Ashland Union.

J. J. & F. S. JACOBS, PROPRIETORS.] "THE UNION—IT MUST AND SHALL BE PRESERVED." [OFFICE OVER T. C. BUSHNELL'S STORE

VOL. XVII. ASHLAND, ASHLAND COUNTY OHIO, WEDNESDAY MORNING FEBRUARY 4, 36

Business Directory.

Judicial Officers.

GEO. W. GEDDES, Common Pleas Judge.
JOHN D. JONES, Probate Judge.
H. S. SEE, Clerk Com. Pleas and Dist. Courts.
G. W. HILL, Prosecuting Attorney.

County Officers

JOHNSON OLDROYD, Auditor.
R. N. MERSHEY, Treasurer.
JAMES McCOOL, Sheriff.
GEORGE JOHNSTON, Recorder.
JOHN KEENE, Surveyor.
GEO. W. CROSIER, Coroner.
JOHN BERRY, JACOB EMERICK, ROBERT COWAN, } Commissioners.
JOS. STRICKLAND, D. K. HULL, J. S. MARTIN, } Infirmary Directors.

School Examiners.

REV. JOHN ROBINSON, T. Y. McCRAY, R. M. CAMPBELL, } Ashland.

BANKERS.

HULBERT LUTHER, JACOB CRALL, JAMES PURDY, | W. S. GRANGER, G. H. TOPPING, J. O. JENNINGS.
Under the name and style of
LUTHER, CRALL & CO.
DO EXCLUSIVELY A BANKING BUSINESS—Buy and sell Eastern Exchange and coin—Discount on individual security. 15tf

HOTELS.

AMERICAN HOUSE,
FORMERLY McNULTY'S, by ARCHIBALD FINLEY, Ashland, Ohio. The House is thoroughly refitted, and its proprietor is prepared to accommodate all his old friends and as many new ones as may be pleased to give him a call. 1y48

WITHER HOUSE,
MAIN STREET, between third and fourth, Mansfield, Ohio.
D. M. MILLER, *Proprietor*
Mansfield, March 2, 1859. 39tf

McNULTY HOUSE.
ASHLAND, O., by W. McNulty. Rooms airy and commodious, and table constantly supplied with all the luxuries of the season, and reasonable bills. Patronage solicited. Feb. 4, 185 —34tf.

MILLER HOUSE,
OPPOSITE the McNulty House, Ashland, Ohio, M. Miller, Proprietor. Good accommodations and reasonable bills. Patronage solicited.
Feb. 4, 1857.—34tf

LAWYERS.

W. T. JOHNSTON,
ATTORNEY at Law, office over Hower's store, Main Street, Ashland, O., will attend promptly to all business entrusted to his care in Ashland, Wayne and Knox counties

D. L. N & CURTIN.
HAVE formed a partnership in the practice of Law and will attend to business in their profession in Ashland and adjoining counties. Office in the building heretofore occupied by W. Osborn, on Church street. March 2, 1859.—39tf

T. J. KENNY
ATTORNEY at Law, has opened an Office on the corner of Main and Church streets, where he will be happy to see his old friends and such others as may wish to engage his professional services.
April 20, 1860. 15tf

J. H. McCOMBS,
ATTORNEY and Counsellor at Law, Ashland Ohio. Office in the Bank building over the Hardware Store. 15tf

JACOBS & McSWEENEY,
ATTORNEYS at Law, office immediately opposite the Bank, on Main street, Ashland, Ohio.

PHYSICIANS.

GEO. W. HILL, M. D.,
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON, Ashland, Ohio. Particular attention will be paid to the treatment of the following special diseases: DYSPEPSIA, diseases of the LIVER, the KIDNEYS, SCROFULA and ESPECIAL CANCER. Office over J. R. Squire's Store. v16n36

Dr. JOSEPH SHEETS,
OFFERS HIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES to the people of Ashland and the vicinity. Office on corner of Main and Church Streets.
Ashland, July 24, 1861.—v16n8

J. P. COWAN, M. D.
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON, Ashland, Ashland Co. Ohio. Office over the Post-Office, opposite the Town Hall. July 24, 1861

Miscellaneous.

DON'T FORGET TO
BUY YOUR BOOTS & SHOES
OF
J. Wasson, Ashland, Ohio.

