WEEKLY STATE SENTINEL
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY AT THE
SENTINEL BUILDINGS,
Nos. 14, 16, 18 and 20,
EAST WASHINGTON STREET.
BINGHAM & DOUGHTY, Proprietors.

TERMS OF WEEKLY SENTINEL.
One copy one year $1 00
Ten copies to one address, and one to the maker of the club 10 00
Twenty copies to one address, and two to the maker of the club 20 00
Thirty copies to one address, and one copy of the Weekly and one of the Daily, to the maker of the club 30 00
Fifty copies to one address, and two copies of the Weekly and two of the Daily 50 00
Additions can be made to Clubs at any time at the above rates. Where the paper is addressed to each subscriber separately, the extra copies will not be sent.

POSTAGE.
The postage on the *Weekly State Sentinel*, and mailed for one year, is as follows:
Within the County .... Free.
Within the State .... 13 cents.
Within the United States .... 25 cents.

THE DAILY SENTINEL
Will be sent by mail or express to subscribers at any point for fifty cents a month, or six dollars a year.
All subscriptions invariably in advance. Address
BINGHAM & DOUGHTY, Indianapolis.

INDIANA STATE SENTINEL.

VOL. XX. NO. 38. INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1861. WHOLE NO. 1,116.

Political.

Sentiment at the South.

To show the state of feeling at the South among the people, not the politicians, we give extracts from two letters, one from North Carolina and the other from Tennessee, written in the freedom of private correspondence from one friend to another for personal information and without any intention of publication. The writers of both letters are business men, deeply interested in the preservation of peace and a stable Government, which fact gives value to the sentiments they express and the representations they make of the existing state of feeling among what may be regarded the conservative men of the border slave States. They will well repay perusal by all who desire to be informed as to the sentiment of one section of the country upon the issues which threaten to dissolve the Government:

MURFREESBORO', N. C., January 25, 1861.

Political matters are engrossing the attention of every body in this usually quiet section of our country, and the feeling in favor of secession and a Southern Republic, is the *general* one felt by the people. They seem to have lost all confidence in Republicanism. They have adopted the opinion that the Northern aversion to slavery and to the Southern people points alone to hatred and aggression in the future, on the part of the North to the South, and if that is to be the case, the universal feeling is for immediate and *lasting* secession. Such is the feeling here in conservative North Carolina, and it is worse in other sections of the South. Before the 4th of March, it is my opinion, we shall see either the secession of every Southern State, excepting, possibly, Maryland; and after the 4th of March *coercion* will be the beginning of, and, indeed, civil war itself. Lincoln may not be inaugurated—the chances are all against him—and let some violent Southern fanatic assassinate him, and the fiendish spirit of discord and strife will hurry our country into civil war, with all its untold and unimagined horrors. The Republicans have the union and peace of our country in their hands, and my opinion is it is in bad hands.

I see South Carolina, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, &c., propose immediately forming a provisional Governments, and sending ambassadors to European Government for the purpose of forming treaties of amity and securing the assistance, in case of war, of such foreign nations. These States offer to such foreign nations "free trade"—a boon of the greatest price and value to any foreign power. These seceding States are the producers, and the chief producers, of cotton, an article of *necessity* to all the world. Will not foreign nations readily assist these States on such terms? They will, in my opinion, do so without fail. Why is France, through Louis Napoleon, making such remarkable preparations for war? In my opinion it is for the exclusive purpose of aiding the great cotton States of America in resisting an aggressive and Constitution-breaking North. I have two facts before me which are conclusive proof to my mind that such is the design of France. One is, that her (France's) chief preparations are in the increase of her navy, and the other fact is the assurance made to me personally, by persons of ultra Southern proclivities, and claiming to know the facts in the case, that Louis Napoleon has made such a promise to South Carolina, and other seceding Southern States. There is yet another reason—the crowned Kings and Emperors of Europe would be the more securely established in their thrones by the overthrow of the American Republic—the last, greatest, and most noble attempt of man at self-government. And will the Republicans so act as to establish a full and complete fruition of such plans and schemes, and the total ruin of true liberty? While they pretend to be lovers of freedom, I assure you the signs of the times to my mind point to a certain and lasting overthrow of our Government, and not only to that, but to civil war; and in such event, what will or can the North make by coercion? The whole of the Southern States will become united, and can the North coerce the whole of the South? No, never. And can the North coerce both the Southern States and Fance, and possibly other strong nations? The North, through the mad hatred of the Republicans for the South, I tell you, are hastening these results upon themselves, and upon the civilized world. The great powers of Europe are too dependant upon the cotton States of America to be indifferent or idle in the drama the Republicans are forcing ahead. Would that I could speak to every man in the North and cause him to see the certainties in the future to result from the Republicans and the North's attempt and dream of ability to coerce the South. If I could, every man in the North loving his country, and having sentiments of common honesty, would cheerfully and hastily accord to the South, and to the Southern States, equality of rights in all our territories. Indeed, nothing can be lost to freedom, but everything of true freedom gained thereby. Fanaticism is now ruling our country, and to my mind, with a fruitfully good prospect of success—a success that will eventuate, after years of blood spilled, and innumerable woes endured, in the total overthrow of the liberty of the whole American people; and the result to the Northern States themselves will be, as you say, "military despotism," in place of the glorious rights and privileges of the liberty we now enjoy. Such a result has been the experience of the world, and common sense tells us that a people crushed to death by the horrors and sufferings of war, will accept the rule of any power capable of giving them peace and all its joys.

My interests are all in the Northern States—my sympathy is with my whole country, and its union is essential to the preservation of its present high degree of freedom as well as of its general prosperity, and I believe it would be wise for us to make any sacrifice claimed by the extreme South rather than have a Union dismembered and involved, as such a divided Union must be, in the horrors of a civil war.

What is ultra Republicanism or Abolitionism gaining for the poor negro in the course they are pursuing? Their action will either lead to the annihilation of the negroes or the more effectual and severe enslavement of them; even in liberal minded North Carolina the feeling is often felt, and I have heard it often expressed by influential men here, that it is right and proper to enslave the free negroes of the State or drive them out—let civil war come, and one of these things will be done. But if the negroes of the South could be freed, what benefit would result to any party? The South, with her sentiments and habits would immediately enslave every one remaining with them, and granting that the great body of the four millions of slaves should escape to the Northern States, what advantage would their presence be to these Northern States? who wants these negroes? who or what State? Does my State of Iowa want them? or does Massachusetts want them? They would suit the latter State better than any other portion of the United States; she (Massachusetts) could then have several thousand of marriages of white persons with negroes every year rather than only some fifty-seven, the number of such marriages the past year.

Republicans say they have nothing to do with slaves or slavery; but I tell you, and would that I could tell every Republican in the North the fact, that unless they allow the Southern States equal right of occupying the common property of the nation with all their property rights unimpaired by any act of the General Government or the Northern States, secession and a total and lasting dissolution of our Union is the consequence. Now when the Republicans say they will not grant this equal right to the South, let it be remembered they thereby say they—the Republicans—are willing to accept a dissolution of our Union and the destruction of the Government under which we now live, and the Republicans themselves become responsible for such consequences. I waive the right or wrong of the demands of the Southern States, whether such demands are right or wrong, the consequences flowing from the act of the Republicans is *disunion*; the Republican leaders know this fact, and knowing, have so little regard for the preservation of our Union they refuse to make the sacrifice for its preservation absolutely necessary to be made. If I have dealings with a man who claims more than his due, and I *know* that if I tell him he is a scoundrel and his claim unjust he will strike me, am I not responsible for the fight ensuing upon my taking that course that will certainly, in my own view of the case, lead to such fight? I think I am. So are the Republicans making themselves responsible for disunion to-day. The only question for them and the North to settle is whether the Union is worth the making what to the Republicans seem a sacrifice or improper concession. One thing is certain, when such men as John B. Floyd and Hunter and Mason, of Virginia, make demands as *ultimatums*, and in case of their being refused are in favor of disunion, the most of the Southern people will follow.

