

Republican State Ticket.

FOR GOVERNOR, HENRY S. LANE, of Montgomery. FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, OLIVER P. MORTON, of Wayne. FOR SECRETARY OF STATE, WILLIAM A. PEELE, of Randolph. FOR TREASURER OF STATE, JONATHAN S. HARVEY, of Clarke. FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL, ALBERT LANGE, of Vigo. FOR SUPERVISOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, MILES J. FLETCHER, of Putnam.

O. P. Morton's Speech. We can supply Mr. Morton's Speech in pamphlet for 5 cents each, \$1.25 a hundred or \$10 per thousand. It is a speech that ought to be circulated extensively among the people.

Meeting of the County Executive Committee. At the office of Thos. H. Nelson, in Terre Haute, Saturday, March 17th, at 1 o'clock, P. M.

Business of importance requires a punctual attendance. Lost Creek. All those citizens of Lost Creek Township who are opposed to the measure of the present disunion Democratic party, are requested to meet at the Township House in Lost Creek Township, on Thursday evening, the 23rd inst., for the purpose of organizing an Opposition Club.

Let there be a general turn out. Vigo County Ratification Meeting! SPEECHES OF HENRY S. LANE AND O. P. MORTON.

One of the largest meetings of the people of this county that ever assembled together at one time, met on Saturday, the 10th inst., at the Court House, for the purpose of ratifying the action of the State Convention of the 23d of February. Our people from every township, and from every neighborhood, came together to give, by their presence, endorsement of the Republican State Ticket and Platform. We hardly remember of seeing so many of our farmers in the city, at one time before. They came from ten to fifteen miles in every direction, and remained until the business of the meeting was entirely closed.

The reputation of the distinguished speakers who were to address the meeting, had much to do, we have no doubt, in making the meeting so unusually large. Vigo county is aroused to the issues of the day, and will give a glorious account of herself at the coming October and November elections. Henry S. Lane made the first speech, and it was peculiarly characteristic of that distinguished and eloquent speaker. It abounded in brilliant displays, and closed logical argument. It was filled with pointed satire and withering invective; overwhelming denunciation and irresistible facts—in convincing, logical deductions, and a comprehensive and statesman-like views of the present political condition of the country. Col. Lane occupied the attention of the audience for about one hour and a half, and every moment of that time, there was the most intense interest to hear him. The large audience, crowded and packed together, filling every square of space in the room of the Court House, was carried on one man, by the force and power of his arguments—delighted by the bright corrections of his hearers, or convulsed with laughter at the un-spareless telling of his anecdotes.

We never saw Col. Lane more happy, more masterly and more himself. Oliver P. Morton followed Col. Lane—the Lieutenant Governor following the Governor. As this was the first speech that Mr. Morton has made since the Convention of the 23d of February, he resolved to place himself in a condition not to be misinterpreted in the future, and read his speech from manuscript. How able, how argumentative and how conclusive that speech is, the reader can learn by reading it in our to-day's issue. It is a truth and in fact, one of the most compact and forcible presentations of the doctrines of the Republican party we have ever read. It is a powerful argument against the disunion Democracy and in favor of Republicanism. No disinterested honest man can read this great speech, without feeling it is the effort of a clear, logical mind, and that the doctrines it maintains are true—historically, politically and universally true. After this speech no one can fail to understand Mr. Morton's position. There is no ambiguity in it—nothing that is plain of different constructions. It is plain, independent, masterly.

After Mr. Morton had concluded, Miles Fletcher, the Republican candidate for Superintendent of Public Instruction, in a few remarks, made a very favorable impression upon the audience. After the adoption of some resolutions, which will be found in another column, the meeting adjourned, and the most enthusiastic feeling for our State ticket was manifested among the people. Thus has opened in Vigo county, the State campaign of 1860. A campaign that is to be memorable in the history of this State, as well as influential on the coming Presidential campaign.

If we are to judge other portions of the State by the rapid advancement of the doctrines advocated by the Republican party in Vigo county, then indeed does a glorious victory await us this Fall. We have never seen the people more determined to go where the right leads them, and refusing to follow the blind dictates of partisan fealty, than now. The rottenness, the prejudices and the usurpations of the disunion Democracy in Vigo have buckled on the armor and intend to fight until victory perches upon our banner.

Our neighbor of the Journal don't like the idea of ladies having attended the Ratification Meeting on Saturday, and inquires that it was a restraint on Col. Lane. Not so, James. Col. Lane never uses in his speeches any language that is vulgar or indecent. He is a man of sense and good sense, and his Democratic administration always. No lady need fear to attend a gathering of the opposit.

