THE WABASH EXPRESS.

WHOLE NO. 955. TERRE-HAUTE, INDIANA, JANUARY 2, 1861. VOL. XX. NO. 4

Great Speech of Andy Johnson,

OF TENNESSEE,

Made in the Senate of the United States, Dec. 18th and 19th, 1860.

A UNION SPEECH FROM A SOUTHERN DEMOCRATIC SENATOR.

The most weighty speech made in the Congress of the United States during the present session, was that by Senator Andy Johnson, of Tennessee, on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week. This speech will have its place in the history of the county, and if Andy Johnson's political life should be cut short by it, as is possible, he will have made an honorable record, of which his children and his country will have reason to be proud. These are the times that test politicians, and Andy Johnson, of Tennessee, gives forth no uncertain sound, but the full toned ring of manhood, and patriotism. His speech is of prodigious length, and crowded with extracts from documents. Published complete, it would fill about three pages of our paper. He argued the "Right of Secession" at great length, and came to the conclusion that there was no such right, and that there was no power conferred to coerce a State, but that there was power to operate upon individuals in the States. He did not think it necessary, in order to preserve the Union, for Congress to have power to coerce a State—all that was necessary was for the Government to have the power to execute and carry out all the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution, whether they apply to the State or otherwise. He says:

This, I think, the Government clearly has the power to do; and so long as the Government executes all the laws in good faith, denying the right of a State constitutionally to secede, so long is the State in the Union, and subject to all the provisions of the Constitution and the laws passed in conformity with it. * *

It is not an invasion of a State for the Federal Government to execute its laws; to take care of its public property, and to enforce the collection of its revenue; but if, in the execution of the laws; if, in the enforcement of the Constitution, it meet with resistance, it is the duty of the Government, and it has the authority, to put down resistance, and effectually to execute the laws as contemplated by the Constitution of the country.

Mr. Johnson quotes largely and most pertinently from the fathers of the Republic on these points. From Jefferson thus:

Mr. Jefferson, in his letter to Col. Monroe, dated Paris, August 11, 1786, speaks thus:

"There never will be money in the Treasury until the Confederacy shows its teeth. The States must see the red; perhaps it must be felt by some one of them. I am persuaded all of them would rejoice to see every one obliged to furnish its contributions. It is not the difficulty of furnishing them which beggars the Treasury, but the fear that others will not furnish as much. Every rational citizen must wish to see an effective instrument of coercion and should fear to see it on any other element than the water."

Mr. Johnson quoted from Madison, Marshall, Jackson and Webster, and finally from Washington. He remarked after having fortified the steps of his argument with history:

"Hence in traveling along through the instrument, we find how the Government is created, how it is to be perpetuated, and how it may be enlarged in reference to the number of States constituting the Confederacy; but do we find any provision for winding it up except on that inherent principle that it may be wound up by the States—not by a State—but by the States that spoke it into existence, and by no other means."

THE WHISKY INSURRECTION—HOW WASHINGTON EXECUTED THE LAWS.

Mr. Johnson referred to the whisky insurrection in Pennsylvania. Mr Johnson says on this head:

The Constitution has been formed; it has been made perfect; or in other words means have been provided by which it can be made perfect. It was intended to be made perpetual in reference to the execution of the laws under it. What do we find? As early as 1775 Congress passed an excise law taxing distilleries throughout the country, and what were called the whisky boys of Pennsylvania, resisted the law.—The Government wanted means; taxed distilleries; the people of Pennsylvania resisted it. What's the difference between a portion of the people resisting a constitutional law and all the people of a State doing so? But because you can apply the term coercion in one case to a State, and in the other call it simply the execution of the law against individuals, you say there is a great restriction. We do not assume the power to coerce a State, but we assume that Congress has power to lay and collect taxes, and Congress has the right to enforce that law when obstructions and impairments are opposed to its enforcement. The people of Pennsylvania did object; they did resist and oppose the legal authorities of the country. Was that law enforced?—Was it called coercion at that day to enforce it? Suppose all the people of the State of Pennsylvania had resisted, would not the law have applied with just the same force, and would it not have been just as constitutional to execute it against all the people of the State as it was to execute it upon a part of their citizens?

Mr Johnson quoted from the annual message of Washington, in which he gave a history of the Whisky Rebellion. In his message Washington said:

"While there is cause to lament that occurrences of this nature should have disgraced the name or interrupted the tranquility of any part of our community, or should have diverted to a new application any portion of the public resources, there are not wanting real and substantial consolations for the misfortune. It has demonstrated that our prosperity rests on solid foundations, by furnishing an additional proof that my fellow citizens understand the true principles of Government and liberty; that they feel their *inseparable union*; that, notwithstanding all the devices which have been used to sway them from their interest and duty, they are now as ready to maintain the authority of the laws against licentious invasions as they were to defend their rights against usurpation."