W. H. HANCOCK,
MERCHANT TAILOR and dealer in Furnishing Goods, 45 Superior Street, under the Western House, Cleveland: Ohio. v15tf

WILLIAM HALSTON,
JEWELER and Silver smith, a few doors West of the Post Office, Ashland, Ohio. Gold and Steel Pens, and a choice variety of Jewelry, kept constantly on hand. Highest price paid for old gold and silver. Repairing done to order, on reasonable terms—satisfactorily warranted. v15tf

DENTIST
H. J. CRESSINGER, Resident Dentist.
ASHLAND, O.
TEETH inserted on Gold, Silver, Amber, or Vulcanite.
ALL OPERATIONS WARRANTED!
H. J. CRESSINGER.
Ashland, May 27.—v16n22tf

C. A. HUMES,
BOOT and SHOE maker, Main street, Ashland. Shop a few doors West of the Miller House.
Ashland, January 28, 1863.

New Livery Stable!
LEVI McCAULEY & CO.,
would respectfully announce to the public that they have started a New LIVERY STABLE in the town of ASHLAND, where they can always be found ready to accommodate customers with fast horses and first class carriages at the lowest rates.

JOB PRINTING
Of every description, neatly and expeditiously executed at this office.
Ashland, Jan. 28. 1863.

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT LAIRD VALLANDIGHAM, OF OHIO.

In the House of Representatives, January 14, 1863.

[CONTINUED FROM LAST WEEK.]

scale the most costly and gigantic in its proportions, of creating love by force, and developing fraternal affection by war; and history will record, too, on the same page, the utter, disastrous, and most bloody failure of the experiment.

But to return: the country was at war; and I belonged to that school of politics which teaches that when we are at war, the Government—I do not mean the Executive alone, but the Government—is entitled to demand and have, without resistance, such number of men, and such amount of money and supplies generally, as may be necessary for the war, until an appeal can be had to the people. Before that tribunal alone, in the first instance, must be the question of the continuance of the war be tried. This was Mr. Calhoun's opinion, and he laid it down very broadly and strongly in a speech on the loan bill, in 1841. Speaking of supplies, he said:

"I hold that there is a distinction in this respect between a state of peace and war. In the latter, the right of withholding supplies ought ever to be held subordinate to the energetic and successful prosecution of the war. I go further, and regard the withholding supplies, *with a view of forcing the country into a dishonorable peace*, as not only to be what has been called, moral treason, but very little short of actual treason itself."

Upon this principle, sir, he acted afterwards in the Mexican war. Speaking of that war in 1847, he said:

"Every Senator knows that I was opposed to the war; but none knows but myself the depth of that opposition. With my conception of its character and consequences, it was impossible for me to vote for it."

And again, in 1848:

"But, after the war was declared, by authority of the Government *acquiesced in what I could not prevent, and which it was impossible for me to arrest*; and I felt it to be my duty to limit my efforts to *give such direction to the war* as would, as far as possible, *prevent the evils and dangers with which it threatened the country and its institutions.*"

Sir, I adopt all this as my own position and my defense; though, perhaps, in a civil war, I might fairly go further in opposition. I could not, with my convictions, vote men and money for this war, and I would not, as a Representative, vote against them. I meant that, without opposition, the President might take all the men and all the money he should demand, and then to hold him to a strict accountability before the people for the results. Not believing the soldiers responsible for the war, or its purposes, or its consequences, I have never withheld my vote where their separate interests were concerned. But I have denounced from the begining the usurpations and the infractions, one and all, of law and Constitution, by the President and those under him; their repeated and persistent arbitrary arrest the suspension of *habeas corpus*, the violation of freedom of the mails, of the private house of the press and of speech, and all the other multiplied wrongs and outrages upon public liberty and private right, which have made this country one of the worst despotisms on earth for the past twenty months; and I will continue to rebuke and denounce them to the end; and the people, thank God, have at last heard and heeded, and rebuked them, too. To the record and to time I appeal again for my justification