VIGO RATIFICATION MEETING.

Pursuant to notice the citizens of Vigo county assembled at the Court House, in Terre Haute, Saturday, March 10th, for the purpose of ratifying the nominations for State officers, made at Indianapolis, the 23d of February last.

Seats were arranged in all the vacant spaces of the Court House, and at an early hour it was filled to its utmost capacity, hundreds of persons being unable to obtain admittance.

On motion of John P. Usher, Esq., Col. Thos. H. Nelson was called to the Chair, and J. O. Jones appointed Secretary.

The Chairman explained the object of the meeting in a few brief and pertinent remarks.

The committee appointed at the last county meeting, reported the following persons to constitute a "County Central Executive Committee," to serve until their successors are duly appointed by a succeeding county meeting.

Harrison Township—H. D. Scott, J. P. Baird, George Naylor, W. B. Warren, Robert Thomas, John H. Barr, J. B. Hager, J. O. Jones, H. S. Briggs, Alois Coltrin.

Petersen—William Brown. Linton—Philip Randolph. Prairie Creek—Stephen Gaper. Riley—Dr. H. D. Lee. Honey Creek—Nelson S. Clair.

Prairieville—William Thornton. Sugar Creek—Thos. McCallough. Fayette—Hiram Shepherd. Newberry—W. P. Willoughby. Lister Creek—Robert Briggs. Oster Creek—Laban Dickerson.

The report was concurred in unanimously. The Hon. Henry S. Lane, the next Governor of Indiana, was then introduced to the meeting. He entertained his large and appreciative audience for an hour and a half, in a speech of great brilliancy and power, thoroughly discussing all the leading questions of the day, both State and National.

He was followed by Judge Morton, who spoke for about two hours. Though pure ly argumentative, he was listened to with marked attention, and evidently made a most favorable impression upon the judgment of his auditory.

Prof. Fletcher of Greencastle, candidate for Superintendent of Public Instruction, made a few appropriate remarks respecting the duties and peculiarities of the station for which he was a candidate.

The Committee on Resolutions, Messrs. J. P. Usher, James Farrington, Harvey Evans, Joseph James, and Alfred Peag, reported as follows:

Resolved, That we heartily approve and ratify the action of the Opposition Convention which met at Indianapolis on the 23d of February last.

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to each other, and to the Opposition throughout the State, our untiring devotion to the candidates presented, and principles there enunciated, and will only cease our efforts with the election of the one, and the complete vindication of the other.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted. The intervals between the speeches were enlivened by delicious music from O'Hara's Brass Band; the presence of the ladies added much to the cheerfulness and enjoyment of the occasion, no doubt but what our eloquent standard bearers were made our eloquent, and more argumentative, under the influence of the bright eyes that were continually beaming upon them.

On motion, the meeting then adjourned. THOS. H. NELSON, Chm'n. J. O. JONES, Sec'y.

The April Election. We call the attention of our Republican friends, and all others who are acting in opposition to the disunion Democracy party, to the importance of the coming April election. Every political step taken from this time forward, until after the Presidential contest is over, must be one of prudence, caution and policy. Men who are aspirants for office, but without possessing the necessary qualifications to discharge the duties thereof, ought not to be placed upon our ticket. Men who are unpopular with the people, ought not to be thrust before them, and their support expected.

The office of Township Trustee is an important one, particularly in this township it is a very important one, and a good, judicious, competent and popular man should be selected as our candidate. Throughout the county, for all the township offices, good men, and men who can be elected, should be placed upon the ticket.

To a campaign of so much importance as that of 1860, our prospects should not be retarded by having to carry any "dead weight." Let those who enter, like the unshrinking racer, rely upon their individual strength and fitness, and being free from all incumbrances, they will be almost sure to win the goal.

The April election is important, and we call the special attention of our friends to that fact. We are able to carry the great majority of the townships in this county, and we ought to do it. But we will not do it unless we select good men, and popular men for the different positions. We hope our friends, both in the city and country, will look to this matter and give it prompt attention.

Col. Lane, the nominee for Governor proposed to hold the doctrine of the old Whig party, which include bankrupt law, United States Bank, land distribution and a high tariff for protection. Mr. Morton, the candidate for Lieut. Governor claims to hold to the Democratic doctrine, except upon the "nigger" issue. He professes to be against class legislation, for bad money, free trade and for husbanding the public domain as one of the resources for the support of the General Government—State Seditious.