Mr. Johnson said:

We see that in that instance President Washington thought there was power in this Government to execute its laws. We see, too, that George Washington considered the militia the army of the Constitution. We see, too, that George Washington refers to this Union as being inseparable. This is the way that the laws were executed by the Father of his Country, the man who sat as President of the Convention that made the Constitution. Here was resistance interposed—opposition to the execution of the laws; and George Washington, then President of the United States, went in person at the head of the militia; and it showed his sagacity, his correct comprehension of men, and the effect that an immediate movement of that kind would have upon them. He ordered fifteen thousand of his countrymen to the scene of action, and went there in person, and stayed there till he was satisfied the insubordination was quelled. That is the manner in which George Washington put down rebellion.—That is the manner in which he executed the laws.

Mr. Johnson referred to Gen. Jackson in nullification times, and remarked:

Then we see where General Washington stood, and where General Jackson stood.—Now how does the present case stand?—The time has come when men should speak out. Duties are mine; consequences are God's. I intend to discharge my duty, and I intend to avow my understanding of the Constitution and the laws of the country. Have we no authority or power to execute the laws in the State of S Carolina as well as in Vermont or Pennsylvania? I think we have. Now, sir, what is the Government to do in S Carolina? If S Carolina undertake to drive the Federal Courts out of that State, yet the Federal Government has the right to hold these courts there.—She may attempt to exclude the mails, yet the Federal Government has the right to establish post offices and post roads and to carry the mails there. She may resist the collection of revenue at Charleston, or any other point that the Government has provided for its collection; but the Government has the right to collect it and to enforce the law. She may undertake to take possession of the property belonging to the Government which was originally ceded by the State, but the Federal Government has the right to provide the means for retaining possession of that property. If she makes an advance either to dispossess the Government of that which it has purchased or to resist the execution of the revenue laws, or of our judicial system, or the carrying of the mails, or the exercise of any other power conferred on the Federal Government, she puts herself in the wrong, and it will be the duty of the Government to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

SOUTH CAROLINA'S DEED OF CESSION.

Mr. Johnson read the deed of cession by South Carolina to the General Government of the land on which the forts of Charleston are erected. Mr. Johnson said:

Here is a clear deed of cession. The Federal Government has complied with all the conditions, and has, in its own right, the hand on which these forts are constructed. The conditions of the cession have been complied with; and the Government has had possession from that period to the present time. There are its forts; there is its arsenals; there are its dock yards; there is the property of the Government; and now, under the Constitution, and under the laws in pursuance thereof, has South Carolina the authority and the right to expel the Federal Government from its own property that has been given to her by her own act, and of which it is in possession? By resisting execution of the laws; by attempting to dispossess the Federal Government, does she not put herself in the wrong?—Does she not violate the laws of the United States? Does she not violate the Constitution? Does she not put herself, within the meaning and purview of the Constitution, in the attitude of levying war against the United States? The Constitution defines and declares what is treason. Let us talk about things by their right names. I know that some hotspur or madcap may declare that these are not times for a government of law; that we are in a revolution. I know that Patrick Henry once said, "If this be treason make the most of it." If anything can be treason in the scope and purview of the Constitution, is not levying war upon the United States treason? Is not an attempt to take its property treason? Is not an attempt to expel its soldiers treason?—is not an attempt to resist the collection of the revenue, or to expel you mails, or to attempt to drive your courts from her borders, treason? Are not these powers clearly conferred in the Constitution on the Federal Government to be exercised? What is it, then, I ask in the name of the Constitution in the meaning of the term as she defined? It is treason, and nothing but treason; and if one State, upon its own volition, can go out of this Confederacy without regard to the effect it is to have upon the remaining parties to the compact, what is your Government worth? what will it come to? and in what will it end? It is no Government at all upon such a construction.

WHAT DARE WE PERMIT A STATE TO DO?

Suppose this doctrine to be true, Mr. President that a State can withdraw from his Confederacy and suppose South Carolina has seceded, and is now out of the Confederacy; in what an attitude does she place herself? There might be circumstances under which the States ratifying the compact might tolerate the secession of a State, she taking the consequences of the act. But there might be other circumstances under which the States could not allow one to secede. Why do I say so? Some suppose—and it is a well-founded supposition—that by the secession of a State, all the remaining States might be involved in disastrous consequences. They might be involved in war; and by the secession of one State, the existence of the remaining States might be involved. Then without regard to the consequences, dare the other States permit one to secede when it endangers and involves all the remaining States? The question arises in this connection, whether the States are a condition to tolerate or will tolerate the secession of South Carolina. That is a matter to be determined when it comes up. It is a question which must be left open to be determined by the surrounding circumstances, when the occasion arises.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

But conceding, for argument's sake, the doctrine of secession, and admitting that the State of South Carolina is now upon your coast, a foreign Power, absolved from all connection with the Federal Government, out of the Union: what then? There was a doctrine inculcated in 1823, by Mr. Monroe, that this Government, keeping in view the safety of the people and the existence of our institutions, would permit no European Power to plant any more colonies on this continent. Now, suppose that South Carolina is outside of the Confederacy and this Government is in possession of the fact that she is forming an alliance with a foreign Power—with France, with England, with Russia, with Austria, or with all of the principal Powers of Europe; that there is to be a great naval station established there; an immense rendezvous for their army, with a view of making advances upon the rest of these States: let me ask the Senate, let me ask the country, if they dare permit it? Under and in compliance with the great law of self preservation, we dare not let her do it; and if she were a sovereign Power to-day, outside of the Confederacy, and was forming an alliance that we deemed inimical to our institutions, and the existence of our Government, we should have a right to conquer and hold as a province.