The only question now is concession and preservation of the Union, or no concession and disunion, with civil war if the North attempts coercion. One or the other is among the certainties of the future, and in event of civil war the great powers of Europe, without doubt, will take a hand, and the grand result will be a nation impoverished and their present liberty gone, and another failure added to the many past failures of mankind at self-government.

You know my aversion to slavery. I would not have every slave in North Carolina on the condition that I was to keep them and be responsible for their proper care. I have made my permanent home in Iowa where I could live free from slavery and negroes. I believe I but truthfully state the sentiments of the people of Iowa when I say they do not want negroes in any shape in their midst. Their sympathy and mine is with the white race; but can we not let others, in their own States, do what may please them without taking upon ourselves the right of condemning or the power of correcting? And in the Territories, is it not better to let the people going there take their property, even if such property be negroes, than to have our Union dissolved? I myself think it is, and I think besides that there is now no territory belonging to the United States that would under such an arrangement become a slave State, nor would slavery thereby become extended. If it is left to a people of a Territory, when forming a State Constitution, to say whether slavery shall or shall not exist, is there any doubt of the result's being against the establishment of slavery? It seems not to me, for the reason that the Northern States could and *would* furnish at least three settlers for each Territory to one furnished by the South.

Then, I ask, will the Republicans refuse to make a concession that will eventuate in no harm to freedom, but that will save our country from disunion and civil war, or will they insist upon that course which will lead inevitably to the establishment of existing disunion, to civil war and probably to an ultimate overthrow of the liberties of the American people? A short time now will answer this question, but I fear in a manner destructive to our Government and to the prosperity of the American people. W. J. G.

OAKLAND, FAYETTE CO., TENN., January 26, 1861.

* * * That we are in the midst of a most fearful revolution there can be no dispute. That from the tone of some of the Legislatures of the Northern States, it is more than probable that we will be in a civil war in a very short time. What has brought about this state of things? Was it the election of Lincoln to the Presidency? I think not. What then? You are aware that for the last twenty-five years there has been in the Northern part of the United States a feeling unfriendly to the institution of slavery; that this feeling has manifested itself not only at the North and in the Congress of the United States, but not content with a violation of their oaths to maintain the Constitution af the United States, in nullifying the Federal laws, by the passage of what they were pleased to call "liberty bills," they have even dared to *invade* the States for the purpose of exciting insurrectionary movements among our slaves, and stealing and carrying them off to the North, where they might evade the laws of the Federal Government. This continued aggression on our rights has brought about a state of feeling in the South that was not longer to be borne. And when, after the election of a sectional candidate for the Presidency, and men have been brought to reflect on our wrongs to those professing to be our brethren, the wonder is—not that we are in a revolution and ready to resist aggression at the point of the bayonet, but that we have so long borne with this state of things, and that we have not resorted before to the arbitration of the sword. Happily for us of the South we are a unit in sentiment in this movement. Every class of men, every shade of politics, is merged in this all-absorbing question. The only difference among us that I am aware of, is to length of time. Some are for immediate secession, while others more hopeful are willing to wait a little while to hear from the State authorities in the North. But her voice from New York and other Eastern States, has pretty nearly dissipated this delusion, that the North will be just to the South, if given time for them to speak out; and I tell you, sir, when the first gun is fired by the North against the South, or the first drop of blood is spilt, all shades of opinion, even as to time, will be dissipated with the celerity of the lightning's flash. Then will be a united South—then will be ten millions of free men ready and willing when the emergency will call for it—to take the field in defense of those rights and principles more dear to them than life itself. Do you doubt the result? We do not. I flatter myself that you do not believe that I write this in no other spirit than that of soberness and truth. So far as I am concerned, I have been nothing else but a Whig, and, as you know, have been taunted as being friendly to the North and opposed to the interests of South; but amidst all the opprobrium heaped on us, I have never swerved from doing what I conceived to be right. In our last election I voted for Bell and Everett. But now Bell men, Douglas men, Breckinridge men, stand shoulder to shoulder for our rights—and our rights we shall have. E. G. R.

Resolutions Adopted by the New York Democratic State Convention, at Albany, Feb. 1.

Resolved, That the crisis into which the country has been thrown by the conflict of sectional passions, and which has already resulted in the declared secession of six States, and the threatened co-operation of nearly all the other States of the South with them—the seizure of government property and of the Federal defences—the confronting of the disaffected States and of the Federal Government in the attitude and with the armament of civil war—is of such a nature as, raising all patriotic citizens above the considerations of party, should impel them to the sacrifices by which alone these calamities may be averted or their further progress arrested.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this convention, the worst and the most ineffective argument that can be addressed by the Confederacy or its adhering members to the seceding States is civil war. Civil war will not restore the Union, but will defeat forever its reconstruction.

Resolved, That we can look for the restoration of the Union and the reinvigoration of the Constitution only to the continuance of that spirit of conciliation and concession in which they were founded; and that there is nothing in the nature of pending difficulties which does not render it proper to adjust them by compromises, such as, by the practice of our Government, have been resorted to in the settlement of disputed claims even with foreign nations; that while our Government believed its title to the Territories in the north eastern and north-western portions of the Union, which were given up to Great Britain, was clear and unquestionable, yet, for the purpose of saving the people from the evils of war, it surrendered a portion of our original territory, and also a part of the Louisiana purchase, exceeding in value all the domain which the South demands in joint occupation; that, having conceded thus much to a foreign nation in the interest of peace, it would be monstrous to refuse to settle claims between the people of our land, and avert destruction from our common country, by a similar compromise.

Resolved, That, whereas, it is obvious that the dissolution of this Union can only be prevented by the adoption of a policy which shall be satisfactory to the border States, it is our duty to support them in their patriotic efforts to adjust these controversies. And, inasmuch as these questions grow out of the acquisition of territories not provided for by the Constitution, and in regard to which the people of the South believe that they are entitled to a joint occupancy, in person and property, under the Constitution and by the decision of the Courts, while, on the other hand, the dominant party at the North claim that they should be excluded therefrom, it is eminently fit that we should listen to the appeals of loyal men in the border States to dispose of this question by one of those measures of compromise in the spirit in which the Constitution was founded, and by which all territorial questions have, from time to time, been settled.

Resolved, That, inasmuch as the political convulsions which threaten the destruction of the country were not contemplated at the time of the last election, and their continuance will be most disastrous to the interests of our citizens, involving the ruin of our commercial and laboring classes, and possibly carrying the desolation of civil war into the homes of our citizens, we hold that it is their right to be heard in regard to the adjustment of these difficulties (which, in our opinion, can at present best be settled by the adoption of the Crittenden proposition or some other measure acceptable to the border States); and that a committee of five be appointed to prepare, in behalf of this convention, a suitable memorial to the Legislature, urging them to submit the Crittenden compromise to a vote of the electors of the State at the earliest practicable day.

