained. Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Munroe—(A voice—Clay) Mr. Clay of course. He was not one of the Presidents. He maintained the same opinion. Webster maintained the same opinion—that it was impossible to bring about even political equality between the races. In a State where there are a very few negroes, hardly enough to count—this thing may be tolerated. In Massachusetts, where, for instance, there are very few negroes, they can pass a law, if they wish, that the negro may vote. In New York they have a law that the negro may vote if he has $250 worth of real estate. Every State can act for itself. Here, in New Jersey, you can do the same thing if you choose to do it; and it is a question that belongs to New Jersey, and does not belong to Congress. [Applause. A voice, "That's State rights."] But as this question is talked of so frequently, you will pardon me if I offer one other authority bearing upon this question. I refer to the authority which certainly is held in reverence by the Republican party, or which they profess to revere. I mean Mr. Lincoln. He said in his debate with Mr. Douglas: "I am not, nor never have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor qualifying them to hold office, nor intermarrying them with the white people. I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black race, which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and, inasmuch as they cannot live on those terms, while they do remain together, there must be a position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race." (Applause.) These were the views of Mr. Lincoln.

THE GORILLA AS A VOTER.

Now, fellow-citizens, if you will read the works of such men as Professo rAgassix of Cambridge; if you read the statements of the travellers in Africa; if you read the learned statement recently made in New York Du Chaillu, in relation to the physical difference between the races, all giving particular accounts of the condition of these tribes and races of Africa from which all these negroes have sprung, all the authorities will demonstrate what Mr. Trumbull says, what Mr. Lincoln says, what Mr. Jefferson says, what Mr. Clay and all the great men of the country always have said, who have any knowledge on this subject—will demonstrate this difference and diversity which exists, physical, mental, and moral, beginning from the crown of the head and going to the soles of the feet, in the very anatomy—the hair, the skull, the brain, the jaw, the chest, the arms, the bones—every characteristic of the white and black man goes to demonstrate this difference. They speak of a distinct race, and not the greatest of these differences is the difference in the complexion. (Applause.) Now, the attempt by Congress to force upon the States of the South the principle of political equality in a community where the majority in five States are negroes, and in five other States where they form a very large portion of the population—the attempt to do that (which of necessity must bring with it social equality) is, I undertake to say, an offence against civilization, an offence against the laws of nature, and it ought to be put down. (Applause.) This merging of the two races, forced on by Congress, is what civilization, truth, and justice forbid, and it should not be sanctioned by the American people. [A Voice—And never shall be.] Again I maintain that those black people, or the most of the black people of the Southern States, independent of the question of the division of the races, the most of them in the cotton States and in the late slave States are thoroughly unfit to exercise the elective franchise. You know very well that these people in Africa belong to the very lowest types of the human race. Brought to this country, they have been kept in slavery and ignorance, not accustomed to the habits nor the duties of freemen, uneducated altogether, the most of them living on plantations. There are exceptions, it is true; there are some that have been brought up in families in domestic service. There are some who have lived in towns who have shown some aptitude for mechanics, for learning. These few are qualified sufficiently so that the States, if they choose, could qualify their suffrages, could admit such persons to vote, if the States think proper to do so, but it is a question for the States themselves. [Applause.] But when we speak of these exceptions, which don't extend to one-tenth of the whole adult male population of the South, the other nine-tenths of the black population are utterly unqualified and unfit to exercise the great political right of government in the States of the South, and therefore I do most earnestly protest against these bills which Congress has forced upon the South, as against civilization. They disfranchise large numbers of the white people of the South, and enfranchise the unqualified blacks—all to be enforced by the armies placed there, and the Freedmen's Bureau, which is in operation there. They have organized this mass of ignorance, and have put it practically in the possession and control of these States, and therefore they have by so doing wrenched these governments out of the hands of the civilized whites, and put them in the hands of the few uncivilized negroes, an exotic race, to which we don't belong, and which is not at home in this climate, and which is totally unfit to be our rulers. [Applause.]