* * * * * *

THE MEXICAN WAR.

After having expended $120,000,000 in the war, after having lost many of our bravest and most gallant men; after having paid $15,000,000 to Mexico for the territory, and admitted into the Union as a State, now that the people of California have got into the Confederacy and can stand alone, according to this modern doctrine, your Government was just made to let them in, and then to let them step out. Is not the conclusion illogical? Is it not absurd to say, now that California is in, she, on her own volition—without regard to the consideration paid for her; without regard to the policy which dictated her acquisition by the United States—can walk out and bid you defiance? Is it not an absurdity, if you take the reason and object of Government?

TEXAS.

But we need not stop here; let us go to Texas. Texas was engaged in a revolution with Mexico. She succeeded in the assertion and establishment of her independent Power outside of this Union. She applied for admission, and she was admitted into this family of States. After she was in, she was oppressed by the debts of her war which resulted in her separation from Mexico; she was harrassed by the Indians upon her border, and in 1850, by way of relief to Texas, what did we do? There was an extent of territory that lies north, if my memory serves me right, embracing what is now called the territory of New Mexico. Texas had it not in her power to protect the citizens that were there. It was a dead limb, paralyzed, lifeless. The Federal Government came along as a kind of physician, saying, "We will take this dead limb from your body and vitalize it, by giving protection to the people, and incorporating it into a territorial government, and in addition to that we will give you $10,000,000, and you may retain your own public lands," and the other States were taxed in common to pay the $10,000,000. Now, after all this is done, Texas, forsooth, upon her own volition, is to say, "I will walk out of this Union!" Were there no other parties to that compact? We are told the compact is reciprocal. Did we take in California, did we take in Texas, just to benefit them? No; but to add to this great family of States; and it is apparent, from the fact of their coming in, that the compact is reciprocal; and having entered into the compact, they have no right to withdraw without the consent of the remaining States.

LOUISIANA.

The Senator in like manner referred to the State of Louisana—the money the nation paid for her—the battles fought for her, and remarked:

And now after all this; after the money has been paid; after the free navigation of the river has been obtained—not for the benefit of Louisiana alone, but for her in common with all States—Louisiana says to the other States, "We will go out of this Confederacy; we do not care if you did acquire the free navigation of this river from France; we will go out if we think proper, and constitute an independent Power, and bid defiance to the other States." It is an absurdity; it is a contradiction; it is illogical; it is not deducible from the structure of the Government itself.

* * * * * *

So sensitive have been the people of my State upon the free navigation of that river, (Mississippi) that as far back as 1796, now sixty four years ago, in their bill of rights, before they passed under the jurisdiction of the United States, they declared:

"That an equal participation of the free navigation of the Mississippi is one of the inherent rights of the citizens of this State; it cannot, therefore, be conceded to any prince, potentate, Power, person, or persons whatever."

This shows the estimate that the people fixed on this stream sixty-four years ago; and now we are told, if Louisiana does go out, it is not her intention at this time to tax the people above. Who can tell what may be the intention of Louisiana hereafter? Are we willing to place the rights of our citizens, are we willing to place the travel and commerce of our citizens, at the discretion of any Power outside of this Government? I will not; I do not care whether the other Powers be Louisiana or the moon.

FLORIDA.

Mr. Johnson gave the history of the purchase of Florida, and the expenditures of the Government in driving out the Indians, and remarked:

We paid the sum of $25,000,000 to get the Seminoles out of the swamps, so that the Territory could be inhabited by white men. We paid for it, we took possession of it; and I remember, when I was in the other House, and Florida was knocking at the door for admission, how extremely anxious her then able Delegate was to be admitted. He now sits before me, [Mr. Yulee] I remember how important he thought it was then to come under the protecting wing of the United States as one of the stars of our Confederacy. But now, the Territory is paid for, England is driven out, $25,000,000 have been expended; and they want no longer the protection of this Government, but will go out without consulting the other States, without reference to the effect upon the remaining parties to the contract. Where will she go? Will she attach herself to Spain again? Will she pass back under the jurisdiction of the Seminoles? After having been nurtured and protected and fostered by all these States, now, without regard to them, is she to be allowed, at her own volition, to withdraw from the Union? I say she has no constitutional right to do it; and when she does it, it is an act of aggression. If she succeeds, it will only be a successful revolution. If she does not succeed she must take the penalties and terrors of the law.