And now, sir, I recur to the state of the Union to-day. What is it? Sir, twenty months have elapsed, but the rebellion is not crushed out; its military power has not been broken; the insurgents have not dispersed. The Union is not restored; nor the Constitution maintained, nor the laws enforced. Twenty, sixty, ninety, three hundred, six hundred days have passed; a thousand millions been expended; and three hundred thousand lives lost or bodies mangled; and to day the confederate flag is still near the Potomac and the Ohio, and the confederate government stronger, many times, than at the beginning. Not a State has been restored, not any part of any State has voluntairly returned to the Union. And has anything been wanting that Congress, or the States, or the people in their most generous enthusiasm, their most impassioned patriotism, could bestow? Was it power? And did not the party of the executive control the entire Federal Government, every State government, every county, every city, town, and village in the North and West? Was it patronage? All belonged to it. Was it influence? What more? Did not the school, the college, the church, the press, the secret orders, the municipality, the corporation, railroads, telegraphs express companies, the voluntary association, all, all yield it to the utmost? Was it unanimity? Never was an Administration so supported in England or America. Five men and half a score of newspapers made up the opposition. Was it enthusiasm? The ethusiasm was fanatical. There has been nothing like it since the Crusades. Was it confidence? Sir, the faith of the people exceeded that of the patriarch. They gave up Constitution, law, right, liberty, all at your demand for arbitrary power that the rebellion might, as you promised, be crushed out in three months and the Union restored. Was credit needed? You took control of a country, young, vigorous, inexhaustible in wealth and resources, and of a Government almost free from public debt, and whose good faith had never been tarnished. Your great national loan bubble failed miserably, as it deserved to fail; but the bankers and merchants of Philadelphia, New York, and Boston lent you more than their entire banking capital. And when that failed too, you forced credit by declaring your paper promises to pay a legal tender for all debts. Was money wanted? You had all the revenues of the United States, diminished indeed, but still in gold. The whole wealth of the country, to the last dollar, lay at your feet. Private individuals, municipal corporations, the State governments, all in their frenzy gave you money or means with reckless prodigality. The great eastern cities lent you $150,000,000. Congress voted, first, $250,000,000, and next $500,000,000 more in loans; and then, first, $50,000,000, then $10,000,000, next $30,000,000, and, in July last, 150,000,000 in Treasury notes; and the Secretary has issued also a paper "postage currency," in sums as low as five cents, limited in amount only by his discretion. Nay, more: already since the 4th of July, 1861, this House has appropriated $2,017,864,000, almost every dollar without debate, and without a recorded vote. A thousand millions have been expended since the 15th of April, 1861; and a public debt or liability of $1,500,000,000 already incurred. And to support all this stupendous outlay and indebtedness, a system of taxation, direct and indirect, has been inaugurated, the most onerous and unjust ever imposed upon any but a conquered people.

Money and credit, then, you have had in prodigal profusion. And were men wanted? More than a million rushed to arms! Seventy-five thousand first, (and the country stood aghast at the multitude,) then eighty-three thousand more were demanded; and three hundred and ten thousand responded to the call The President next asked for four hundred thousand, and Congress, in its generous confidence, gave him five hundred thousand; and, not to be outdone, he took six hundred and thirty seven thousand. Half of these melted away in their first campaign; and the President demanded three hundred thousand more for the war, and then drafted yet another three hundred thousand for nine months. The fabled hosts of Xerxes have been outnumbered. And yet victory strangely follows the standards of the foe. From Great Bethel to Vicksburg, the battle has not been to the strong. Yet every disaster, except the last, has been followed by a call for more troops, and every time so far they have been promptly furnished. From the beginning the war has been conducted like a political campaign, and it has been the folly of the party in power that they have assumed that number alone would win the field in a contest not with ballots but with musket and sword. But numbers you have had almost without number—the largest, best appointed, best armed, fed, and clad host of brave men, well organized and well dicipline, ever marshaled A Navy, too, not the most formidable perhaps, but the most numerous and gallant, and the costliest in the world, and against a foe almost without a navy at all. Thus with twenty millions of people, and every element of strength and force at command—power, patronage, influence, unanimity, ethuriasm, confidence, credit, money, men, an Army and a Navy the largest and the noblest ever set in the field or afloat upon the sea; with the support almost servile, of every State, county, and municipality in the North and West; with a Congress swift to do the bidding of the Executive; without opposition anywhere at home, and with an arbitrary power which neither the Czar of Russia nor the Emperor of Austria dare exercise; yet after nearly two years of more vigorous prosecution of war than ever recorded in history; after more skirmishes, combats and battles than Alexander, Cæsar, or the first Napoleon ever fought in any five years of their military career, you have utterly, signally, disastrously—I will not say ignominiously—failed to subdue ten millions of "rebels," whom you had taught the people of the North and West not only to hate but despise. Rebels, did I say? Yes, your fathers were rebels, or your grandfathers. He who now before men on canvas looks down so sadly upon us, the false, degenerate, and imbecile guardians of the great Republic which he founded, was a rebel. And yet we, cradled ourselves in rebellion, and who have fostered and fraternized with ever insurrection in the nineteenth century everywhere throughout the globe, would now, forsooth, make the word "rebel" a reproach. Rebels certainly they are; but all these persistent and stupendous efforts of the most gigantic warfare of modern times have, through your incompetency and folly, availed nothing to crush them out, cut off though they have been by your blockade from all the world, and dependent only upon their own courage and resources. And yet they were to be utterly conquered and subdued in six weeks, or three months! Sir, my judgment was made up and expressed from the first. I learned it from Chatam: "My lords, you cannot conquer America." And you have not conquered the South. You never will. It is not in the nature of things possible; much less under your auspices. But money you have expended without limit, and blood poured out like water. Defeat, debt, taxation, sepulchres, these are your trophies. In vain the people gave you treasure and the soldier yielded up his life. "Fight, tax, emancipate, let these," said the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. PIKE,] at the last session, "be the trinity of our salvation." Sir, they have become the trinity of your deep damnation. The war for the Union is, in your hands, a most bloody and costly failure. The President confessed it on the 22d of September, solemnly, officially, and under the broad seal of the United States. And he has now repeated the confession. The priests and rabbis of abolition taught him that God would not prosper such a cause. War for the Union was abandoned; war for the negro openly begun, and with stronger battalions than before. With what success? Let the dead at Fredericksburg and Vicksburg answer.