Resolved, That this convention earnestly but respectfully urge upon Congress immediate action for the adoption of such timely and adequate measures of conciliation as are in its present power to enact, and to submit at this session amendments of the Constitution, for ratification by the conventions of the several States; and that, in the failure of Congress to act, the Legislature of this State be requested to take the initiatory steps, under the Constitution, for summoning a general convention for proposing amendments to that instrument.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this convention, a compliance with the request of the Legislature of Virginia, that Commissioners from the several States be sent to Washington to confer upon the present crisis in the affairs of the nation, is eminently proper and expedient; and we trust that the Legislature of this State will immediately respond to such request by the appointment of such Commissioners.

Resolved, Pending these remedial measures, we implore the States in the attitude of secession to stay the sword, and save the nation from civil war, until the "sober second thought" of the people of all the States can be rendered efficient in perfecting the work of compromise, and in the resoration of peace. To the Southern States which have not seceded we also earnestly appeal to join hands with us in staying the progress of dissolution, and preparing the minds of our countrymen to meet on some common ground, where they may preserve to themselves and their posterity that Constitution and Union which has been fraught with so much happiness to this people.

Artemus Ward on the Crisis.

On returnin to my humsted in Baldinsville, Injianny, resuntly, my feller sitterzens extended a invite for me to norate to 'em on the Krysis. I excepted & on larst Toosday nite I peared be4 a C of upturned feces in the Red Skool House. I spoke neerly as follers:

Baldinsvillins: Hereto4, as I have numerously observed, I hev abstrained from havin any sentimunts or principles, my pollertics, like my religion, bein of a exceedin accommodatin character. But the fack can't be no longer disgised that a Krysis is onto us, & I feel it's my dooty to except your invite for one consecutive nite only. I spose the inflammertory individooals who assisted in projucing this Krysis know what good she will do, but I ain't 'shamed to state that I don't, scarcely. But the Krysis is hear. She's bin hear for sevral weeks, & Goodness nose how long she'll stay. But I venture to assert that she's rippin things. She's dnockt trade into a cockt up hat and chaned Bizness of all kinds tighter nor I ever chaned any of my livin wild Beests. Allow me to hear dygress & stait that my Beests at present is as harmless as the new-born Babe. Ladys & gentlemen needn't have no fears on that pint. To resoom—Altho I can't exackly see what good this Krysis can do, I can very quick say what the origernal cawz of her is. The origernal cawz is Our Afrikan Brother. I was into Barnim's Moozeum down to New York the other day & saw that exsentric Ethiopian, the What Is It. Sez I: Mister What Is It, you folks air raisin thunder with this grate country. You're gettin to be ruther more numeris than interestin. It is a pity you coodent go orf somewhares by yourselves, & be a nashun of What Is Its, tho' if you'll excoose me. I shooden't care about marryin amung you.

No dowt you're exceedin charmin to hum, but your stile of luvliness isn't adapted to this cold climit. He larfed into my face, which rather Riled me, as I had been perfeckly virtoous and respectable in my observashuns. So sez I, turnin a leetle red in the face I spect, "Do you hav the unblushin impoodents to say you folks haven't raised a big mess of thunder in this brite land, Mister What Is It?" He larfed agin, wusser nor be4, whareupon I up and sez, "Go home, Sir, to Afriky's burnin shores & taik all the other What Is Its along with you. Don't think we can't spair your interestin picters. You What's Its air on the pint of smashin up the gratest Guv'ment ever erected by man, & you actoolly hav the owdassity to larf about it. Go home, you low cuss!"

I was workt up to a high pitch & I proceeded to a Restorator & cooled orf with sum little fishes biled in ile—I b'leeve they call 'em sardeens.

Feller Sitterzuns, the Afrikan may be Our Brother. Sevral hily respectyble gentlemen, and sum talentid females tell us so, & fur argyment's sake I mite be injooced to grant it, tho' I don't b'leeve it myself. But the Afrikan isn't our sister & our wife & our uncle. He isn't sevral of our brothers & all our fust wife's relashuns. He isn't our grandfather, and our Aunt in the country. Scarcely, and yet numeris persons would hav us think so. It's troo he runs Congress & sevral other public groserys, but then he ain't everybody & everybody else likewise. [Notiss to bizness man of Vanity Fair: Extry charg fur this larst remrrk. It's a goak.—A. W.]

But we've got the Afrikan, or ruther he's got us, & now what air we going to do about it! He's a orful noosance. Praps he isn't to blame fur it. Praps he was creatid fur sum wise purpuss, like the measles and new Englan rum. but it's mity hard to see it. At any rate he's no good here, & as statid to Mister What Is It, it's a pity he coodent go orf sumwhares quietly by oisself, whar he cood wear red weskits and speckled necties & gratterfy hiz ambishun in varis interestin wase, witout hevin a eternal fuss kickt up about him.

Praps I'm bearing down to hard upon Cuffy. Cum to think on it, I am. He wooden't pe sich a infernal noosanse if white peple wood let him alone. He mite indeed be interestin. And now I of it why can't the white peple let him alone? What's the good of continnerly stirring him up with a ten foot pole? He isn' the sweetest kind of Perfoomery when in a nateal stait.

Feller Siterzens, the Union's in danger—The black devil disunion is trooly here, starin us squarely in the face. We must drive him back. Shall we make a 2nd Mexiko of ourselves? Shall we sell our birthrit for a mess of potash? Shall one brother put the knife to the throat of another brother? Shall we mix our whisky with each others' blud? Shall the star spangled Banner be cut up into dishcloths? Standin here in this here Skoolhouse, upon my nativ shore so to speek, I anser—Nary!

Oh you fellers who air raisin this row & who in the fust place startid it, I'm 'shamed of you. The Showman blushes for you, from his boots to the topmost har upon his wenerable hed.

I say to the South don't sesesh! I say to the galiant peple of that sunny land, jus lock up a few hundred of them rearin & rearin fellers of yourn in some strong boxes, and send 'em over to Mexico. And we peple up North here will consine a ekal number of our addle braned rip-snorters to the same lokallerty, & thar let 'em fite it out among theirselves. No consekents, not the slitist, which licks. Why shooden't the peple who got up this fite do the fitin? Git these ornesy critters out of the way, & the sensible peple of the North & South, can fix the matter up very easy. And when 'tis fixt let both seeshuns resolve to mind their own bizniss.

Feller Sitterzens, I am in the Sheer & Yeller leaf. I shall peg out I of these dase. But while I do stop here I shall stay in the Union. I know not what the Supervizers of Baldwinsville may conclude to do, but for one, I shall stand by the Stars and Stripes. Under no circumstances whatsomever will I sesesh. Let every Stait in the Union sesesh & let Palmetter flags float thicker nor shirts on Square Baxter's close line, still will I stick to the good old flag. The country may go to the devil, but I won't. And next Summer when I start out on my campane with my Show, wharever I pitch my little tent, you shall see flotin prowdly from the center pole thereof the American Flag, with nary a star wiped out, nary a stripe less, but the same old flag that has allers flotid thar! & the price of admisshun will be the same it allers was—15 cents, children harf price.

Feller Sitterzens, I am dun. Accordingly I squatted.

Revolution Not Riot.