WHAT IS KANSAS—A STATE OR TERRITORY?

But, sir; there is another question that suggests itself in this conection. Kansas, during the last Congress, applied for admission into this Union. She assumed to be a State, and the difficulty in the way was a provision in her Constitution, and the manner of its adoption. We did not let Kansas in. We did not question her being a State; but on account of the manner of forming her Constitution and its provisions, we kept Kansas out. What is Kansas now? Is she a State, or is she a Territory? Does she revert back to her territorial condition of populage? Or, having been a State, and having applied for admission and been refused, is she standing out a State? You hold her as a Territory; you hold her as a province.—You prescribe the mode of electing the members of her Legislature, and pay them out of your own Treasury. Yes, she is a province controlled by Federal authority, and her laws are made in conformity with the acts of Congress. Is she not a Territory? I think she is.

THE OSTEND MANIFESTO.

Mr. Johnson here quoted from the Ostend manifesto. That manifesto would justify taking Cuba, "on the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor, if there were no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own home."

Mr Johnson called this "pretty sound doctrine," and added:

We find this document, signed by our three ministers, and approved by the American people, the doctrine laid down clearly that if the United States believed that Cuba was to be transferred by Spain to England or to France, or to some other Power inimical to the United States the safety of the American people, the safety of our institutions, the existence of the Government, being imperiled, we should have a right, without regard to money or blood, to acquire it.

Where does this carry us? We find that this doctrine was not only laid down but practiced, in the case of Florida.—Suppose Louisiana was now out of the Confederacy, holding the key to the Gulf, the outlet to the commerce of the great West, under the doctrine laid down by these ministers, and practiced by the Congress of the United States; would not this Government have the right, in obedience to the great principle of self-preservation, and for the safety of our institutions, to seize it and pass it under the jurisdiction of the United States, and hold it as a province subject to the laws of the United States? I say it would. The same principle applied to Florida. The same principle would apply to South Carolina. I regret that she occupies the position that she has assumed, but I am arguing a principle, and do not refer to her out of any disrespect. If South Carolina were outside of the Confederacy, an independent Power, having no connection with the U. States, and our institutions were likely to be endangered, and the existence of the Government imperiled by her remaining a separate and independent Power, or by her forming associations and alliances with some foreign Power that would injure our free institutions, I say we should have a right, on the principle laid down by Mr. Mason, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Soule, and upon the principle practiced by the Congress of the United States in the case of Florida, to seize her, pass her under the jurisdictionof the United States, and hold her as a province.

Mr. President, I have spoken of the possibility of a State standing in the position of South Carolina making alliances with a foreign Power. What do we see now?—Ex-Governor Manning, of that State, in a speech made not long since at Columbia, made these declarations:

"Cotton is king, and would enable us in peace to rule the nations of the world, or successfully to encounter them in war.—The millions in France and England engaged in its manufacture, are an effectual guarantee of the friendship of those nations. If necessary, their armies would stand to guard its uninterrupted and peaceful cultivation, and their men-of-war would line our coasts to guard it in its transit from our ports."

Ah! are we prepared, in the face of doctrines like these, to permit a State that has been a member of our Confederacy to go out, and erect herself into an independent Power, when she points to the time, when she will become a dependent of Great Britain, or when she will want the protection of France? What is the doctrine of Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Mason and Soule? If Cuba is to pass into the hands of an unfriendly Power; or any Power inimical to the United States, we have a right to seize and to hold her. What is the difference between the two cases?

If South Carolina is outside of the Confederacy as an independent Power, disconnected from this Government, and we find her forming alliances to protect her, I ask what becomes of the great principle, the law of self preservation?

THE PROPOSED CORRECTION OF BORDER SLAVE STATES BY THE GULF STATES.

Mr. Johnson read extracts from the message of Governors and the fire-eating Congressmen from the Gulf States showing their determination to drag the Border States into revolution. He said:

Now, our sister, without consulting her sisters, without caring for their interest or their consent, says that she will move forward; that she will destroy the Government under which we have lived, and that hereafter, when she forms a Government or a Constitution, unless the border States come in, she will pass laws prohibiting the importation of slaves into her State from those States, and obstruct the slave trade among the States, and throw the institution back upon the border States, so that they will be compelled to emancipate their slaves upon the principle laid down by the Abolition party. That is the rod held over us!

I tell our sisters in the South that so far as Tennessee is concerned, she will not be dragged into a southern or any other confederacy until she has time to consider; and then she will go when she believes it to be her interest, and not before. I tell our northern friends, who are resisting the execution of the laws made in conformity with the Constitution, that we will not be driven on the other hand into their confederacy, and we will not go into it unless it suits us, and they give us such guarantees as we deem right and proper. We say to you of the South, we are not to be frightened and coerced. Oh, when one talks about coercing a State, how madening and insulting to the State; but when you want to bring the other States to terms, how easy to point out a means by which to coerce them! But, sir, we do not intend to be coerced.