And now, sir, can this war continue? Whence the money to carry it on? Where the men? Can you borrow? From whom? Can you tax more? Will the people bear it? Wait till you have collected what is already levied. How many millions more of "legal tender"—to-day forty-seven per cent. below the par of gold—can you float? Will men enlist now at any price? Ah, sir, it is easier to die at home. I beg pardon; but I trust I am not "discouraging enlistments." If I am, then first arrest Lincoln, Stanton, and Halleck, and some of your other generals; and I will retract; yes, I will recant. But can you draft again? Ask New England—New York. Ask Massachusetts. Where are the nine hundred thousand? Ask not Ohio—the Northwest. She thought you were in earnest, and gave you all, all—more than you demanded.

"The wife whose babe first smiled that day,
The fair, fond bride of yester eve,
And aged sire and matron gray,
Saw the loved warriors haste away,
And deemed it sin to grieve,"

Sir, in blood she has atoned for her credulity; and now there is mourning in every house, and distress and sadness in every heart. Shall she give you any more?

But ought this war to continue? I answer no—not a day, not an hour. What then? Shall we separate? Again I answer, no, no, no! What then? And now, sir, I come to the grandest and most solemn problem of statesmanship from the begining of time; and to the God of Heaven, Illuminer of hearts and minds, I would humbly appeal for some measure, at least, of light and wisdom and strength to explore and reveal the dark but possible future of this land.

CAN THE UNION OF THESE STATES BE RESTORED? HOW SHALL IT BE DONE?

And why not? Is it historically impossible? Sir, the frequent civil wars and conflicts between the States of Greece did not prevent their cordial union to resist the Persian invasion; nor did even the thirty years Peloponnesian war, springing, in part, from the abduction of slaves, and embittered and disastrous as it was—let Thucidides speak—wholly destroy the fellowship of those States. The wise Romans ended three years social war after many bloody battles, and much atrocity, by admitting the States of Italy to all the rights and privileges of Roman citizenship—the very object to secure which these States had taken up arms. The border wars between Scotland and England, running through centuries, did not prevent the final union, in peace and by adjustment, of the two kingdoms under one monarch. Compromise did, at last what ages of coercion and attempted conquest had failed to effect. England kept the crown, while Scotland gave the king to wear it; and the memories of Wallace and the Bruce of Bannockburn, became part of the glories of British history. I pass by the union of Ireland with England—a union of force, which God and just men abhor; and yet precisely "the Union as it should be" of the abolitionists of America. Sir, the rivalries of the houses of York and Lancaster filled all England with cruelty and slaughter; yet compromise and intermarriage ended the strife at last, and the white rose and the red were blended in one. Who dreamed a month before the death of Cromwell that in two years the people of England, after twenty years of civil war and usurpation, would with great unanimity, restore the house of Stewart in the person of its most worthless prince, whose father but eleven years before they had beheaded? And who could have foretold in the begining of 1812, that within some three years, Napoleon would be in exile upon a desert island, and the Burbons restored? Armed foreign intervention did it; but it is a strange history. Or who then expected to see a nephew of Napoleon, thirty-five years later, with the consent of the people, supplant the Burbon and reign Emperor of France? Sir, many States and people, once separate, have become united in the course of ages through natural causes and without conquest; but I remember a single instance only in history, of States or people once united, and speaking the same language, who have been forced permanently asunder by civil strife or war, unless they were separated by distance or vast natural boundaries. The secession of the Ten Tribes is the exception; these parted without actual war; and their subsequent history is not encouraging to secession. But when Moses, the greatest of all statesmen, would secure a distinct nationality and government to the Hebrews, he left Egypt and established his people in a distant country. In modern times, the Netherlands, three centuries ago, won their independence by the sword; but France and the English Channel separated them from Spain. So did our Thirteen Colonies; but the Atlantic ocean divorced us from England. So did Mexico, and other Spanish colonies in America; but the same ocean divided them from Spain. Cuba and the Canadas still adhere to the parent Government. And who now, North or South, in Europe or America, looking into history, shall presumptuously say that because of civil war the reunion of these States is impossible? War, indeed, while it lasts, is disunion, and, if it lasts long enough, will be final, eternal separation first, and anarchy and despotism afterward. Hence I would hasten peace now to-day, by every honorable appliance.