Mr. Seward, in the course of his speech upon the New York monster petttion, rather underrated the depth and strength of the secession movement. The Senator assumed the ground of the radical Republicans, and treated the secessionists as a mob, to be hereafter dispersed by the reading of the riot act or the firing of a few volleys of musketry. One would suppose from reading this speech that the movement in the South is of no more account than an Astor place riot. Such is not the fact. If the movement in the South is a riot—and that depends entirely upon the future—it is the most important one in the history of the world. It is a riot in which eight millions of people are engaged—free, proud, courageous people, with arms in their hands. No reading of riot acts, no appeal to the supremacy of the Federal law, will disperse these rioters. Then, if Mr. Lincoln intends to fight them, the question will arise, where are his troops to come from? and the still more important one, if the rioters are subdued, how can they be kept in submission except by the raising and maintaining of a large standing army, a measure alike repugnant to the people of all sections? It is the error of the Republican leaders, and a very grave one, that they entirely misunderstand the motives and acts of the leading secessionistst and unless the eyes of all parties are opened to the truth, adjustment, without a long and exhausting civil war, will be altogether impossible.—*New York Herald.*

The Democracy of Rush.

Pursuant to public notice, the Democracy of Rush county assembled in convention at the Court house in Rushville, on Saturday, the 2d day of February, 1861.

On motion of William S. Hall, George Hibben was chosen President of the convention, John Megee and Ebenezer Smith, Vice Presidents, and Edward P. Schlater and Joseph Woods, Secretaries.

On motion of William A. Cullen, a committee was appointed by the President to report resolutions for the consideration of the convention, and the following were appointed as such committee: William A. Cullen, Isaac Inlow, Ethelbert C. Hibben, Hiram Tribby, James Downey, Samuel S. McBride, William S. Hall, Thomas Ochiltree, Hamilton Miller and William Selby.

The committee retired to consult and subsequently reported to the convention the following resolutions:

The Democracy of Rush county in convention assembled, viewing with great alarm the present perilous condition of our beloved country, precipitated upon the verge of ruin and civil war, the legitimate result of sectional parties and sectional triumph, and beholding with surprise and regret the leaders of the Republican party in Congress persistently and perseveringly lending their aid towards widening the breach between the two great sections of the country, refusing their assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good, in favor of coercion and against all compromise, in favor of civil war and against peace, constraining our fellow-citizens of the North to take up and bear arms against their brethren of the South, becoming the executioners of their friends and brethren, or falling themselves by their hands. We therefore deem it our duty, in view of so priceless an inheritance as this home of our freedom formed by the combined wisdom of our fathers and cemented by the best blood of the patriots of the revolution, to say to our Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled, that the same must not be trifled away for light and transient causes, and to the end that they may understand our will and wishes, we make and publish the following resolutions:

Resolved, That we are firmly and unalterably attached to the Federal Union, formed as it was by the wisdom of our fathers, and baptized in their blood, and are in favor of its preservation at any sacrifice.

Resolved, That we deprecate a Government maintained by the sword, or a Union held together by the bayonet; as our fathers laid the basis of our National existence in the fraternal sentiment of the whole people, so we must restore harmony, by restoring those sentiments, until in our political vocabulary there shall be no "North nor South," but one undivided family, emulous only in acts of kindness and charity toward each other.

Resolved, That the olive branch tendered by our sister State of Kentucky and embraced in the proposition submitted by Senator Crittenden as an amendment to the Constitution, or any similar basis of settlement, will in our judgment be indorsed by the people of Indiana by an overwhelming majority, whenever the Republican Legislators shall so far trust the people as to submit the question to them.

Resolved, That, under the present alarming condition of our country, we regard all persons, whether in Congress or out, who are opposed to compromise or in favor of coercion, as dangerous persons to be entrusted with power, as unfriendly to the Union, and disloyal to her best interests.

Resolved, That the people of the South, and especially of "Old Kentucky," in other days when our people were exposed to the ruthless savages, the tomahawk and the scalping knife, were our neighbors, our friends and our brethren and with matchless generosity, and brave and daring heroism, rushed to our rescue; and whilst th bones of a single member of their gallant bands rest upon our soil, we will remember the deed in acts of unmistakable gratitude; and the following accepted by the commitee from master Shawhan, a lad of tender years:

"A union of hearts and a union of hands,
A union that none may sever;
A union of lakes, and a union of lands,
The American Union forever."

And, on motion of Hon. Reuben N. Logan, said resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Thereupon, Ethelbert C. Hibben introduced the following resolution:

Whereas, during the last political canvass, division of sentiment existed among us, formed by disruption of the party; and, whereas, we mutually concede to each honesty of conviction and purity of purpose, therefore,

Be it unanimously resolved, That pledging ourselves to forget all of that division, except the experience of divided councils and disrupted forces, with its defeats, we do hereby respectfully request and insist that in the next call for a Democratic State Convention, both State Executive Committees unite in that call, and that said convention when assembled choose a State Central Committee for the united Democracy of Indiana. Which was adopted by the convention, with marked manifestations of applause.

Hon. Reuben D. Logan, E. C. Hibben and Wm. A. Cullen then addressed the convention in a manner which met the hearty concurrence of all who were present.

On motion it was ordered that a copy of these proceedings be furnished the Legislative Assembly of the State, and that they be published in the Indiana State *Sentinel*, Cincinnati *Enquirer* and *Courier*, and in the Democratic papers of this district. And on motion the convention adjourned.

GEORGE HIBBEN, Pres't.
EDWARD P. SCHLATER, JOSEPH WOODS, Sec's.

Washington Correspondence.

No hope of an Adjustment—The Bullet before the Ballot—The English Journals on the Crisis—The Patriotic Attitude of the Northern Democracy.

WASHINGTON, February 4, 1861.

To the Editor of the Daily State Sentinel:

SIR: There is no longer any room for doubt or hope. Our friends here were quite sanguine, a few days ago, that the convention to meet in this city to-day would be productive of much good, but now their hope has given way to despair. The Chicago Platform is the primatum and ultimatum of the Republicans.

The Commissioners appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania are all Black Republicans, and are instructed—first, to oppose any and all amendments to the Constitution; second, to refuse the right of transit to the slaveholder with his slave through the Northern States; and third, to demand protection to Northern men when temporarily sojourning or traveling through the South. Thus, instead of evincing a disposition to compromise, Pennsylvania instructs her Commissioners not to compromise; nay, she sends them with an insult and a taunt in their mouths to further provoke, if possible, and influence the Southern mind. What can be the intention of this menace on the part of the Republicans of Pennsylvania? It can have but one meaning—to drive the South out of the Union, and to inaugurate civil war. They want disunion. And yet all winter these hypocrites have been shedding crocodile tears over the Union. At times their looks of devout sincerity, accompanied by the most intense expressions of patriotism and love for the Union, did deceive many a shrewd and sensible man, innocent of trickery and deception. In this manner, they actually fooled Douglas, Crittenden and others of our friends completely. But now the bold, glaring and infamous deception stands revealed before them. The character of the men appointed by the Republicans to this convention, and the instructions by which they are hampered, conclusively demonstrates that it will break up without doing anything to save the Union. After its adjournment the work of secession will be short and rapid. The South will then be convinced that the Republican leaders have resolved that there shall be no compromise—no lowering of the Republican flag—no Union on the basis of the Constitution.

Yet, after all this, how *ardent*, how *devoted* how *intensified* is the love of the Republicans for the Union! All we ask of them is to allow a vote of the people to be taken on the several propositions of compromise. But they are afraid to offer the people the *ballot*; instead, they proffer the *bullet*. The ballot is the representative of American civilization, the bullet of barbarism. True to their nature, they distrust the people.

