SUPPLEMENT TO THE

Wilmington Journal.

From our Own Correspondent.

CONWAYBORO', S. C., Feb. 28th, 1860.

The political pulse runs high in this District, and considerable disunion sentiment prevailing; "cut off the cotton, rice, and grain crops from the North, and let us see if that will not bring the Helperites to their senses" is the talk down here.

No confidence is had in their "mass" and "great Union meetings," nor in such men as place their names on paper to save the Union, as Northern merchants have done. The Georgia Editor has done a great thing for the South in showing up these "miserable tricksters," and if he should come nearer home he could have more work to do; and speaking of home reminds me of the independent humbug spirit at the South. Now let us see and notice a card put forth in a Charleston paper, addressed to the "merchants of the South and West." Never was there a more barefaced humbug palmed off on a people than this advertisement, and they offer to compete with New York in their importations and their prices. Now there is always "two sides to a question," and we have heard their side.

We will allow them to import, and do anything else to turn trade to Charleston, and fill their vaults with cash, "and to sell as cheap and on as easy terms as Northern houses;" but let us reason one moment.—Look over the advertisement and you will find *one third of the houses to be "Branches" of Northern houses.*—They never can carry on anything of a "direct trade" with Europe, and why? Because they have not the importation facilities of Northern houses, consequently their prices must of course be *greater* than Northern prices. Northern capital will seek the place that pays best, and that place is the "Queen City." Northern capitalists are "quiet and easy," and laugh and snigger in their sleeves, and say, "ah, you Southern and Southwestern merchants will not come North to spend your money, but you can stop in Charleston and we will catch you there; of course, it is the very thing they want.—"The Southern branch house gets better prices, and pays better than the Northern house," and "we will rather you trade in Charleston."

I am "no disunionist" Messrs. Editors, nor a "fire eater;" but I would like to see these gentlemen buy another "castor," and have two hats for their two faces, and not crowd too much under a narrow brim, simply because they go for the money. It won't do.—No sir, the venerable gray hars of society cannot be fooled that way; society is too old.

Yours truly,

JOZIF ADDUMS.

For the Journal.

A New Farmers' Club.

A number of enterprising farmers in and about Spring Garden and Rocky Point, in New Hanover, have recently organized a Farmers' Club. The objects are two fold: first, to institute a better system of government and treatment of the negro population in those districts; and secondly, to improve the existing system of Agriculture. In each of these important relations, much good is promised by this new Agricultural Asociation. A Constitution, suitable to the objects in view, has been adoptel, and the Club has gone to work in real earnest.

The following are the officers for the present year:

GEORGE J. MOORE, Esq., President;
Mr. JOEL HINES, Vice President;
Mr. HINTON E. CARR, Recording Secretary;
Mr. JAMES S. HINES, Corresponding Sec'y.

Monthly meetings will be held, and successively at the houses of the members of the Club. The first regular meeting will be held at the residence of Mr. Hinton E. Carr, on the fourth Saturday in March next. An excellent regulation adopted is, that the members at their meetings shall walk over the farm where they meet, examine the fields, fences, ditches, farming implements, stock, &c., of the owner, and at the same time freely interchange views in respect to the various methods, animals, implements, and objects examined. This will introduce a method of friendly criticism, which no one will take offence at, and which will thus draw out of each member a fund of observations and experience, that will make up altogether a valuable stock of practical knowledge for the benefit of the whole club. In this way, too, a better state of social feeling will be produced among the farmers. The cause of Agriculture is materially hindered by the isolated habits of farmers. They see too little of each other; know too little of one another, and not enough of each other's views and experience in farming.

New Hanover is behind in the great pursuit of Agriculture. Her people are too blind to the golden truth that her swamp lands, her marl beds, and her fine forests even, contain rich ores of agricultural wealth. Rich would now be her citizens, and better off their condition, if not one of her pine trees had ever been boxed, nor a turkiln ever been made. Let the pursuit of agriculture supersede that of naval stores, and let our people seize hold of and improve the advantages which nature spreads out with a liberal hand before them, and New Hanover will, in a few years, be up to Edgecombe and other boasted counties in raising cotton and securing wealth by farming. We should not lag behind as we do; but, animated by the spirit of progress in other counties and States, and encouraged by what nature has done for us, and by the fact that Wilmington is one of the best markets in the country, let us hold our County Fairs, and show that we will not be outstripped in the great career of agricultural progress.