Are there physical causes which render reunion impracticable? None. Where other causes do not control, rivers unite; but mountains, deserts, and great bodies of water—*oceani dissociabiles*—separate a people. Vast forests originally, and the lakes now, also divide us—not very widely or wholly—from the Canadas, though we speak the same language, and are similar in manners, laws, and institutions. Our chief navigable rivers run from North to South. Most of our bays and arms of the sea take the same direction. So do our ranges of mountains. Natural causes all tend to Union, except as between the Pacific coast and the country east of the Rocky mountains to the Atlantic. It is "manifest destiny." Union is empire. Hence, hitherto we have continually extended our territory, and the Union with it, South and West. The Louisiana purchase, Florida, and Texas all attest it. We passed desert and forest, and scaled even the Rocky mountains, to extend the Union to the Pacific. Sir, there is no natural boundary between the North and the South, and no line of latitude upon which to separate; and if ever a line of longitude shall be established, it will be east of the Mississippi valley. The Alleghanies are no longer a barrier. Highways ascend them everywhere, and the railroad now climbs their summits and spans their chasms, or penetrates their rock ieat sides. The electric telegraph follows, and, stretching its connecting wires along the clouds, there mingles its vocal lightnings with the fires of heaven,

But if disunionists in the East will force a separation of any of these States, and a boundary, purely conventional, is at last to be marked out, it must and it will be either from Lake Erie on the shortest line to the Ohio river, or from Manhattan to the Canadas.

And, now, sir, is there any difference of race here, so radical as to forbid reunion? I do not refer to the negro race, styled now, in unctuous official phrase by the President, "Americans of African descent." Certainly, sir, there are two white races in the United States, both from the same common stock, and yet so distinct—one of them so peculiar—that they develop different forms of civilization, and might belong, almost, to different types of mankind. But the boundary of these two races is not at all marked by the line which divides the slaveholding from the non-slaveholding States. If race is to be the geographical limit of disunion, then Mason and Dixon's can never be the line.

Next, sir, do not the causes which, in the beginning, impelled to Union still exist in their utmost force and extent? What were they?

First, the common descent—and therefore consanguinity—of the great mass of the people from the Anglo-Saxon stock. Had the Canades been settled originally by the English, they would doubtless have followed the fortunes of the thirteen colonies. Next, a common language, one of the strongest of the ligaments which bind a people. Had we been contiguous to Great Britain, either the causes which led to a separation would have never existed, or else been speedily removed; or, afterwards, we would long since have been reunited as equals and with all the rights of Englishmen. And along with these were similar, at least not essentially dissimilar, manners, habits, laws, religion, and institutions of all kinds, except one. The common defense was another powerful incentive, and is named in the Constitution as one among the objects of the "more perfect Union" of 1787. Stronger yet than all these, perhaps, but made up of all of them, was a common interest. Variety of climate and soil, and therefore of production, implying also extent of country, is not an element of separation, but, added to contiguity, becomes a part of the ligament of interest, and is one of its toughest strands. Variety of production is the parent of the earliest commerce and trade; and these, in their full development, are, as between foreign nations, hostages for peace; and between States and people united, they are the firmest bonds of Union. But, after all, the strongest of the many original impelling causes to the Union, was the securing of domestic tranquility. The statesmen of 1787 well knew that between thirteen independent but contiguous States without a natural boundary, and with nothing to separate them except the machinery of similar governments, there must be a perpetual, in fact an "irrepressible conflict" of jurisdiction and interest, which, there being no other common arbiter, could only be terminated by the conflict of the sword. And the statesmen of 1862 ought to know that two or more confederate governments, made up of similar States, having no natural boundary either, and separated only by different governments, cannot endure long together in peace, unless one or more of them be either too pusillanimous for rivalry, or too insignificant to provoke it, or too weak to resist aggression.