The English journals are beginning to show their hands quite plainly. Even the London *Times*, which heretofore has *seemed* to be very belligerent towards the South, not only moderates its tone, but is shifting over on their side. In a recent article it says that if the border slave States go into the Southern confederacy," it would, in fact, make the Southern Federation the real United States, and reduce the North to what our ancestors would have called a Rump;" every natural advantage would be on the side of the slave States.

"In the mean time, all the riches of the New World would be in the grasp of the Southerners. Instead of exploring the inhospitable regions in the neighborhood of the British frontier, which would be all that remained to the North, the slave owners would carry their "undeniable property" into lands blessed with every advantage of climate, soil and mineral wealth. Texas has territory enough to make three or four great States. New Mexico is about to be admitted with slave institutions. Arizona will follow. *Mexico must in a few years be conquered, and the Southerners, lords of the most magnificent domain in the world, would control the passage between the two oceans.'*

The *Times* concludes by expressing the hope that "the seperation may be an amicable one!" The Republicans will soon find out that England's interests rule Englands *conscience*.

Gallantly are the Northern Democracy coming up to the rescue of the country from the dire calamities of a civil war, which the Black Republican fanatics are striving to inaugurate. Indiana, ever true and ever sound, led the way on the side of peace: the Democracy of Illinois followed; and then the Democracy of Ohio, the young Giant of the North-west, and now the Democracy of the Empire State of the Union in thunder-tones, proclaim that the country *must not* and *shall not*, be plunged into the horrors of a civil war. The Convention appointed the venerable ex-Chancellor Walworth, ex President Fillmore, Horatio Seymour, Charles O'Conor, Addison Gardner, Greene C. Bronson, Erastus Corning, Amasa J. Parker, and Samuel Tilden as commissioners to attend the Conference in this place. Nothing but the united and firm position of the Northern Democracy against coercion can save this country from civil war. PEN.

FEDERAL RELATIONS.

Speech of Hon. Horace Heffren, of Washington and Harrison Counties, in the Indiana House of Representatives, February 1, 1861.

[REPORTED BY W. H. DRAPIER.]

The question being on concurring in the report of the minority of the Committee on Federal Relations, submitted January 31st, embracing a series of resolutions on the state of the Union,

Mr. Heffren said:

MR. SPEAKER:—I hope, in the discussion of this question, I may be able not only to answer the statements and arguments of gentlemen on the other side of the house, but also to render impregnable the position taken by the minority of the select committee of thirteen.

I will commence with the honorable gentleman from Laporte, (Mr. Sherman,) who referred to treason and rebellion running through every line and sentiment of the report of the minority of the committee. While I have *great respect* for his *intelligence* and kindness of heart, and while I believe he would say nothing upon this floor calculated *to wound or irritate the sensibilities* of any gentleman opposed to him in principle, I must grant that under the circumstances surrounding the Northern prison, he must have thought he was speaking about my friend from Allen's (Mr. Jenkinson) resolution to annihilate that penitentiary, instead of the minority report of the committee of thirteen. Being charitably disposed, and knowing his whole soul is fixed upon keeping the penitentiary at Michigan City, I look over any remark he may have made in the heat of debate in regard to his report as the offshoot of a morbid imagination. But the gentleman who followed him on the same side of the house, the gentleman from Jasper, (Mr. Moody,) who has been wading in swamp land frauds in that woe-begone county for lo! these many months—

Mr. Sherman, (interrupting)—The gentleman from Jasper is not present—is not in his seat. I hope no allusions to him will be made.

Mr. Heffren—Will the gentleman from Laporte assume the gentleman's position?

Mr. Sherman—I prefer not to, inasmuch as I am reminded that the gentleman from Jasper is not present.

Mr. Heffren—I will make but a single allusion in regard to the charge of treason and rebellion which he hurled against the Democratic party and their Representatives here. I could expect nothing else from one whose soul is so lost to honor, to decency, and to the finer feelings of human nature—a heart so devoid of feeling, so depraved and infamous, as to rise in his place upon the floor and speak in calumnious terms and heap opprobrious epithets upon the dead.

The Speaker (Mr Gresham in the chair) rapping on his desk with the gavil—"Order."

Mr. Heffren (with emphasis)—Aye, Mr. Speaker, you may call to order now. Why did you not call to order those gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber when they hurled upon us here the epithets of *treason* and *traitor?*

The Speaker (interrupting)—I will inform the gentleman that I have just taken this seat. I was not in the chair when those he refers to were speaking.

Mr. Heffren—The Speaker of this House suffered those epithets, and we must suppose that he who is his substitute would do the same thing, especially when that substitute did not rise in his place and call the gentlemen to order. So much for that. The gentleman from Koscuisko (Mr. Frazier) spoke this morning about divers and sundry things in connexion with these reports. I do not propose to follow in the same path which has been marked out here by gentlemen upon the other side. I do not propose to descend to their pools of infamy and scurility, and in the language that distinguishes pot-house politicians belch forth here upon this floor slanders upon my opponents, save in self-defense. It would be beneath the dignity of a Representative of the people of Indiana, and unbecoming a member who stands here recognizing himself as well as those who surround him as being gentlemen and entitled to respect, until their own conduct prescribes a different course. You may discuss this question as you will—talk of treason and Democratic traitors—talk about the bones of patriotic fathers rattling in their graves—yea, go back to the musty records of the past, and hunt up what the Democratic creed was in 1849, and give a dissertation thereon, aad even follow it down to 1861, and say that we have changed front—that we have abandoned our party platforms and principles—that they are now different from what they were twelve years ago—and what does it amount to? That is not now the question. It is not who is consistent, but a far greater question is to be met—one affecting every department of industry, and even liberty itself. It is a question of the right of a State or the people of a State to dissolve the bonds that bind them to this Union and exercise the rights of freemen, and establish independent governments, with power to contract alliances, make treaties, etc. But before entering into a discussion of this question I must be permitted to answer some of the objections of gentlemen who have preceded me, and refute the accusations made by them, and also to illustrate their positions and arguments, and compare the same with their political Bible—the Chicago Platform. The gentleman from Koscuisko (Mr. Frazier) told us this morning of the wrongs of the poor negro. He bewailed his fate in piteous tones and dolorous accents, and took the Abolition ground, as I thought, of *negro equality*. When I asked him the plain and simple question—"*is a negro a man?*"—he dodged and squirmed like a worm upon a hot shovel, until at last I got the answer from him that *a negro was a man*. Gentlemen appear to be indignant when accused of negro equality proclivities, yet their Chicago Platform says "all men are created free and equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Now, the gentleman says a negro is a man, and your platform says *all men are equal*. Then I submit that, according to your logic, your platform and those who indorse it are in favor of "negro equality." Tell me, you who swear by that platform, is it not so? Is it not the fact, and are not the negroes entitled to equal privileges, in accordance with its provisions, with yourselves; and do you not in effect say so?

Mr. Frazier (interrupting)—Does not the bill of rights of the Indiana Consitution commence the same way?

A voice—"Does the Constitution of the United States?"

Mr. Heffren—Perhaps they do, sir, but that does not make any difference after the gentleman asserts that a negro is a man. I am following up the arguments of the gentleman from Kosciusko. When he tells me that he swears by the Chicago platform of the Republican party of 1860, and then tell me, when he says a negro is a man, that he is not in favor of negro equality, I must come to one of two conclusions, either he believes that the platform is a lie, or that a negro is not a man.

Mr. Bundy (interrupting)—Does the gentleman say a negro is not a man?