INTELLIGENT VOTERS.

It was stated the other day, as an illustration to show how utterly unfit these persons are, or most of them, to exercise the right of the franchise, that in the State of Georgia a white man who desired to be elected to a convention, resorted to this kind of political subterfuge (a trick which any man should not sanction, for in political affairs as in all business and social affairs I truly despise trickery and falsehood)—this man resorted to this subterfuge in order to procure an election. He gave a mulatto fifty dollars to pretend to come out as a candidate for the convention in the same district. The mulatto pretended to be a candidate, and on election day pretended to circulate his tickets among his colored friends. What do you think was the result? When they came to count the votes every vote was given for the white man. (Roars of laughter.) Not a single vote was given for the mulatto. (Renewed laughter.) Now, what do you think of the intelligence of the mass of the voters that in a whole country (it was a populous disttict in Georgia) there was not intelligence enough among all the negroes that were there voting to ascertain the fact that they were voting for the man they intended to defeat, and against the man they intended to elect? (Applause.) Just so with South Carolina. I hold in my hand a statement of what occurred there in a recent election for members of the Convention. Among the negroes many had forgotten their names, and scarcely one in a hundred could tell after the election for whom they voted.—They were controlled blindly by the loyal leagues. The tickets were printed in Charleston, with a likeness of President Lincoln on them. There never has been before such a wide field opened for the demagogues and unprincipled aspirants to office. The negro is the most credulous being in the world, and most easily imposed on by vile wretches who are disposed to pander to his ignorance and passion.—Emmissaries from the North, white and black, have come here and prejudiced him against the white race. He has been told that unless he voted the Radical ticket he would be placed back in slavery and that if he voted that ticket he would have lands and mules given him. In some instances the negroes actually brought with them bridles to take their mules home with. Fellow-citizens, do not misunderstand me. I don't wish to deride the negroes at the South at all. I don't blame them for their ignorance. I don't blame them because they are no better fitted to exercise the right to vote. I am only speaking of the fact that they are utterly unfit, the most of them, some exceptions there may be, they are utterly unfit to exercise this high prerogative of suffrage in the South which has been forced upon them by the Reconstruction policy of Congress.

RADICAL STULTIFICATION.

But, fellow-citizens, passing from that, for it is, not my purpose to dwell very long upon one point to-night, here is another objection to the reconstruction policy adopted by Congress. It is this: that the reconstruction policy is against the Constitution of the United States. (Applause.) The Constitution of the United States recognizes the right of each State to fix the qualifications of its voters.—Without this right on the part of the State it ceases to be a republican State government. If New Jersey has not the power for herself to say who shall exercise the right of suffrage; if the State of New York, for instance, had the right to say who should vote in New Jersey, New Jersey would cease to be a republican State government and become a mere dependency of New York. [Applause.] Therefore I maintain that this right which belongs to the States is an essential right to its political independence and its existence as a republican State government. Now, fellow-citizens, you know that in these bills which are now pending in Congress, the one which came up in relation to Arkansas not many days ago Congress inserts in that bill what is denominated a fundamental condition by which they provide that the people of Arkansas shall never have the right to amend their constitution on the subject of franchise. This fundamental condition is put into the bill for the admission of Arkansas. They are determined, I think, to put the same condition into the bills for the admission of the other Southern States.

SOME APT QUOTATIONS.