These, sir, along with the establishment of justice, and the securing of the general welfare, and of the blessings of liberty to themselves and their prosperity, made up the causes and motives which impelled our fathers to the Union at first.

And now, sir, what one of them is wanting? What one diminished? On the contrary, many of them are stronger to-day than in the beginning. Migration and intermarriage have strengthened the ties of consanguinity. Commerce, trade, and production have immensely multiplied. Cotton, almost unknown here in 1787, is now the chief product and export of the country. It has set in motion three fourths of the spindles of New England, and given employment, directly or remotely, to full half the shipping, trade, and commerce of the United States. More than that: cotton has kept the peace between England and America for thirty years; and had the people of the North been as wise and practical as the statesmen of Great Britain, it would have maintained Union and peace here. But we are being taught in our first century and at our own cost, the lessons which England learned through the long and bloody experience of eight hundred years. We shall be wiser next time. Let not cotton be king, but peacemaker, and inherit the blessing.

A common interest, then, still remains to us. And union for the common defense, at the end of this war, taxed, indebted, impoverished, exhausted, as both sections must be, and with foreign fleets are armies around us, will be fifty-fold more essential than ever before. And finally, sir, without union, our domestic tranquility must forever remain unsettled. If it cannot be maintained within the Union, how then outside of it, without an exodus or colonization of the people of one section or the other to a distant country? Sir, I repeat that two governments so interlinked and bound together every way by physical and social ligaments, cannot exist in peace without a common arbiter. Will treaties bind us? What better treaty than the Constitution? What more solemn, more durable? Shall we settle our disputes, then, by arbitration and compromise? Sir, let us arbitrate and compromise now, inside of the Union.—Certainly it will be quite as easy.

And now, sir, to all these original causes and motives which impelled to union at first, must be added certain artificial ligaments, which eighty years of association under a common Government must have most fully developed. Chief among these are canals, steam navigation, railroads, express companies, the post office, the newspaper press, and that terrible agent of good and evil mixed—"spirit of health, and yet goblin damned"—if free, the gentlest minister of truth and liberty; when enslaved, the supplest instrument of falsehood and tyranny—the magnetic telegraph. All these have multiplied the speed or the quantity of trade, travel, communication, migration, and intercourse of all kinds between the different States and sections; and thus, so long as a healthy condition of the body-politic continued, they became powerful cementing agencies of union. The numerous voluntary associations, artistic, literary, charitable, social, and scientific, until corrupted and made fanatical; the various ecclesiastical organizations, until they divided; and the political parties, so long as they remained all national and not sectional, were also among the strong ties which bound us together. And yet all of these, perverted and abused for some years in the hands of bad or fanatical men, became still more powerful instrumentalities in the fatal work of disunion; just as the veins and arteries of the human body, designed to convey the vitalizing fluid through every part of it, will carry also, and with increased rapidity it may be, the subtle poison which takes life away. Nor is this all. It was through their agency that the imprisoned winds of civil war were all let loose at first with such sudden and appalling fury; and, kept in motion by political power, they have ministered to that fury ever since. But, potent alike for good and evil, they may yet, under the control of the people, and in the hands of wise, good, and patriotic men, be made the most effective agencies, under Providence, in the reunion of these States.

Other ties also, less material in their nature, but hardly less persuasive in their influence, have grown up under the Union. Long association, a common history, national reputation, treaties and diplomatic intercourse abroad, admission of new States, a common jurisprudence, great men whose names and fame are the patrimony of the whole country, patriotic music and songs, common battle-fields, and glory won under the same flag. These make up the poetry of Union; and yet, as in the marriage relation, and the family with similar influences, they are stronger than hooks of steel. He was a wise statesman, though he may never have held an office, who said, "Let me write the songs of a people, and I care not who makes their laws." Why is the Marseillaise prohibited in France? Sir, Hail Columbia and the Star Spangled Banner—Pennsylvania gave us one, and Maryland the other—have done more for the Union than all the legislation and all the debates in this Capitol for forty years; and they will do yet more again than all our armies, though you call out another million of men into the field. Sir, I would add "Yankee Doodle;" but first let me be assured that Yankee Doodle loves the Union more than he hates the slaveholder.*

And now, sir, I propose to briefly consider the causes which led to disunion and the present civil war; and to inquire whether they are eternal and ineradicable in their nature, and at the same time powerful enough to overcome all the causes and considerations which impel to reunion.