An individual who is not a constant reader of the Indiana State Sentinel, might expect to find, at all times, consistency and truth in its columns. But no one who has been a continuous daily reader of that sheet, for one moment expects to find there the one or the other. No paper in Indiana has more felicitous knack at lying, than this same Sentinel. It seems to have a peculiar faculty in that way—an innate impulse to counterfeit the truth.

Col. Lane does not profess to hold to a "bankrupt law," but on the contrary, has always been against it, and when he was a member of Congress and instructed by his constituents to vote for that law, he cast the vote under a protest.

Mr. Morton is not "husbanding the public domain as one of the resources for the support of General Government," but favors, and is in favor of giving homes out of this public domain to actual settlers.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—Our brethren of the press most excuse us for sending them a half-sheet this week. Our list of subscribers is rapidly increasing, and the demand for Mr. Morton's speech is so great, that our editors of to-day will be so inefficient to supply the demand.

Chicago Convention.

The following letter was received a few days ago from Hon. R. M. Cowdrey, a distinguished member of the Cincinnati delegation to the Chicago Convention, which, with the permission of the gentleman to whom it is addressed, but without the knowledge of the author, we take the liberty of publishing as a matter of public interest. The position of the Ohio delegate has been much misrepresented and misunderstood, it having been industriously circulated that they would vote for Mr. Chase as a unit. We are glad to see that is not pledged to Mr. Chase or any other man, but that they will go into the Convention untrammelled, with a determination to "act understandingly, for the good of the country and the triumph of our principles."

CINCINNATI, March 5th, 1860. DEAR SIR: Of course, my views have been misinterpreted, but no more than the views of other Delegates who have not declared their individual preferences for the Presidency. But, I do not suppose my opinions are of any consequence except to my personal friends, and therefore, the more, to which you refer, have not been noticed publicly by me. My friends may take the trouble to inquire into my views, and when they do, I shall not hesitate to announce whatever opinions I may have. I cheerfully recognize your right to ask for them in advance of the meeting of the Convention, and respond accordingly.

I have not, since I was elected, a delegate, expressed a preference for either of the distinguished men, whose names have been spoken of in connection with the nomination of the Convention at Chicago. It is a great mistake to represent me as being pledged for or against any man in the catalogue. In this, I believe my three colleagues in these two Districts concur. When elected, I distinctly announced that I should go to the Convention wholly free to vote for such candidates as I might, in my judgment, truly represent the sentiments of the opposition party, and would insure our success. I declared then, and have seen no reason to change that opinion, that I had no well defined preference, and would endeavor to keep my mind free, until the Convention assembled, when by an interchange of views with the Delegates, I could act understandingly for the good of the country, and the triumph of our principles. In my choice I shall be limited by certain well-defined rules. I may now state some of them. I will not vote for any man who does not substantially come up to this standard:

1st. He must be well known to be opposed to the extension of Slavery, as a political institution, into Territory now free.

2d. In favor of the restoration of our Territories for the occupation of free white labor.

3d. Opposed to the slightest interference with the rights of the owners of Slaves in the States where Slavery exists by authority of law.

4th. In favor of the clear recognition of the rights of the citizens of all the States, as guaranteed to them by the Constitution and the laws of Congress.

5th. The enforcement of all laws properly passed by Congress, and more especially by the Supreme Court has recognized and adjudicated their Constitutionality, until they are repealed by Congress.

6th. The eradication of the price of the public domain to such figures and under such restrictions as will insure its sale to none but actual settlers.

7th. The passage of an equitable Homestead Law.

These two latter are based upon the cardinal proposition that the Government should be administered for the greatest good of the greatest number.

I regard these as the leading issues.—They make up all the platform I should advocate. They cannot be ignored by any party and succeed. The people are as much alive to them and their importance as they are opposed to the resurrection of the dead and wholly unimportant issues which formerly constituted so many planks in the Missouri platform of the faded and fading parties, the individuality whereof has been lost in the upthrusting and obliteration of these old creeds. The attempt to ventilate the latter at Chicago will prove to be a Syrian wind—destructive alike of candidate and party.

Expecting to meet you at Chicago, I will not now pursue this subject further. My daily pursuits, at this time, are foreign to the consideration of politics, except as merely incidental; and consequently my opinions should be attached no sort of importance, except in so far as they prefigure my probable course at Chicago.

Truly yours, R. M. COWDREY. To Col. T. H. NELSON, Terre Haute, Ind.