You know these men who have come forward at last with this multitude of reconstruction bills, but a short time ago rested their appeals upon what was called a constitutional amendment—that the South should have the right to say who should exercise the franchise. If they restricted the franchise on account of race or color, they should be diminished in the number of their representatives, on the principle that their representation should be measured by their voters. But that plainly implied that the power existed with the people of the South to fix the qualifications of voters for themselves.—[Applause.] When Mr. Fessenden, as Chairman of the Reconstruction Committee in the Senate, came forward to address the Senate, he used this language. It is just about two years ago. The Constitution certainly has not changed since that time. Mr. Fessenden used this language: "The power exists in all these States," speaking of the States of the South, "to regulate these matters as they please. The Constitution gives us no power to limit them, and the Constitution does not limit them, nor does it give us the power in the matter of franchise. It leaves to the States, as everybody knows, perfect authority to regulate the franchise for themselves." When Mr. Fessenden said this about two years ago he spoke not only for himself, he spoke for the whole Reconstruction Committee. He stated that the views that he expressed were not merely his views, but the views of the Reconstruction Committee, and he was, in the same speech, combatting the doctrine of Mr. Sumner, who, with three, four, or five other persons only in the Senate, were contending for the right and the power of Congress to fix this question of suffrage upon the States. But Mr. Fessenden uses strong language, for the States have a perfect right to regulate this question for themselves as everybody knows they have; we know it, you know it, all the world knows it, or ought to know it. And yet these reconstruction bills of this present Congress, which does not regard itself as bound by the Constitution—which, as Mr. Thaddeus Stevens says, "goes outside of the Constitution" to reconstruct these States—this Congress, by its reconstruction policy, is trampling the Constitution under its feet; and therefore I say, fellow-citizens of New Jersey, that this reconstruction policy of Congress, inasmuch and in so far as it tramples down the rights of the States, is a new rebellion against the Constitution of the country. [Great Applause.]

TEST OATH.

But what else do they do? What is this constitution that comes up from the State of Arkansas? It contains a clause of disfranchisement of which I will presently speak. It contains something more; it contains a test-oath, which is to be put to every man as he approaches the ballot-box, requiring him to swear that he accepts political equality of all men, civil and political equality of all men, meaning the right of franchise in the negro equally with the white man; in the Chinese, the Coolie, and the Indian, as well as the white man. When he goes to the ballot-box in Arkansas, before he can deposit his ballot he must lay his hands upon the Holy Book and swear that he accepts this dogma of political equality, and swear further that he will never undertake to make any distinction in political rights between the races on account of race or color. Now, fellow-citizens of New Jersey, how does this bear upon you and upon you children? You have the right to emigrate to Arkansas if you please; so have your sons; and if the majority of the people of New Jersey (for I have no doubt that there is a majority of fifteen or twenty thousand, if not more, in the State of New Jersey who reject this doctrine—(applause)—this dogma of the political equality of the races—if you were to emigrate to the State of Arkansas you would be disfranchised. You could never vote at all unless you go to the polls and swear that you accept political equality for the negroes and Indians, and swear that you will never undertake to make any distinction between negroes and Indians. I ask you is it right? Is it constitutional? Is it just that any such test-oath as that which would exclude from the polls in Arkansas the majority of the electors of New Jersey, or the electors of New York; the majority of the electors of Connecticut—(applause)—the majority of the electors of Ohio—(great applause)—the majority of the electors of Michigan, and a majority, I believe, of 10,000 of the electors of Wisconsin? (Applause.) By this oath in Arkansas they would be excluded from the right to exercise the ballot. Why, fellow-citizens, these Radicals are almost equal to Napoleon III. when he wanted to be elected Emperor, "You can vote for whom you please, but you must vote for Napoleon."—"You may vote for whom you please, but, if you vote at all, you must swear that you believe in our dogma." Now, fellow-citizens, is this just, is it in accordance with the first principles of civil liberty that such a test-oath is to be applied to a man before he is allowed to exercise the right of franchise? You might just as well apply to him a religious test, and make him swear that he is not a Catholic and never will be a Catholic, or that he is not a Protestant and never will be a Protestant.—(Applause.)

THE VALIDITY OF PARDONS.

Now, fellow-citizens, there is another branch of this disfranchisement, growing out of these Reconstruction bills, to which I wish to call your attention for a few moments. You are aware of the fact that Mr. Lincoln, and Mr. Johnson, following him, issued proclamations to the people of the Southern States who had been engaged in rebellion, in which they promised that people that if they would lay down their arms and take the oath to support the Constitution of the United States henceforth, they should receive pardon and the restoration

[CONTINUED ON THIRD PAGE.]