Having two years ago discussed fully and elaborately the more abstruse and remote causes whence civil commotions in all Governments, and those also which are peculiar to our complex and Federal system, such as the consolidating tendencies of the General Government, because of executive power and patronage, and of the tariff, and taxation and disbursement generally, all unjust and burdensome to the West equally to the South, I pass them by now.

What, then, I ask, is the immediate, direct cause of disunion and this civil war? Slavery, it is answered. Sir, that is the philosophy of the rustic in the play—"that a great cause of the night, is lack of the sun." Certainly slavery was in one sense—very obscure indeed—the cause of the war. Had there been no slavery here, this particular war about slavery would never have been waged. In a like sense, the Holy Sepulcher was the cause of the war of the Crusades; and had Troy or Carthage never existed, there never would have been Trojan or Carthaginian war, and no such personages as Hector and Hannibal; and no Iliad or Ænied would never have been written. But far better say that the negro is the cause of the war; for had there been no negro here, there would be no war just now.—What then? Exterminate him? Who demands it? Colonize him? How? Where? When? At whose cost? Sir, let us have an end of this folly.

But slavery is the cause of this war. Why? Because the South obstinately and wickedly refused to restrict or abolish it at the demand of the philosophers or fanatics and demagogues of the North and West. Then, sir, it was abolition, the purpose to abolish or interfere with and hem in slavery, which caused disunion and war. Slavery is only the *subject*, but abolition the *cause*, of this civil war. It was the persistent and determined agitation in the free States of the question of abolishing slavery in the South, because of the alleged "irrepressible conflict" between the forms of labor in the two sections, or in the false and mischievous cant of the day, between freedom and slavery, that forced a collision of arms at last. Sir, that conflict was not confined to the Territories. It was expressly proclaimed by its apostles, as between the States also, against the institution of domestic slavery everywhere. But, assuming the platforms of the Republican party as the standard, and stating the case most strongly in favor of that party, it was the refusal of the south to consent that slavery should be excluded from the Territories that led to the continued agitation, North and South, of that question, and finally to disunion and civil war. Sir, I will not be answered now by the old clamor about "the aggressions of the slave power." That miserable specter, that unreal mockery, has been exercised and expelled by debt and taxation and blood. If that power did govern this country for the sixty years preceding this terrible revolution, then the sooner this Administration and government return to the principles and policy of southern statesmanship, the better for the country; and that, sir, is already, or soon will be, the judgment of the people But I deny that it was the "slave power" that governed for so many years, and so wisely and well. It was the Democratic party, and its principles and policy, molded and controlled, indeed, largely by southern statesmen. Neither will I be stopped by that other cry of mingled fanaticism and hypocricy, about the sin and barbarism of African slavery. Sir, I see more of barbarism and sin, a thousand times, in the continuance of this war, the dissolution of the Union, the breaking up of this Government, and the enslavement of the white race by debt and taxes and arbitrary power. The day of fanatics and sophists and enthusiasts, thank God, is gone at last; and though the age of chivalry may not, the age of practical statesmanship is about to return. Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African." And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been best secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to-day in the West than there was two years ago; and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of morals, or religion, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned, or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, are established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation, and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be "proslaveryism," if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our own midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, an anti-slavery paper in New York, (the Tribune,) the most influential, and, therefore, most dangerous of all of that class—it would exhibit more of dignity, and command more of influence, if it were always, to discuss public questions and public men with a decent respect—laying aside now the epithets of "secessionist" and "traitor," has returned to its ancient political nomenclature, and calls certain members of this House "pro-slavery." Well, sir, in the old sense of the term as applied to the Democratic party, I will not object. I said years ago, and it is a fitting time now to repeat it:

"If to love my country; to cherish the Union; to revere the Constitution; if to abhor the madness and hate the treason which would lift up a sacrilegious hand against either; if to read that in the past, to behold it in the present, to foresee it in the future of this land, which is of more value to us and to the world for ages to come than all the multiplied millions who have inhabited Africa from the creation to this day.—If this is to be proslavery, then in every nerve, fiber, vein, bone, tendon, joint, and ligament, from the topmost hair of the head to the last extremity of the foot, I am all over and altogether a proslavery man."