LET me have the pleasure of attending the exhibition of the "Franklin Society" connected with F. F. Cornell's school in Honey Creek township, on last Friday evening. The exhibition consisted of declamations, essays and debate, and in each and all of those, the young gentlemen acquitted themselves very creditably indeed. We have scarcely ever attended an exhibition more entertaining and one which did more credit to the participants. Interspersed along the performances, was some excellent vocal music, by a choir formed of young ladies and gentlemen in the neighborhood.

Mr. Cornell deserves much praise for the interest he has taken in education in that vicinity, and no one is more competent to instruct.

The editor of this paper and Dr. Hawkins addressed the Society.

SAYBROOK, March 8, 1860. MR. EDITOR:—You will please give these lines a place in your paper, as it shows the Black Republican spirit which is found in all our country. On last Tuesday night they demolished a "respectable" coffee-house, in the town of Sandford, which is much lamented by the Union people of this community, and it is not believed there was a Democrat in such a vile crowd. The house had been kept by a Mr. McFarland, of "good character," then by our worthy and much esteemed citizen, Thos. Welch, but was sold to a worthy Democrat of Elbridge, who had brought on some of his good drinks, and we were waiting with some impatience for some to refresh our spirits. But, alas! on Wednesday all our hopes were blasted, when we found it all in ruins. And now, Mr. Editor, don't you think they talk hard of Mr. Welch, and wouldn't be surprised if he should continue to aid in that laudable business if he would find himself dressed in a coat of tar and feathers, for it is believed they are bad enough to do that thing.

Yours, OLIVER AND HIS GRANDS. P. S. The Journal will please copy.

They say the State should be admitted with a Constitution recognizing Slavery.—Journal.

Who says so?—When did they say so? Where did they say so? Remember the sixth commandment, neighbor.

Speech of Oliver P. Morton.

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. Delivered before the Ratification Meeting, held in the City of Terre Haute, on the 10th day of March, 1860.

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY. Popular Sovereignty, as defined by its most distinguished teachers, is the right of a people of a Territory to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, or, in other words, it is the absolute right of self-government in the people of a Territory. If this right exists, it is an inherent right; it is not derived from any clause of the Constitution of the U. S. If the people of a Territory have the right of self-government, they have equally the right to choose their form of government, organize and inaugurate it. They have not only the right to elect their Legislature, but to elect their Governor, Judges, and all the officers of State; and Congress has no right to interfere with the organization or Constitution of government through the medium of the Nebraska Bill, or otherwise. This will be seen that the Territories, instead of being made mere dependencies of the General Government—in a state of pupillage and preparation for final admission into the Union as States, and for the enjoyment of equal rights and privileges with the other States—would be absolute and independent sovereignties, outside of the Union, having rights and powers greatly exceeding those of the States in the Union. The Constitution of the United States forbids any State to enter into any treaty, alliance or confederation; to make anything but gold and silver coin; to lay any impost duties on imports or exports, except what may be necessary for executing inspection laws; to grant letters of marque and reprisal—but the Territories would have power to do all these things, for the Constitutional prohibition extends only to States, and it would require merely a latitudinarian construction to make it apply to the Territories. It seems to be conceded, theoretically at least, that the Constitution should be strictly construed, and the Constitution says that no State shall do these things; besides, it provides expressly that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." The Constitution of the United States was made for the Union, and applies in its terms to the States in the Union. It was not intended to apply to and provide for two classes of States—one in the Union and the other out. Such a form of government would indeed be complex and anomalous. This view of the Constitution was espoused by all parties to be correct in 1820, in the passage of the Missouri Compromise, being then admitted that the clause of the Constitution providing for the restoration of fugitive slaves did not extend to Territories, but was applicable only to States; and that, in the absence of an act of Congress providing for such capture in the Territories, the master would have no such right. Mr. Benton, in his great essay, reviewing the Dred Scott decision, enters into an elaborate argument and overwhelming citation of opinions and authorities, showing that the Constitution, in its prohibitions, is applicable, not to Territories, but to States. But, if we adopt the other view of the Constitution—that view which received the sanction of all parties, all Congress, all State Legislatures, and all Courts, for more than fifty years from its adoption—these difficulties and absurdities are swept away. That view regarded the Territories as dependencies, as communities in a state of minority, to be governed, trained and prepared for admission into the Union as States. The power of the Federal Government to control the Territories may be successfully derived from two sources: First, as an inevitable incident of the right to acquire Territory. This principle is so simple and familiar as scarcely to require illustration; the power to acquire without the power to govern, whether by individuals or governments, would be most barren and unprofitable.—Secondly, from that clause of the Constitution which provides that Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory, or other property belonging to the United States. This clause, manifestly regarding the Territories as dependencies and not as States or sovereignties, confers upon Congress plenary power to make all needful rules and regulations for their government.