We are told that certain States will go out and tear this accursed Constitution into fragments, and drag the pillars of this mighty edifice down upon us, and involve us all in one common ruin. Will the border States submit to such a threat? No. If they do not come into the movement, the pillars of this stupendous fabric of human freedom and greatness and goodness are to be pulled down, and all will be involved in one common ruin. Such is the threatening language used. "You shall come into our confederacy, or we will coerce you to the emancipation of your slaves."—That is the language which is held toward us.

DISUNION IS ABOLITION.

There are many ideas afloat about this threatened dissolution, and it is time to speak out. The question arises in reference to the protection and preservation of this institution of slavery, whether dissolution is a remedy or will give to it protection. I avow here, to-day, that if I were an Abolitionist, and wanted to accomplish the overthrow and abolition of the institution of slavery in the Southern States, the first step that I would take would be to break the bonds of this Union, and dissolve this Government. I believe the continuance of slavery depends upon the preservation of this Union, and a compliance with all the guarantees of the Constitution. I believe an interference with it will break up the Union; and I believe a dissolution of the Union will in the end, though it may be some time to come, overthrow the institutions of slavery. Hence we find so many in the North who desire the dissolution of these States as the most certain and direct and effectual means of overthrowing the institution of slavery.

FOR WHAT IS DISSOLUTION A REMEDY?

What protection would it be to us to dissolve this Union? What protection would it be to us to convert this nation into two hostile Powers, the one warring with the other? Whose property is at stake? Whose interest is endangered? Is it not the property of the border States? Suppose Canada were moved down upon our border, and the two separated sections, then different nations, were hostile: what would the institution of slavery be worth on the border? Every man who has common sense will see that the institution would take up its march and retreat as certainly and as unerringly as general laws can operate. Yes, it would commence to retreat the moment this Government was converted into hostile Powers, and you make the line between the slaveholding and non slaveholding States the line of division.

Then, what remedy do we get for the institution of slavery? Must we keep up a standing army? Must we keep forts bristling with arms along the whole border? This is a question to be considered, one that involves the future; and no step should be taken without reflection.—Before this Union is dissolved and broken up, we in Tennessee, as one of the slave States, want to be consulted; we want to know what protection we are to have; whether we are simply to be made outposts and guards to protect the property of others, at the same time that we sacrifice and lose our own. We want to understand this question.

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNION.

Mr. Johnson spoke eloquently on this subject, concluding on this head by saying:

Here, too, in the center of the Republic, is the seat of Government, which was founded by Washington, and bears his immortal name. Who dare appropriate it exclusively? It is within the borders of the States I have enumerated, in whose limits are found the graves of Washington, of Jackson, of Polk, of Clay. From them is it supposed that we will be torn away? No sir; we will cherish these endearing associations with the hope, if this Republic shall be broken, that we may speak words of peace and reconciliation to a distracted, a divided, I may add, a maddened people. Angry waves may be lashed into fury on the one hand; on the other blustering winds may rage; but we stand immovable upon our basis, as on our native mountains—presenting their craggy brows, their unexplored caverns, their summits "rock ribbed and as ancient as the sun"—we stand speaking peace, association, and concert, to a distracted Republic

WHAT KIND OF A GOVERNMENT WILL THE SOUTH HAVE?

Mr. Johnson proceeded in this place to inquire what sort of a government the South would have if the Union were dissolved. He read extracts from Georgia and South Carolina papers showing that the people there were actually thinking of the establishment of a monarchy. Commenting on these extracts he said:

Is it not better to

"Bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of."

We see, by these indications, that it is contemplated to establish a monarchy.—We see it announced that this government has been a failure from the beginning.—How has it been a failure? Now, in the midst of a revolution, while the people are confused, while chaos reigns, it is supposed by some that we can be induced to return to a constitutional or absolute monarchy. Who can tell that we may not have some Louis Napoleon among us, who may be ready to make a *coup d'etat*, and enthrone himself upon the rights and upon the liberties of the people? Who can tell what kind of government may grow up?

RED HOT MADNESS.

Speaking for the State of Tennessee, Mr Johnson said:

Sir, I will stand by the Constitution of the country as it is, and by all its guarantees. I am not for breaking up this great Confederacy. I am for holding on to it as it is, with the mode and manner pointed out in the instrument for its own amendment. It was good enough for Washington, for Adams, for Jefferson, and for Jackson. It is good enough for us. I intend to stand by it, and to insist upon a compliance with all its guarantees, North and South.

We intend to act in the Union, and under the Constitution, and not out of it.—We do not intend that you shall drive us out of this house, that was reared by the hands of our fathers. It is our house. It is the constitutional house. We have a right here, and because you come forward and violate the ordinances of this house, I do not intend to go out; and if you persist in the violation of the ordinances of the house, we intend to eject you from the building, and retain the possession ourselves. We want, if we can, to stay the heated, and I am compelled to say, according to my judgment, the rash and precipitate action of some of our Southern friends that indicates red-hot madness

WHY GO OUT OF THE UNION? WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH SOUTH CAROLINA?