Mr. Heffren—I do, emphatically; and I hope the gentleman from Henry will not take it that I intend to impeach his manhood in making the assertion, for I do not. [Laughter.] I think, perhaps, the less talk there is about the political history of the past, the better it will be for us all. The question is upon us, and what is our duty? What is our duty as Representatives? You denounce the report made by the minority of the Committee of Thirteen. You say it is a fling at religion and the bible. Not a word or a sylable can you find therein that gainsays the bible, its holy precepts, or makes a fling at religion. Look at the three thousand clergymen of New England, who petitioned Congress in the name of Almighty God. Look at those who preach politics instead of Christ and Him crucified. Look at one of those long-faced Judas-hearted, hypocritical wretches who invade the sanctuary of religion and make a hypocritical show of morality and decency Look at these fiends who do all in their power to distract our country, who have divided the Church and now seek to carry out their infamous designs by the division of the national Government. Are they not worthy of execration? Are they not deserving of damnation and everlasting scorn and infamy? Sir, in this city they pollute, with their vile presence, the house of God; they aid immorality and vice, produce discord and strife, and seem never so well at themselves as when they are stirring up some scheme of disunion. Talk to me and then make me believe the report of the minority hits them too hard. One case I will cite in this city, made, too, in a church, by a professed minister of God, a church which now lies in ruins and the ashes scattered to the four winds of Heaven, standing there before his God, with heart full of rottenness and meanness, he proclaimed to the world that "Jesus Christ was a hero, and so was John Brown." What place in hell is there, taking the orthodox view or account of it to be true, hot enough, terrible enough for such an one? He and all the vile, hypocritical, Janus-faced wretches are worthy only of scorn, hate and detestation. This is the class the minority refer to in their report.

We mean not the pious minister of God, with a heart full of piety and with peace and good will toward mankind emblazoned on his banner, who with reverential awe kneels before the altar and offers up a prayer to the God of the universe for his many blessings; who at morn and evening remembers this injunction of the most High and who goes about doing good, relieving the distressed, supplying the wants of the needy and who, when he enters the sacred pulpit, kneels upon the threshhold and implores heaven's blessings upon him, and then in a spirit of true Christian piety follows out the exercises by preaching the gospel and exhorting sinners to repentance, performs his duties as becomes a preacher, a man of God. Oh! no, we mean not such a man; but these reprobates who in their hearts despise decency as well as morality, justice as well as religion; those "who steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil in." The gentleman from Henry (Mr. Bundy) says we make a fling at religion. If it be a fling at religion to denounce the conduct of these men, then so be it. I am ready to take the responsibility. Sir, go back a few days and see the published proceedings in the Cincinnati *Gazette* of the anniversary of the birth day of Tom Paine, in that city. Take up the toasts of Republicans at that meeting as well as their speeches, look at them and then search the country over for more damnable atheism and infidelity than is exhibited there. The bible religion scorned and despised, decency and morality outraged, and yet not a word do we hear of the blasphemy from the Republicans. Sir, in this city of Indianapolis is a paper published by a German infidel, a scoffer at the bible and religion, denying God and trampling under its unhallowed feet the moral precepts of our fathers and of the church. This is a Republican paper, but not one single one of that party dare raise his voice and vote against it. You will hug it to your bosoms and will hold it as dear to your hearts as does the Mahammedan his Koran or the followers of Joe Smith the book of Mormon.

While you pour out the vials of your wrath upon our devoted heads because we dare call things by their right names, because we dare denounce hypocritical wretches and scoundrels, because we dare defend pure and undefiled religion, will you look to your own household and see the festering, corroding poison that is taking hold of the vitals of not only religion and the bible, but the morals, liberty and even the very foundations of society, and stay its onward march.

Mr. Moody, (interrupting)—I rise to a question of privilege. I have been informed the gentleman has been making some allusions personal to myself when absent from my place. I desire he should repeat them.

Mr. Heffren.—With the utmost pleasure, and I desire first to inform the gentleman that I hold myself responsible outside of this chamber for what I say in it, in accordance with the rules prescribed among gentlemen. I said that when the gentleman from Jasper was talking about treason and traitors, when he was speaking about the minority report being an insult not only to the Democracy upon this floor but to the people of State of Indiana, that I could expect nothing better from a heart so corrupt and rotten or from a mind so debased, disgraced, dishonored, vile and cowardly, as would make such a general, dishonorable fling at the dead as you made about the late Governor Willard in the location of the county seat of Newton county. [Applause.]

Mr. Moody.—I would ask the gentleman if that was all he said?

Mr. Heffren.—If there was anything more I will give the gentlemen the benefit of it in the fullest, most complete and greatest extent, in all ways, shapes and manners which he may desire.

Mr. Moody.—Was there nothing else said in regard to my connection with swamp lands?

Mr. Heffren.—I said the gentleman from Jasper, coming from a county where he had been wading in the swamp land trades up to his knees for these many months, nothing better could be expected from you than to disgrace if possible the dead by your remarks.

Mr. Moody.—Mr. Speaker, permit me, sir, at this time, if the gentleman will permit it—

Mr. Heffren.—Certainly. Only one thing remember, the insult is cast upon you, act in accordance with the code prescribed for gentlemen and clear your garments, or wear the badge of infamy.

Mr. Moody.—I wish to say to members of this House that I have had no connection, within the past two or three years or at any time, with swamp land matters, in any possible shape. I have never been mixed up with their frauds or speculations in any way or manner, except during the last few months. I have investigated these matters to satisfy myself, and I proclaimed the frauds from every stump in that district, and pledged myself I would use what influence I possessed to have a thorough and complete investigation of that. If the gentleman states it because he knows the fact, I will say the gentleman states what is not true; and if he states that he does not know to be true, he certainly is not justified before this body. In regard to the other matter, what the gentleman has stated I will say this only, I refer to the circumstances connected with Gov. Willard's administration. I take it that it needs nothing from me here or elsewhere to vindicate my assertions, for it will be furnished before the session is over. I will detain the House no longer with explanations of this matter. I will explain them in some other place, and in a proper mode and manner.

Mr. Heffren.—I shall take up the glove and accept your propositions. The gentleman from Porter (Mr. Cameron)—and I must confess that he discusses the question as a Representative should discuss it—talks here about the strong arm of power. The strong arm of power, sir. The people of the Southern States are doing but what our fathers did. I, standing here to-day, firm admirer of and believer in the Virginia resolutions of 1798. I say I am here still standing by the principles contained in them recognizing the right of a State whenever her people may choose, to leave this confederacy and set up a Government for itself. If this be treason, then I am a traitor. But with me you will find more than a *hundred thousand traitors* in this broad land, in the State of Indiana, and before you undertake to come with hemp in one hand and a bayonet in the other, as you threaten, to expiate our crimes upon the altar of the country, I tell you to speak for your own coffins and bring them with you for we will meet you as Leonidas with his Spartan band met Xerxes and his hosts at the pass of Thermopelae, and only over our dead bodies shall the hordes of Abolitionism, under its dark and black banner, march across the Ohio river and there endeavor to plunge the sword in the breasts of our Southern brethren. [Applause.]

The Speaker.—If there is any more disorder in the galleries I shall direct the door-keeper to clear them. The Chair has upon all occasions attempted to suppress any marks of approbation or disapprobation, and hopes order will be preserved.

Mr. Heffren.—I heartily coincide with what the Speaker says, and hope my friends will not applaud. I insist that the Virginia resolutions of 1798, which I will read, and which have been re endorsed every four years by the Democratic party, shows where that party stood in years past and gone, and where that party stands now.