WHAT IS A SECTIONAL PARTY? The true definition of a Sectional Party is a party which, in its principles and purposes, seeks to consult and promote the interests of one section of the Republic, regardless of, or at the expense of the interest and property of all other sections. The number and locality of the members of a party have no influence on its sectional character. The religion of our Saviour could not with any propriety have been termed sectional, even while its professors were limited to a mere handful of Jews, for its spirit and principles comprehended humanity everywhere, and in all ages. The great principle of the Republican Party is the preservation of the Territories to Freedom, and the protection and elevation of Free Labor. Surely a purpose so beneficial as this cannot be either selfish or sectional. It contemplates and comprehends the highest interests of a large majority of those living in the slave States, as well as of the people of the free States. It is in fact too palpable and notorious to be denied, that there is but a small minority of the people of the slave States who are really interested in the preservation and enlargement of the institution of Slavery, and it is equally palpable and notorious that the institution rests as a horrid and crushing incubus upon the prosperity of the large majority in such States. The prosperity of every part of our beloved country is intimately bound up with the prosperity of every other portion. Our country is one, and our people are one, and any damage suffered by one portion is, in our country, an injury inflicted upon the body of the nation. Tried by this test, the Democratic party is not national, and is even less sectional, for its aim, policy and purpose is the promotion of the special interests of a minority class in one section of the Union to the manifest disregard and injury of the majority in the other section. The number of slaveholders who are not opposed to slavery in Kansas has retailed upon Missouri, not in Kansas, in violation of blood, but in the development of an emancipation movement, possessing such remarkable vigor and making such remarkable progress as to threaten the speedy extinction of slavery in that State. It is therefore not impossible or even improbable that the attempt made by citizens of Missouri to fasten slavery upon Kansas by force of arms, may result in the legitimate and peaceful expulsion of slavery from Missouri. But in that contest we have no right to mingle. It is one that under the shield of State sovereignty pretains exclusively to the citizens of that State, and no people, party, or tribunal out of it, have any right whatever to dictate what shall be done. The bloody page that records the infant history of Kansas, and the criminal adventure and death of John Brown, may be read with profit by the people both North and South and from it they may deduce the lesson, that the security and immortality of the nation, can only be preserved by the people of each section scrupulously regarding and protecting the rights of the people of every other section.

THE ABOLITION OF THE SLAVE TRADE. The agitation of the Slavery question, can be traced directly to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. As clearly as ever effect can be traced to cause, or punish the sin that occasioned it, so can the troubles which now afflict our beloved country be referred to that mournful and disastrous measure.

If found the country at peace had left it stained with blood and torn by civil dissensions. It reopened the slavery question in a form most offensive and under circumstances most aggravating to the anti-slavery sentiment of the North. It was a deliberate act, and one of a time-honored principle which had its origin in the most critical period of our political history, and had given peace to the nation.—History will pronounce judgment upon it as a wretched and wicked act, without a circumstance to palliate or excuse its perpetration; and as having its origin in the political necessities and reckless ambition of partisans. The object to be gained was the united favor of the South, and the means of obtaining it an extravagant and reckless devotion to her supposed interests. Both parties are likely to be cheated; the South will most probably fail to derive any benefit from the measure, but on the contrary is likely to be seriously damaged and the ambitious and desperate politician who devised it is likely to be foiled and defeated in the grand purpose of his life.

Allow me to read a brief extract from a recent letter addressed by Ex-President Fillmore, to a Union meeting in New York, which he had been invited to attend. The sentiments contained in it are so beautifully expressed and manifestly just as to command the hearty approbation of all intelligent minds:

After a severe struggle, which threatened the integrity of the Union, Congress finally settled the question of the admission of the Territories by the Missouri Compromise, and the people for a time seemed to acquiesce in that compromise, as a final settlement of this exciting question. But, alas! it was not long that the South, with mistaken ambition or the hope of promoting a party triumph should have compelled any one to raise this question again. But, in a common, but a noble, box of Slavery was again opened by Mr. Fremont, to be used as a lever to force Slavery into Kansas by a repeal of the Missouri Compromise; and the blood of our country was again stained by the foundation of a fraternal blood, may all be traced to this unfortunate act. What might have been the result, few acts have ever had so far-reaching a good, and so fruitful an evil. The contest has exasperated the public mind, North and South, and engendered feelings of distrust, and I may say, again, that I fear will take years to wear away.