Why should we go out of the Union?—Have we anything to fear? What are we alarmed about? We say that you of the North have violated the Constitution, that you have trampled under foot its guarantees; but intend to go to you in a proper way, and ask you to redress the wrong, and comply with the Constitution. We believe the time will come when you will do it, and we do not intend to break up the government until the fact is ascertained that you will not do it. Where is the grievance, where is the complaint that presses on our sister South Carolina now? Is it that she wants to carry slavery into the Territories; that she wants protection there? How long has it been since, upon this very floor, her own Senators voted that it was not necessary to make a statute new for the protection of slavery in the Territories? No longer ago than the last session.

* * *

I was going on to say that the want of protection to slavery in the Territories connot be considered a grievance now. That is not the reason she is going out, and going to break up the Confederacy. What is it, then? Is there any issue between South Carolina and the Federal Government?—Has the Federal Government failed to comply with, and to carry out, the obligation it owes to South Carolina? In what has the Federal Government failed? In what has it neglected the interests of South Carolina? What law has it undertaken to enforce upon South Carolina that is unconstitutional and oppressive?

If there were grievances, Mr. Johnson said they should be specially stated.

THE POSITION OF TENNESSEE AND SOUTH CAROLINA COMPARED

Tennessee will be found standing as firm and unyielding in her demands for those guarentees in the way a State should stand, as any other state in this Confederacy. She is not quite so belligerent now. She is not making quite so much noise. She is not as blustering as Sempronius was in the council in Addison's play of Cato, who declared that "his voice was still for war." There was another character there, Lucius, who was called up on to know what his opinions were, and when he was called upon, he replied that he must confess his thoughts were turned on peace; but when the extremity came, Lucius, who was deliberative, who was calm, and whose thoughts were upon peace, was found true to the interests of his country. *He proved himself to be a man and a soldier; while the other was a traitor and a coward.*

LINCOLN'S ELECTION.

Mr. Johnson proceeds to show that Lincoln's election was no adequate cause for secession. If the South Carolina Senators would come back and stay, there would be a majority of six in the Senate against Lincoln on the 4th of March next.

Am I to be so great a coward as to retreat from duty? I will stand here and meet the encroachments upon the institution of my country at the threshold; and as a man, as one that loves my country and my constituents. I will stand here and resist all encroachments and advances. Here is the place to stand. Shall I desert the citadel, and let the enemy come in and take possession? No. Can Mr. Lincoln send a foreign minister, or even consul, abroad, unless he receives the sanction of the Senate? Can he appoint a postmaster whose salary is over a thousand dollars a year, without the consent of the Senate? Shall we desert our posts, shrink from our responsibilities, and permit Lincoln to come with his cohorts, as we consider them, from the North, to carry off everything? Are we so cowardly that now that we are defeated, not conquered, we shall do this? Yes, we are defeated according to the forms of law and the Constitution: but the real victory is ours—the moral force is with us. Are we going to desert that noble and that patriotic band who stood by us at the North? who have stood by us upon the Constitution? They stood by us and fought the battle upon principle; and now that we have been defeated, not conquered, are we to turn our back upon them and leave them to their fate? I, for one, will not. I intend to stand by them. How many votes did we get in the north? We got more votes in the north against Lincoln than the entire southern States cast. Are they not able and faithful allies? They are; and now, on account of this temporary defeat, are we to turn our backs upon them and leave them to their fate, as they have fallen for us in former controversies?

We find, when all the north is summed up, that Mr. Lincoln's majority there is only about two hundred thousand on the popular vote; and when that is added to the other vote cast throughout the Union, he stands today in a minority of nearly a million votes. What, then, is necessary to be done? To stand to our posts like men and not upon principle; stand for our country; and in four years from this day, Lincoln and his administration will be turned out, and the worst defeated and broken down party that ever came into power. It is an inevitable result from the combination of elements that now exist. What cause then is there to break up the Union? What reason is there for deserting our posts and destroying this greatest and best Government that was ever spoken into existence?

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT IN THE SOUTH.

Are we likely when we get to ourselves, north and South, to sink into brotherly love? Are we likely to be so harmonious in that condition, as some suppose? What did we find here the other day among our brother Senators, one of whom refered to a Southern Governor? I allude to itonly to show the feeling that exists even among ourselves. I am sometimes impressed with the force of Mr. Jefferson's remark, that we may as well keep the north to quarrel with, for if we have no north to quarrel with, we shall quarrel among ourselves. We are a sort of quarrelsome, pugnacious people, and if we cannot get a quarrel from one quarter we shall have it from another; and I would rather quarrel a little now with the north than be quarreling with ourselves. Because the Governor of a Southern State was refusing to convene the Legislature to hasten this movement that was going on throughout the South; and because he objected to that course of conduct, what did a Senator say here in the American Senate? The question was asked if there was not some Texan Brutus that would rise up and rid the country of the hoary-headed traitor! This is the language that a Senator used. This is the way we begin to speak of Southern Governors. Yes, to remove an obstacle in our way, we must have a modern Brutus who will go to the capital of a State and assassinate a Governor to accelerate the movement going on. If we are so unscrupulous in reference to ourselves, and in reference to the means we are willing to employ to consummate this dissolution, then it does not look very much like harmony omong ourselves after we get out of it.