"*Resolved*, That the several States composing the United States of America are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their General Government, but that by compact, under the style and title of a Constitution for the United States and amendments thereto, they constitute a General Government for special purposes, delegated to the Government certain defined powers, reserving each State to itself the residuary mass of right to their own self-government; and that whenever the General Government assumes undelegated powers, its acts are unauthoritative, void and of no effect; that to this compact each State acceded as a State, and is an integral party; that this Government, created by this compact, was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact between parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself as well of infractions as of the mode and manner of redress."

There is a platform that has come down from 1798, upon which I stand, that either party to a compact has a right to say what shall be the proper mode of redress. Take the Declaration of Independence, quoted so often upon this floor—take those principles, and let us stand by the flag of our Fathers and the principles which they carried through a seven years' war, and you stand upon the resolutions of 1798. I will read a single extract from that Declaration of Independence:

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

I ask if there is anything more plain than this. If the people of the Southern States say the Government has been destructive of the ends for which it has been organized, whether they have not the right to say they will judge for themselves and become a free and independent nation among the nations of the earth. These rights were recognized by the fathers, and when you ask me whether I believe them to be true, I will tell you that I do. I will tell you that I believe the very men who framed our Constitution so understood it, and in proof of my position I will cite from those men in whose souls there dwelt a pure and holy patriotism.

It is a conceded fact among sensible men that the Federal Government derives its origin and *all the powers* it possesses from the States; from the States it derives its organic laws. The powers which belong to the Federal Government *were delegated* to it by the States, each State being a sovereign and independent power, possessing in itself *inherent, unalienable* and *indefeasible rights and powers*. Without some of these powers having been delegated by the States to the Federal Government, the Federal Government would have no existence; hence it follows that the States are the creators or principals, and the Federal Government the creature or agent of the States, and acting entirely under delegated powers, and claiming no right as inherent in itself. When a question arises between the States and Federal Government, and no provision is made in the Constitution, or in the instruments which creates or appoints the agent to settle the dispute, Blackstone, in his Comm., vol. 1, page 212, says: "Whenever a question arises between the society at large and any magistrate ve ted with powers *originally delegated* by *that society*, it must be decided by the voice of that society itself; *there is not upon earth any other tribunal to resort to.*"

Again, Vattel's Laws of Nations says: "Every nation that governs itself, under what form soever, without dependence on any foreign power, is a *sovereign State*. Its rights are naturally the same as those of any other State." Again he says: "Several sovereign and independent States, may unite themselves together by a perpetual confederacy, without ceasing to be, each individually, a perfect State. They will together, constitute a federal republic; their joint deliberations will not impair the sovereignty of each member, though they may, in certain respects, put some restraint on the exercise of it, in virtue of voluntary engagements. A person does cease to be free and independent when he is obliged to fulfill engagements which he has *voluntarily* contracted."—*Book 1, chap. 1, Vattel.*

Mr. Jefferson, in the Virginia and Kentucky resolution, says: "The several States composing the United States of America are not united on the principles of *unlimited submission* to their General Government; they constituted a General Government for special purposes, and delegated to that government certain definite powers; that this General Government, created by this compact, (Constitution) was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself; that as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measures of redress."

Mr. Madison says: "That where resort can be had to no tribunal superior or authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the rightful judges, in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated. The Constitution of the United States was formed by the sanction of the States, *given by each in its sovereign capacity*. The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows, of necessity, that there can be no tribunal, above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; they must themselves decide in the last resort," etc.

In the case of Charles River Bridge *vs.* Warren Bridge, etc., 11 Peters, S. C. R., page 420, etc., the court says: Public grants are to be construed strictly." In grants by the public, nothing passes by implication. "The court cannot deal thus with the rights reserved to the States, and by legal intendments and mere technical reasoning take away from them any portion of that power over their own internal police and improvements." In the case of Pollard *et al. vs.* Hagan *et al.*, 3 Howard, before referred to, the same court say: "This is the first time we have been called upon to draw a line that separates the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the government of the Union, and the State governments." "The United States never held any municipal sovereignty, jurisdiction or right of soil in or to the territory to which Alabama or any of the new States were formed, except for temporary purposes, and to execute the trusts created," etc. "If an express stipulation had been inserted in the agreement granting the municipal right of sovereignty and eminent domain to the United States, such stipulation would have been void and inoperative, because the United States have no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty or eminent domain within the limits of a State or elsewhere," etc. Eminent domain, as is well known, means this: "The inherent sovereign power of a State, which gives to the Legislature the control of private property for public uses." 2 Kent Com., 339. "The ultimate right of the sovereign power to appropriate, not only the public property, but the private property of all citizens within the territorial sovereignty, to public purposes."—*Story, J.* 11, *Peters R.* 420 404, *etc.*

With all these lights, we fail to perceive the first ray of sovereignty, or any inherent right of government, or eminent domain, in the Federal Government—it is but the creature of the States, truly.

Article five of the Constitution requires that before the Constitution shall or can be amended, that *two-thirds of both Houses* shall deem it necessary, or it can be amended on application of the Legislatures of "two-thirds of the several States," by calling conventions. After this is done, and before the amendments are perfected, the amendments must be ratified by three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths of the States; provided, "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." Can the sovereignty and independence of each State be more explicitly admitted and recognized? Here is no power given to the Federal Government to "force, coerce" any State to ratify or accept of the amendment; nor can a State, without its (the State's) consent, be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. Again, it requires a majority of the electoral college to elect a President. Suppose such States which would control this majority, refused to vote for a President, &c., or to elect Senators or Representatives, where is the Federal Government in such an event? Who can "force or coerce" the States to elect, &c? At every step we take we can not fail to recognize and to admit the independence and distinct sovereignty of each one of the States, and that the Federal Government is but the creature and agent of the State, and that it exists only by the sufferance of the States.

As to coercing a State, Mr. Ellsworth said: "Hence we see how necessary for the Union is a coercive principle. No man pretends the contrary; we all see and feel this necessity. The only question is, shall it be a coercion of law or a coercion of arms? There is no other possible alternative. Where will those who oppose a coercion of law come out? Where will they end? A necessary consequence of their principles is a war of the States, one against the other. I am for coercion by law—that coercion which acts only upon delinquent individuals. This Constitution does not attempt to coerce sovereign bodies—States in their political capacities. No coercion is applicable to such bodies, but that of an armed force. If we should attempt to execute the laws of the Union by sending an armed force against a delinquent State, it would involve the good and bad, the innocent and guilty, in the same calamity."—*Elliot's Debates in the Federal Convention, vol. 2, page* 197.

Alexander Hamilton said: "To coerce the States is one of the maddest projects that was ever devised. A failure of compliance will never be confined to a single State. This being the case, can we suppose it wise to hazard a civil war? It would be a nation at war with itself. Can any reasonable man be well disposed towards a Government which makes war and carnage the only means of supporting itself—a Government that can exist only by the sword? Every such war must involve the innocent with the guilty. This single consideration should be sufficient to dispose every peaceable citizen against such a Government."—*Ib. vol.* 2, *page* 233.

Mr. Madison said: "The more he reflected on the use of force, the more he doubted the practicability, the justice, and the efficacy of it when applied to people collectively and not individually. A Union of States containing such an ingredient seemed to provide for its own destruction. The use of force against a State would look more like a declation of war."—[*Debates in the Federal Convention, vol. 5, page* 140.] Mr. Randolph and Mr. Patterson in assisting to frame the Constitution, proposed to give the Federal Government power to use force against the States; it was refused. The attempt was then made to give the Federal Government a negative power or force over the States, viz: To give the President the power to veto State laws, to nominate State Governors, to give Congress power over legislation by the States, &c., all of which were refused to be granted by the convention. Mr. Madison says again: "A negative was the mildest expedient for preventing these mischiefs. Any Government for the United States formed on the supposed practicability of using force against the unconstitutional proceedings of the States, would prove visionary and fallicious," &c.—*Ib. vol.* 5, *page* 171.