"The lamentable tragedy at Harper's Ferry, partly attributable to this unfortunate controversy about Slavery in Kansas, and while the chief actor in this criminal invasion has exhibited some traits of character which challenge our admiration, yet his fanatical zeal, and his blind and deluged moral perceptions, and hurried him into an unlawful attack upon the lives of a peaceful and law-abiding community in a sister State, with the evident intention of raising a servile insurrection, which no one can contemplate without horror, and few believe will be long in being forgotten to the consequences of his acts, or so blinded by fanatical zeal, as not to believe that he fully justified the penalty of the law which he has violated. I cannot but hope that the fate of John Brown and his associates will deter all others from an unlawful attempt to force Slavery into Kansas by a repeal of a sister State. But this tragedy has not closed, and Virginia has vindicated the supremacy of her laws, and shown that she is quite competent to manage her own affairs, and to protect her own rights. And thanks to an overruling Providence, the question about Slavery in Kansas has also been settled in favor of the Union. It is a triumph, and having triumphed, let us have unanimity and generosity toward Southern brethren, show that the contest on her part was a mistake, and not of personal hatred or the low ambition of sectional triumph."

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF THE PRESENT HOSTILITY OF THE SOUTH TOWARDS THE NORTH? The fact is not to be disguised or evaded, that there is a deep feeling of hostility prevailing among the people of the South towards the great body of the people of the North, and the question may be asked, has the South just cause of complaint towards the North? She has but it is this complaint as against States and communities can always prefer against each other. There have been and always will be individual wrongs and injuries done by the one to the other, and it is the duty of each to redress them by their own and not by the rights and immunities of other States. If such injuries, because of war or just retaliation, then different communities could never be at peace, and no confederacy of States could be peaceful or permanent. I doubt not that men from the North have sometimes injured slaves to run away from their masters, though not perhaps once in a hundred, but a hundred times; such conduct is in violation of the law and good neighborhood, and is not to be palliated or excused. But if we were to open a book account with the North, of mutual outrages springing out of the slavery question, we shall find perhaps, if it did not come out about even, a balance standing against her. The question may be asked then, what is the cause of the hostility prevailing in the Southern mind towards the people of the North? There are many causes, but the chief one is to be found in the policy of the Democratic Party. To chain the State firmly to the car of party it has for years proclaimed that every other party has for North was fatally bent on the invasion and destruction of the constitutional rights of the South, and that the success of any other party would prove destructive to the institution of slavery.—To this end it has labored and lied in season and out of season with Stannic industry, to indoctrinate the South with the notion that the masses of the opposition of the North, now an overwhelming majority, are hostile to Southern institutions and to the Southern people, and are impatiently awaiting the hour when they may even by force subvert the institutions of the South. Witness the recent course of Northern and Southern Democratic papers and speeches representing the entire Republican party of the North as the aiders and abettors of the raid of John Brown at Harper's Ferry. A very considerable portion of the Southern people have come to believe this enormous lie, and have no means of knowing any better. Republican papers are not permitted to circulate in the South. Republican speakers are not permitted to speak there, while Democratic papers North and South learn with the speeches of Wendell Phillips and Wm. Lloyd Garrison, as the expositions of Northern sentiment and feeling. Even the opposition party of the South—what there is left of it—rarely contradicts the monstrous falsehood for fear of being charged

Speech of Oliver P. Morton.

are not permitted to publish, nor Republican speakers to speak, in many of the Southern States, proves nothing but the existence of the despotic power wielded by the minority class. As well might you establish the sectional and contracted character of the Christian religion by the persecution and expulsion of the primitive Christians from Rome, in the time of the Emperors. Besides that, it would be difficult to explain that principle that were considered outside of it, and upon which the nation acted for the first fifty years of its existence, have suddenly become local, selfish and sectional. THE CONSERVATION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY. It is a common charge made against the Republican party that it is radical, revolutionary and subversive in its character.—Examined by the light of history and reason, this charge is manifestly unjust; for the truth is the reverse of all this, and is that the Republican Party is the historical and conservative party of the nation. A Conservative is defined to be "one who aims to preserve from ruin, innovation, injury or radical change, one who wishes to maintain an institution or form of government in its present state."—In politics, Conservatism is an adherence to old opinions, doctrines and positions of policy or Constitutional law; it is opposed to innovations, novel doctrines and new fangled theories; it prefers the known to the unknown, the tried to the untried, and chooses to walk rather by the light of experience, than to pursue the chimeras of speculation. If it can be shown, then, that the Republican policy of opposition to the general diffusion of Slavery, the preservation of the Territories to Freedom, and the protection and elevation of Free Labor, is coeval with, and anterior to, the adoption of our Constitution—that it was the recognized policy of the Government for more than half a century, that it was the faith of Washington, and almost the religion of Jefferson, that it was woven into Judicial action and legislation, and was the common creed and property of all parties until within a few years past—then its claim to the character of Conservatism is fully established.