ROCKY POINT.

Feb. 28th, 1860.

The Tragedy in Virginia.

The Petersburg *Express* of February 29th, contains the following account of the horrible tragedy in Henry county, Va. A telagraphic account of the same has already appeared in our paper:

The usually quiet and law-abiding people of the county of Henry, have been intensely excited for the past three or four days, in consequence of a terrible tragedy—or rather triple tragedy—that was enacted in their midst on Saturday last. The particulars reached us last evening through a source entirely reliable. The details, although not as full as we shall doubtless be enabled to give at an early day, are sufficient to cause a thrill of horror at their mere recital.

It appears, according to the version given us, that some years since, a grand-daughter of the venerable and talented Vincent Witcher, Esq., of Pittsylvania county, married a gentleman from the adjoining county of Henry, whose name was Clemmens. His Christian name we have been unable to ascertain. The maiden name of Mr. Witcher's grand-daughter was Smith. The parties lived happily together until about eighteen months since, when, upon the most unfounded suspicions, as we have been informed, Mr. Clemmens desired a separation from his wife, and immediately instituted proceedings for a divorce, at the same time impeaching her honor as the grounds of his course.

Last Saturday was set apart for the taking of depositions, and the parties met at a magisterial precinct in Henry county.

Mr. Witcher appeared to defend the suit and protect the honor of his grand-daughter.

The taking of the depositions progressed, and after the plaintiff had finished with a witness, Mr. Witcher asked a question, which greatly exasperated the husband, Mr. Clemens. He immediately arose, drawing a pistol at the same time, and fired at Mr. Witcher. Mr. Witcher it seems, also quickly rose, and drew a pistol from his pocket, and as the ball of his antagonist grazed around the abdomen, he fired, striking Clemmens in the forehead, and killing him instantly.

A nephew of Mr. Witcher, and a Mr. Smith, brother of Mrs. Clemmens, hearing the firing rushed into the room. A brother of Mr. Clemens, who had also been attracted by the pistol reports, fired at a nephew of Mr. Witcher, the ball taking effect, and producing, it is feared, a fatal wound. Upon seeing his nephew shot, Mr. Vincent Witcher again fired, striking Clemmens No. 2, and killing him instantly.

At this stage of the sanguinary affair, Mr. Smith, a brother of Mrs. Clemmens drew a bowie knife, but had scarcely unsheathed the blade, when he was fired upon by a second brother of Clemmens, the ball taking effect in the shoulder, and producing a painful wound. Infuriated by his wound, Mr. Smith rushed upon his antagonist, and with one powerful thrust of the knife completely disemboweled Clemmens No. 3, the unfortunate man falling dead on the spot.

Three of the parties dead, and the other three all wounded, the horrible tragedy here ended.

Vincent Witcher, Esq., the chief actor in this truly terrible affair, is widely known throughout Virginia.—He served for many years in the lower House of the Legislature, and subsequently represented his district in the State Senate with signal ability. He is a prominent member of the Whig party, and his name has been repeatedly mentioned in connection with the office of Governor of the Commonwealth. He succeeded Whitwell P. Tunstall, upon the death of that gentleman, as President of the Richmond and Danville Railroad. After two years service he resigned the Presidency of the road, and has since been engaged in the practice of his profession—that of a lawyer.

Our informant states that throughout this painful affair, which Mr. Witcher believes to have been instituted against an innocent grand-daughter, he has acted with great forbearance, and the part he has been compelled finally to act, will be with none, a source of more deeper regret than himself.

Of course, the whole matter will undergo a judicious investigation, until which we forbear further comment.

SPEECH OF SENATOR DOUGLAS,

On the Invasion of States, Delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 23, 1860.