THE SPIRIT OF CONCESSION FOR THE SAKE OF THE UNION.

I believe that to a certain extent, dissolution is going to take place. I say to the north, you ought to come up in the spirit which should characterize and control the north on this question; and you ought to give those indications in good faith that will approach what the South demands. It will be no sacrifice on your part. It is no suppliancy on ours, but simply a demand of right. What concession is there in doing right? Then, come forward. We have it in our power—yes, this Congress here to-day has it in its power to save this Union, even after South Carolina has gone out.—Will they not do it? You can do it.—Who is willing to take the dreadful alternative without making an honorable effort to save this Government? This Congress has it in its power today to arrest this thing, at least for a season, until there is time to consider about it, until we can act discreetly and prudently, and I believe arrest it altogether.

* * I, for one, will stand here until the high behest of my constituents demands me to desert my post; and instead of laying hold of the columns of this fabric and pulling it down, though I may not be much of a prop, I will stand with my shoulder supporting the edifice as long as human effort can do it.

This speech, of course, was a very uncomfortable one for the secessionists, and they of course indicated by their manner toward the Tennessee Senator that they considered him "an Abolitionist." They several times interrupted him in an insolent way.—Wigfall and Jeff Davis were guilty of gross discourtesy. We have omited all the record of this interruption, that we might make room for the essential parts of the speech. When Mr. Johnson concluded old Joe Lane made a blathering speech, in which he betrayed his treasonable spirit, and a display of about equal parts of ignorance and impertinence.

A PATRIOT.—On Tuesday evening last Hon. Daniel W. Voorhees, United States District Attorney for the District of Indiana, and member of Congress elect for the 7th District of the same State, was returning from a visit in Kentucky, in company with some other prominent Democrats, and as the ferry boat in which he was crossing from Louisville to Jeffersonville approached the Indiana shore, he gave vent to the patriotic ardor which filled his heart in this ejaculation: "There! we are coming into that G—d d—d abolition State. I wish it would sink to the devil." We have this information from eye and ear witnesses, and though we may not have caught the exact language, we certainly have preserved the spirit of his patriotic exclamation, and deem it due to his position to record it. Such an exhibition of ardent affection for a State which has honored him above his merits, certainly deserves to be distributed for general admiration.—*Ind. Journal.*

We had hoped, that since Voorhees had been elected by an honorable and patriotic constituency, he would cease his profanity and blackguardism.

DOES THIS LOOK LIKE HARD TIMES.—The New York Tribune, of the 21st, says a golden shower has begun to pour in upon us. Last Saturday California sent us a million; on Sunday the Europa brought us $540,000 from England. The Ætna came on Tuesday with $330,000; on Wednesday, the Atlantic brought 850,000, and yesterday came the Persia, with $3,100,000, to which the Quaker City, from Havana, added $107,718, and the Borussia, from Hamburg, $17,500, making the receipts of the 20th $3,225,218, or $5,945,218 since Saturday last. Comment may be dispensed with.

Santa Claus on His Rounds,

Luxurious Presents.

JOYOUS, JOLLY JUVENILES.

A Gay Time Generally.

Christmas day is an irrepressible institution. Its observance is confined to no country, no clime no creed. Where ever the civilizing and enlightening influence of Christianity have penetrated, it has become an anniversary observed by every class and condition of mankind. It is not only National in the New World, but is observed all over the world where the Gospel of the despised Nazarene is preached.

The observance of this natal day of the Saviour this city was very general and very hearty. We have endeavored to acquaint ourselves with the leading features of the celebration, and shall note them briefly.

The first reminder of this Christmas holiday was the reception of a neatly written note inviting us to attend an exhibition, on Christmas Eve, by the pupils attending

MISS SUSIE J. MCLEOD'S SCHOOL,

corner of 6th and Walnut streets.

Being detained by business we did not reach the School House in time to witness the first part of the exercises, but were told they were of the same general character as that which followed.

The first performance that we witnessed was the singing of the song "Beautiful Star" by a bright constellation of seven little stars, beautiful as the pleiades, and whose voices were sweet as that of the Morning Stars which sang together at the dawn of creation.

To this as to all other songs and ballads there was a piano accompaniment by Mrs. Crosby, who plays with a degree of grace and excellence seldom equalled by pianoists.

A composition written and read by a little Miss Watson was an admirable performance, and elicited the most irrepressible applause.

These were followed by declamations, compositions, dialogues and other songs, all creditable and many of them very excellent. The Temperance glee, "Sparkling and bright in its liquid light," by the whole school was executed in a manner we have seldom heard surpassed.