Mr. Charles Pinckney moved to add to the powers of Congress: "To negative all laws passed by the several States, interfering in the opinion of the Legislature, with the general interests and harmony of the Union, provided two-thirds of the members of each house assent to the same." Mr. Rutledge said: "If nothing else, this alone would damn, and ought to damn, the Constitution. Will any State ever agree to be bound hand and foot in this manner?" This proposition was withdrawn.

Mr. Randolph said: "If I did believe that all power not expressly retained was given up by the people, I would detest this Government. But I never thought so; nor do I now." Mr. Nicholas said the same.

From this stand-point the irresistable conclusion which every sane mind should come to is, that the Federal Government is the creature and agent of the States; that it exists only by the sufferance of such States as chose to recognize it as its agent, and which are for the time being willing to be bound by the compact by which it is created the agent; that it has no inherent or sovereign rights; it has only powers. The Constitution, which was created by the several States, commands the Federal Government, the language is, the President shall—the Senate shall—House of Representatives shall—the Supreme Court shall. Would this emphatic language be used by an inferior to a superior? This, however, is the language of the people of the several States acting in their individual capacity as sovereigns, commanding their creature. For all this, there live persons who insist that "the Constitution and Union," as they term it, the Federal Government is the sovereign power, or the creator, and that the States are its creatures, and that they can not, nor can any one of them, exercise or reassume its sovereignty, or withdraw the powers it delegated without the assent of the Federal Government, and without the assent of other States."

Sir, I might go on and read extracts by the hour to prove my position. I will add a few more, and then pass from the dry and musty details of authority to something more enlivening. I will quote from the *Federalist:*

"In the convention which framed the Constitution, Edmund Randolph proposed to give the Federal Government power 'to call forth the force of the Union against any member of the Union failing to fulfill its duties under the articles thereof.' Mr. Patterson also desired to be inserted in the Constitution: 'And if any State, or body of men in any State, shall oppose or prevent the carrying into execution such acts or treaties, the Federal Executive shall be authorized to call forth the powers of the confederated States, or so much thereof as may be necessary to compel obedience to such acts, or an observance of such treaties.' In these two instances the convention was distinctly invited to authorize the Federal Government to use force and coercive measures against the States, but no such powers were authorized. Not a single member of the convention advocated force. Hamilton, the strong Government man, rejected and denounced resorting to force. Mr. Madison said 'the more he reflected on the use of force, the more he doubted the practicability, the justice and the efficacy of it.'

"An Union of the States containing such an ingredient (force or coercion) seemed to provide for its own destruction. The use of *force* against a State would look more like a declaration of war than an infliction of punishment, and would be considered by the party attacked as a dissolution of all previous compacts by which it might be bound;" he opposed the use of force. If the Federal Government attempts to coerce a State by *force*, it breaks the compact between all the States and itself; its acts are illegal and unauthorized, and it is a usurper, and no State is bound by the compact, nor can the Federal Government claim longer to act under or by authority of the compact by which it was brought into existence.

Mr Madson again said: "That any government for the United States, formed on the supposed impractability of using force against the States would prove visionary and fallacious."

Hamilton again said: "Force, by which may be understood a coercion of laws or a coercion of arms, it amounts to a war between the parties, the conclusion will increase, and a dissolution of the Union will ensue.—*Elliott's Debates.*

"In a confederacy the people, without exaggeration, may be said to be entirely the masters of their own fate."—*Hamilton.*

"It may safely be received as an axiom in our political system that the State Governments will, in all possible contingencies afford complete security against invasions of the public liberty by the national authority.—*Ib., page* 107.

"The rule that all authorities of which the States are not explicitly divested in favor of the Union, remain with them in full vigor, is not only a theoretical consequence of that division, (sovereign power,) but is clearly admitted by the whole tenor of the instrument which contains the articles of the proposed Constitution."—*Ib., page* 12

"In the establishment of the Constitution, the States should be regarded as distinct and independent sovereigns, and they are so regarded."—*Ib., page* 156.

"It is vain to oppose Constitutional barriers to the impulses of self-preservation.—*Ib., page* 16.

"The Constitution and Union can be superseded without the unanimous consent of the States which are parties to it, upon the great principle of self-preservation; to the transcendant law of nature and of nature's God, which declares that the safety and happiness of society are the objects at which all political institutions must be sacrificed."

"A compact between independent sovereigns, founded on acts of legislative authority, can pretend to no higher validity than a league or treaty between the parties. It is an established doctrine on the subject of treaties, that all the articles are mutually conditions of each other; that a breach of any one article is a breach of the whole treaty; and that a breach committed by either of the parties absolves the others, and authorizes them, if they please, to pronounce the compact violated and void."—*Ib., page* 178.

A word or two more upon the reserved rights of the States when they ratified the Constitution: New York, when she ratified the Constitution of the United States, expressly declared "That the powers of government may be reassumed by the people whensoever it shall become necessary to their happiness; every other power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by the said Constitution clearly delegated to the Congress of the United States, or to the departments of the Government thereof, remains to the people of the several States, or to their respective State governments." *Elliott's Debates, page* 327.

New York, when she ratified the Constitution of the United States, expressly stated:

"Under these impressions, and declaring that the rights aforesaid can not be abridged or violated, and that the explanations aforesaid are consistent with the said Constitution, &c., we assent to and ratify the said Constitution!" These were no proposed amendments, but they were declarations of right and of the common understanding in relation to the meaning of the Constitution.

Virginia, in her ratification, declares and makes known "That the powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the people of the United States, may be resumed by them whenever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression, and that every power not granted thereby, remains with them and at their will."

Rhode Island, when she ratified the Constitution of the United States, expressly declared "That the powers of government may be reassumed by the people whensoever it shall become necessary to their happiness.—*Same as New York.*

As to the right or claim of the Federal Government to forts, &c., in a State after the State has been withdrawn from the Union, and has reassumed all powers and rights once delegated, in the case of Pollard's lessee *vs.* Hagan, 3 Howard, S. P. C. R., pages 212 and 223, the court say: Taking the legislative acts of the United States and the States of Virginia and Georgia, and their deeds of cession to the United States, and giving to each separately, and to all jointly, a fair interpretation, we must come to the conclusion that it was the intention of the parties to invest the United States with the eminent domain of the country ceded, both national and municipal, for the purpose of temporary government, and to hold it in trust for the performance of the stipulations and conditions expressed in the deeds of cession and the legislative acts connected with them." The court also say in the same case: "The United States has no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty or eminent domain within the limits of the State or elsewhere, except in cases in which it is expressly granted." Forts, &c., are built out of the money of all the States, and before the United States has any right or power to build them in a State, the State must give permission by cession, &c. As soon as the State reassumes all of her sovereign rights, and if she refuses longer to recognize as her agent the Federal Government, the Federal Government has no longer any authority or right in or over the State. Thus, suppose your land is condemned, or sold by you for a railroad, road, or street, &c., and you are paid for it; whenever said land ceases to be used, &c., as required, it reverts back to you or your heirs—the fee simple was always in