The hour having arrived for the consideration of the special order, the Senate proceeded to consider the following resolution, submitted by Mr. DOUGLASS on the 16th instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill for the protection of each State and Territory of the Union against invasion by the authorities or inhabitants of any other State or Territory; and for the suppression and punishment of conspiracies or combinations in any State or Territory with intent to invade, assail, or molest the government, inhabitants, property, or institutions of any other State or Territory of the Union.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on the 25th of November last, the Governor of Virginia addressed an official communication to the President of the United States, in which he said:

"I have information from various quarters, upon which I rely, that a conspiracy of formidable extent, in means and numbers, is formed in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and other States, to rescue John Brown and his associates, prisoners at Charlestown, Virginia. The information is specific enough to be reliable. * * * *

"Places in Maryland, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, have been occupied as depots and rendezvous by these desperadoes, and unobstructed by guards or otherwise, to invade this State, and we are kept in continual apprehension of outrage from fire and rapine. I apprise you of these facts in order that you may take steps to preserve peace between the States."

To this communication, the President of the United States, on the 28th of November, returned a reply, from which I read the following sentence:

"I am at a loss to discover any provision in the Constitution or laws of the United States which would authorize me to 'take steps' for this purpose." [That is, to preserve the peace between the States.")]

This announcement produced a profound impression upon the public mind and especially in the slaveholding States.—It was generally received and regarded as an authoritative announcement that the Constitution of the United States confers no power upon the Federal Government to protect each of the States of this Union against invasion from the other States. I shall not stop to inquire whether the President meant to declare that the existing laws confer no authority upon him, or that the Constitution empowers Congress to enact no laws which would authorise the Federal interposition to protect the States from invasion; my object is to raise the inquiry, and to ask the judgment of the Senate and of the House of Representatives on the question, whether it is not within the power of Congress, and the duty of Congress, under the Constitution, to enact all laws which may be necessary and proper for the protection of each and every State against invasion, either from foreign Powers or from any portion of the United States.

The denial of the existence of such a power in the Federal Government has induced an inquiry among conservative men—men loyal to the Constitution and devoted to the Union—as to what means they have to protection, if the Federal Government is not authorized to protect them against external violence. It must be conceded that no community is safe, no State can enjoy peace, or prosperity, or domestic tranquility, without safety against external violence.—Every State and nation of the world, outside of this Republic, is supposed to maintain armies and navies for this precise purpose. It is the only legitimate purpose for which armies and navies are maintained in time of peace. They may be kept up for ambitious purposes, for the purposes of aggression and foreign war; but the legitimate purpose of a military force in time of peace is to insure domestic tranquility against violence or aggression from without. The States of this Union would possess that power, were it not for the restraints imposed upon them by the Federal Constitution. When that Constitution was made, the States surrendered to the Federal Government the power to raise and support armies, and the power to provide and maintain navies, and not only thus surrendered the means of protection from invasion, but consented to a prohibition upon themselves which declares that no State shall keep troops or vessels of war in time of peace.

The question now recurs, whether the States of this Union are in that helpless condition, with their hands tied by the Constitution, stripped of all means of repelling assaults and maintaing their existence, without a guarantee from the Federal Government, to protect them against violence. If the people of this country shall settle down into the conviction that there is no power in the Federal Government under the Constitution to protect each and every State from violence, from aggression, from invasion, they will demand that the cord be severed, and that the weapons be restored to their hands with which they may defend themselves. This inquiry involves the question of the perpetuity of the Union. The means of defence, the means of repelling assaults, the means of providing against invasion, must exist as a condition of the safety of the States and the existence of the Union.

Now, sir, I hope to be able to demonstrate that there is no wrong in this Union for which the Constitution of the United States has not provided a remedy. I believe, and I hope I shall be able to maintain, that a remedy is furnished for every wrong which can be perpetrated within the Union, if the Federal Government performs its whole duty. I think it is clear, on a careful examination of the Constitution, that the power is conferred upon Congress, first to provide for repelling invasion from foreign countries; and, secondly, to protect each State of this Union against invasion from any other State, Territory, or place, within the jurisdiction of the United States. I will first turn your attention, sir, to the power conferred upon Congress to protect the United States—including States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; including every inch of ground within our limits and jurisdiction—against foreign invasion. In the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, you find that Congress has power—

"To raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

These various clauses confer upon Congress power to use the whole military force of the country for the purpose specified in the Constitution. They shall provide for the execution of the laws of the Union; and, secondly, suppress insurrections. The insurrections there referred to are insurrections against the authority of the United States—insurrections against a State authority being provided for in a subsequent section, in which the United States cannot interfere, except upon the application of the State authorities. The invasion which is to be repelled by this clause of the Constitution is an invasion of the United States. The language is, Congress shall have power to "repel invasions." That gives the authority to repel the invasion, no matter whether the enemy shall land within the limits of Virginia, within the District of Columbia, within the Territory of New Mexico, or anywhere else within the jurisdiction of the United States. The power to protect every portion of the country against invasion from foreign nations having thus specifically conferred, the framers of the Constitution then proceeded to make guarantees for the protection of *each of the States* by Federal authority. I will read the fourth section of the fourth article of the Constitution:

"The United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and, on application of the Legislature, or of the Executive, (when the Legislature cannot be convened,) against domestic violence."