And now, sir, I come to the great and controlling question within which the whole issue of union or disunion is bound up; is there "an irrepressible conflict" between the slave-holding and non-slaveholding States? Must "the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana," in the language of Mr. Seward, "be ultimately tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye fields and whose fields of Massachusetts and New York again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men?" If so, then there is an end of all union and forever. You cannot abolish slavery by the sword; still less by proclamations, though the President were to "proclaim" every month. Of what possible avail was his proclamation of September? Did the South submit? Was she even alarmed? And yet he has now fulminated another "bull against the comet"—*brutum fulmen*—and, threatening servile insurrection with all its horrors, has yet coolly appealed to the judgment of mankind, and invoked the blessing of the God of peace and love! But declaring it a military necessity, an essential measure of war to subdue the rebels, yet, with admirable wisdom, he expressly exempts from its operation the only States and parts of States in the South where he has the military power to execute it.

Neither, sir, can you abolish slavery by argument. As well attempt to abolish marriage or the relation of paternity. The South is resolved to maintain it at every hazard and by every sacrifice; and if "this Union cannot endure part slave and part free," then it is already and finally dissolved. Talk not to me of "West Virginia." Tell me not of Missouri, trampled under the feet of your soldiery. As well talk to me of Ireland. Sir, the destiny of those States must abide the issue of the war. But Kentucky you may find tougher. And Maryland—

"E'en in her ashes live their wonted fires."

Nor will Delaware be found wanting in the day of trial.

But I deny the doctrine. It is full of disunion and civil war. It is disunion itself.—Whoever first taught it ought to be dealt with as not only hostile to the Union, but an enemy of the human race. Sir, the fundamental idea of the Constitution is the perfect and eternal compatibility of a union of States "part slave and part free;" else the Constitution never would have been framed, nor the Union ever founded; and seventy years of successful experiment have approved the wisdom of the plan. In my deliberate judgement, a confederacy made up of slaveholding and non-slaveholding States is, in the nature of things, the strongest of all popular governments. African slavery has been, and is, eminently conservative. It makes the absolute political equality of the white race everywhere practicable. It dispenses with the English order of nobility and leaves every white man, North and South, owning slaves or owning none, the equal of every other white man. It has reconciled universal suffrage throughout the free States with the stability of government. I speak not now of its material benefits to the North and West, which are many and more obvious. But the South, too, has profited many ways by a union with the non-slaveholding States. Enterprise, industry, self-reliance, perseverance, and the other hardy virtues of a people living in a higher latitude and without hereditary servants, she has learned or received from the North. Sir, it is easy, I know, to denounce all this, and to revile him who utters it. He is so. The English is, of all languages, the most copious in words of bitterness and reproach. "Pour on: I will endure."

Then, sir, there is not an "irrepressible conflict" between slave labor and free labor.—There is no conflict at all. Both exist together in perfect harmony in the South. The master and the slave, the white laborer and the black, work together in the same field or the same shop, and without the slightest sense of degradation. They are not equals, either socially or politically. And why not, then, cannot Ohio, having only free labor, live in harmony with Kentucky which have both slave and free? Above all, why cannot Massachusetts allow the same right of choice to South Carolina, separated as they are a thousand miles, by other States who would keep the peace and live in good will? Why this civil war? Whence disunion? Not from slavery—not because the South chooses to have two kinds of labor instead of one; but from *sectionalism*, always and everywhere a disintegrating principle. Sectional jealousy and hate—these, sir, are the only elements of conflict between these States, and though powerful, they are yet not at all irrepressible. They exist between families, communities, towns, cities, counties, and States, and if not repressed would dissolve all society and government. They exist also between other sections than the North and South. Sectionalism Rampant, many years ago, saw the South and West united by the ties of geographical position, migration, intermarriage, and interest, and thus strong enough to control the power and policy of the Union. It found us divided only by different forms of labor; and, with consummate but most guilty sagacity, it seized upon the question of slavery as the surest and most powerful instrumentality by which to separate the West from the South, and bind her wholly to the North. Encouraged every way from abroad by those who were jealous of our prosperity and greatness, and who knew the secret of our strength, it proclaimed the "irrepressible conflict" between slave labor and free labor. It taught the people of the North to forget both their duty and their interests, and aided by the artificial ligaments and influence which money and enterprise had created between the seaboard and the Northwest, it persuaded the people of that section, also, to yield up every tie which binds them to the great valley of the Mississippi, and to join their political fortunes especially, wholly, with the East. I resisted the fugitive slave law, and demanded the exclusion of slavery from all the Territories and from this District, and clamored against the admission of any more slave States into the Union. It organized a

(Continued on fourth page.)

* In truth, the song was written in derision, by a British officer, and not by an American.