A part of the programme had been arranged secretly by the teacher and her friends for a surprise to the children, and a white curtain drawn across one corner of the room and over which was written "Merry Christmas" began at length to attract, greatly, the attention of the juveniles.

In the meanwhile the pupils had prepared a surprise for their teacher.

A mysterious package was suddenly laid on the stand upon the rostrum which a little Miss proceeded to unfold, after a prettily spoken and well worded address, and presented to the teacher, as a token of the love and esteem of her pupils. It was a copy of Webster's Dictionary, (unabridged)—a most fitting gift.

The surprise of Miss McLeod was complete and overpowering—she could only reply—Mary you have taken the advantage of me—you have had time to prepare a speech—I haven't"—but her looks, more eloquent than words, spoke the gratitude and joy of her heart.

Merry Christmas was then played and sung by the school, during which the excitement grew more intense among the children, and all eyes were more eagerly fixed upon the screen across the corner which now commenced to be illuminated, and as the song progressed the gentle tintinnabalum of tiny sleigh bells was heard as if in the far distance, drawing nearer and nearer, until at length when the excitement of the children was wrought to the utmost tention, a most excellent representative of venerable Santa Clause, pounced in at the window, enveloped with a heavy fur coat, long flowing white hair and beard and a fur cap ornamented with bells, and at the same time the veil that had so long attracted the curiosity of the children was drawn aside, revealing a perfect elysium of toys suspended from the branches of a magnificent Christmas tree—the whole lighted up by innumerable tapers, attached to its branches.

Talk of the roar of the ocean, the noise of the whirlwind! The seven thunders that terrified the Evangelist on the Isle of Patmos was as the whisperings of the summer breeze.—compared with the shout of joy that burst forth from this crowd of happy, joyous youths.

Had the tree been coral and every toy a diamond it could not have added to the enthusiasm of the hour,—the scene was indescribable. Santa Claus proceeded at once to call out the names of the scholars, giving to each a handful of toys, at the same time talking merrily to each and all as only kriss kinkle can talk—and so till a late hour was the joy prolonged, until each pupil had received a share.

The attendance was very large, the house being crowded with spectators, all highly gratified with the entertainment which was in the highest degree creditable to the teacher and pupils.

Another delightful reunion and festival of joy was at the same time being held at

THE ASBURY CHAPEL

where three beautiful Christmas trees gorgeously decorated with toys, and brilliantly illuminated, occupied the pulpit preaching to the Sunday School Scholars, if less orthodoxly, certainly no less acceptably, than would have been a discourse from the pastor himself.

The music on the occasion was such as only the Sabbath School of Asbury Chapel can make. We regretted we could not witness the whole of the exercises.

Somewhat varied were the celebrations of the evening at other places.

At Carr's Hall a brilliant party attended a ball given for the benefit of the

GEAMAN AND ENGLISH SCHOOL FUND,

The entertainment was a perfect success, both is the brilliancy of the assemblage and the exuberance of the enjoyment.

The assemblage was composed principally of our german fellow citizens, than whom no race of people know better how to enjoy a happy hour. Here more young hearts were made joyous by the introduction of a richly laden Christmas tree.

Another delightful, quiet "hop" was held at the

CENTRAL ENGINE HOUSE,

where fair women and brave men, tripped the "light fantastic toe" to the enchanting measures of sweet music from "dusky eve to frosty morn." It was a lively, gay, and happy party.

The beauty and the chivalry of that portion of our city which lieth north of the Rhine were represented at the Hall of the

NORTHERN LIBERTY ENGINE HOUSE,

where

"Eyes looked love to eyes, which spake [again
And all went merry as a marriage bell."

From the vast amount of sales made at the various toy shops throughout the city on Monday we infer that thousands of young hearts were made happy on CHRISTMAS MORN as the gifts of kriso kinkle rolled from well filled stockings.

The amount of powder burned and of fire crackers exploded was far less than on former Christmas days, and from the quiet good order that generally prevailed through out the day we infer that a less number of people were shot in the neck—than is usual on this happifying occasion.

At John Wilkinson's, Finch & Doughty's Ralph Sprague's and perhaps at a few other Saloons—a pleasant glass of "egg nog" was served to their friends, made to delight but not inebriate.

The day was very pleasantly and very appropriately closed by the

TEMPLAR'S FESTIVAL,

at National Hall, where the attendance was large, the music both vocal and instrumental was excellent and enrapturing, the oysters—the turkey and other refreshments delicious, the ladies beautiful and fascinating, the gentlemen attentive and gallant, and where all hearts seemed happy.

Taken all together, we think this Christmas has been, in this city, to all our people, indeed

A MERRY CHRISTMAS.

☞ The Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati Commercial says, "on the authority of two gentlemen—one a distinguished minister of the Gospel, and the other a prominent officer of the Federal Government in this city, both of whom held a conversation with the President two or three days ago—we are enabled