Measured by this standard, the "Democratic party will be found to be radical, revolutionary and subversive"—departing from its own creed, revolutionizing a long line of just decisions, and subverting the practice of the Government from the time of its creation, it has erected the new, dangerous and portentous dogma into an article of political faith, that the Constitution, by its own inherent power, establishes Slavery in all the Territories, and that there is no power in Congress, or in the people of the Territories—or, to use the language of Mr. Buchanan, in his late message, that there is no "human power," that can exclude it therefrom; that the many acts of Congress, beginning in 1789 and continued until 1848, prohibiting Slavery in the Territories, were unconstitutional and void; and that the many Judicial decisions of the various State and Federal Courts recognizing the power of Congress to provide such legislation—sprang from gross and ill-considered views of the Federal Constitution. And especially is this dogma dangerous and portentous, when we reflect that it is but the beginning of the revolution; that it drags after it, as an inevitable conclusion and consequence—the locomotive draws after it and is followed by the train—that other dogmas, that the Constitution also carries Slavery into all the States, and that there is no human power that can exclude it therefrom; and looks to the fulfillment of the prophecy made by Senator Toombs, that he would live to see the time when he could call the roll of his slaves behind the shadow of the monument on Banker's Hill.

We want no views of the Constitution.—Its construction was settled by the first Congress, and acquiesced in by all the Courts and every Department of the Government for more than half a century. That construction is in harmony with the plain reading of the instrument. It regards the Territories as the children of the Union, to be trained in the nurture and admonition of free institutions, so that when they have arrived at the age of majority they will be qualified to take their places in the family of States, and be admitted to all the rights and privileges of the Union. And these territories are to become our future partners in the Government, we have a deep interest in the formation of their characters and national habits.

INVASION OF VIRGINIA BY JOHN BROWN. Nations explore more than myself the unjustifiable and criminal invasion of the soil of Virginia, by John Brown and his associates. This act which thrilled the South with terror and shocked the moral sense of the nation, may yet in the hands of Providence prove a blessing to the Republic. It has already led parties both North and South more clearly and accurately to define their positions, and thus exonerate themselves from all complicity or blame in the affair. The Republican party has by every medium of expression disclaimed all sympathy with Brown or palliation for his deed, while the proofs which have been taken have failed to connect in the remotest degree any member of that party with this fatal enterprise in any stage of its progress. It has taught the South however, that if she would have peace and security at home, she must refrain from outrages abroad. It is not to be controverted that the stern fanaticism and the malignant passions of John Brown and his associates were cradled in that wicked and unnatural contest in Kansas which was set on foot for the introduction and establishment of slavery in that Territory. Hordes of Border Ruffians from Missouri and other slave States, marched into Kansas in battle array with the avowed purpose of subjugating the free State men and forcing upon them an institution which they abhorred. Having first provided themselves with arms, by the robbery of the U. S. Arsenal at Westport, Missouri; they entered the unhappy Territory with all the paraphernalia and appointment of regular organized war. The robbery of the Arsenal at Westport, was but the prototype of the seizure of the Arsenal at Harper's Ferry. By that mysterious chain of events which cannot be foreseen and can only be realized, the tide of invasion rolled back from the level plains of Kansas to the mountains of Virginia. But the strangest thing remains yet to be told, for that war of aggression set on foot by the slaveholders of Missouri for the propagation of slavery in Kansas has retailed upon Missouri, not in Kansas, in violation of blood, but in the development of an emancipation movement, possessing such remarkable vigor and making such remarkable progress as to threaten the speedy extinction of slavery in that State. It is therefore not impossible or even improbable that the attempt made by citizens of Missouri to fasten slavery upon Kansas by force of arms, may result in the legitimate and peaceful expulsion of slavery from Missouri. But in that contest we have no right to mingle. It is one that under the shield of State sovereignty pretains exclusively to the citizens of that State, and no people, party, or tribunal out of it, have any right whatever to dictate what shall be done. The bloody page that records the infant history of Kansas, and the criminal adventure and death of John Brown, may be read with profit by the people both North and South and from it they may deduce the lesson, that the security and immortality of the nation, can only be preserved by the people of each section scrupulously regarding and protecting the rights of the people of every other section.

THE ABOLITION OF THE SLAVE TRADE. The agitation of the Slavery question, can be traced directly to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. As clearly as ever effect can be traced to cause, or punish the sin that occasioned it, so can the troubles which now afflict our beloved country be referred to that mournful and disastrous measure.

If found the country at peace had left it stained with blood and torn by civil dissensions. It reopened the slavery question in a form most offensive and under circumstances most aggravating to the anti-slavery sentiment of the North. It was a deliberate act, and one of a time-honored principle which had its origin in the most critical period of our political history, and had given peace to the nation.—History will pronounce judgment upon it as a wretched and wicked act, without a circumstance to palliate or excuse its perpetration; and as having its origin in the political necessities and reckless ambition of partisans. The object to be gained was the united favor of the South, and the means of obtaining it an extravagant and reckless devotion to her supposed interests. Both parties are likely to be cheated; the South will most probably fail to derive any benefit from the measure, but on the contrary is likely to be seriously damaged and the ambitious and desperate politician who devised it is likely to be foiled and defeated in the grand purpose of his life.

Allow me to read a brief extract from a recent letter addressed by Ex-President Fillmore, to a Union meeting in New York, which he had been invited to attend. The sentiments contained in it are so beautifully expressed and manifestly just as to command the hearty approbation of all intelligent minds:

After a severe struggle, which threatened the integrity of the Union, Congress finally settled the question of the admission of the Territories by the Missouri Compromise, and the people for a time seemed to acquiesce in that compromise, as a final settlement of this exciting question. But, alas! it was not long that the South, with mistaken ambition or the hope of promoting a party triumph should have compelled any one to raise this question again. But, in a common, but a noble, box of Slavery was again opened by Mr. Fremont, to be used as a lever to force Slavery into Kansas by a repeal of the Missouri Compromise; and the blood of our country was again stained by the foundation of a fraternal blood, may all be traced to this unfortunate act. What might have been the result, few acts have ever had so far-reaching a good, and so fruitful an evil. The contest has exasperated the public mind, North and South, and engendered feelings of distrust, and I may say, again, that I fear will take years to wear away.

"The lamentable tragedy at Harper's Ferry, partly attributable to this unfortunate controversy about Slavery in Kansas, and while the chief actor in this criminal invasion has exhibited some traits of character which challenge our admiration, yet his fanatical zeal, and his blind and deluged moral perceptions, and hurried him into an unlawful attack upon the lives of a peaceful and law-abiding community in a sister State, with the evident intention of raising a servile insurrection, which no one can contemplate without horror, and few believe will be long in being forgotten to the consequences of his acts, or so blinded by fanatical zeal, as not to believe that he fully justified the penalty of the law which he has violated. I cannot but hope that the fate of John Brown and his associates will deter all others from an unlawful attempt to force Slavery into Kansas by a repeal of a sister State. But this tragedy has not closed, and Virginia has vindicated the supremacy of her laws, and shown that she is quite competent to manage her own affairs, and to protect her own rights. And thanks to an overruling Providence, the question about Slavery in Kansas has also been settled in favor of the Union. It is a triumph, and having triumphed, let us have unanimity and generosity toward Southern brethren, show that the contest on her part was a mistake, and not of personal hatred or the low ambition of sectional triumph."

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF THE PRESENT HOSTILITY OF THE SOUTH TOWARDS THE NORTH? The fact is not to be disguised or evaded, that there is a deep feeling of hostility prevailing among the people of the South towards the great body of the people of the North, and the question may be asked, has the South just cause of complaint towards the North? She has but it is this complaint as against States and communities can always prefer against each other. There have been and always will be individual wrongs and injuries done by the one to the other, and it is the duty of each to redress them by their own and not by the rights and immunities of other States. If such injuries, because of war or just retaliation, then different communities could never be at peace, and no confederacy of States could be peaceful or permanent. I doubt not that men from the North have sometimes injured slaves to run away from their masters, though not perhaps once in a hundred, but a hundred times; such conduct is in violation of