This clause contains three distinct guarantees: first, the United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a republican form of government; second, the United States shall protect each of them against invasion; third, the United States shall, on application of the Legislature, or of the Executive, when the Legislature cannot be convened, protect them against domestic violence. Now, sir, I submit to you whether it is not clear, from the very language of the Constitution, that this clause was inserted for the purpose of making it the duty of the Federal Government to protect each of the States against invasion from any other State, Territory, or place within the jurisdiction of the United States? For what other purpose was the clause inserted?—The power and duty of protection as against foreign nations has already been provided for. This clause occurs among the guarantees from the United States to each State, for the benefit of each State, for the protection of each State, and necessarily from other States, inasmuch as the guarantee had been given previously as against foreign nations.

If any further authority is necessary to show that such is the true construction of the Constitution, it may be found in the forty-third number of the Federalist, written by James Madison. Mr. Madison quotes the clause of the Constitution which I have read, giving these three guarantees; and, after discussing the one guarantying to each State a republican form of government, proceeds to consider the second, which makes it the duty of the United States to protect each of the States against invasion. Here is what Mr. Madison says upon that subject:

"A protection against invasion is due *from every society to the parts composing it.* The latitude of the expression here used seems to secure each State, not only against foreign hostility, but against ambitious or vindictive enterprises of its more powerful neighbors. The history both of ancient and modern confederacies proves that the weaker members of the Union ought not to be insensible to the policy of this article."

The number of the Federalist, like all the others of that celebrated work, was written after the Constitution was made, and before it was ratified by the States, and with a view to securing its ratification; hence the people of the several States, when they ratified this instrument, knew that this clause was intended to bear the construction which I now place upon it. It was intended to make it the duty of every society to protect each of its parts; the duty of the Federal Government to protect each of the States, and, he says, the smaller States ought not be insensible to the policy of this article of the Constitution.

Then, sir, if it be made the imperative duty of the Federal Government, by the express provision of the Constitution, to protect each of the States against invasion or violence from the other States, or from combinations of desperadoes within their limits, it necessarily follows that it is the duty of Congress to pass all laws necessary and proper to render that guarantee effectual. While Congress, in the early history of the Government, did provide legislation, which is supposed to be ample to protect the United States against invasion from foreign countries and the Indian tribes, they have failed, up to this time, to make any law for the protection of each of the States against invasion from within the limits of the Union. I am unable to account for this omission; but I presume the reason is to be found in the fact that no Congress ever dreamed that such legislation would ever become necessary for the protection of one State of this Union against invasion and violence from her sister States. Who, until the Harper's Ferry outrage, ever conceived that American citizens could be so forgetful of their duties to themselves, to their country, to the Constitution, as to plan an invasion of another State, with the view of inciting servile insurrection, murder, treason, and every other crime that disgraces humanity? While, therefore, no blame can justly be attached to our predecessors in failing to provide the legislation necessary to render this guarantee of the Constitution effectual; still, since the experience of last year, we cannot stand justified in omitting longer to perform this imperative duty.

The question then remaining is, what legislation is necessary and proper to render this guarantee of the Constitution effectual? I presume there will be very little difference of opinion that it will be necessary to place the whole military power of the Government at the disposal of the President, under proper guards and restrictions against abuse, to repel and suppress invasion when the hostile force shall be actually in the field. But, sir, that is not sufficient. Such legislation would not be a full compliance with this guarantee of the Constitution. The framers of that instrument meant more when they gave the guarantee. Mark the difference in language between the provision for protecting the United States against invasion and that for protecting the States. When it provided for protecting the United States, it said Congress shall have power to "*repel* invasion." When it came to make this guarantee to the States it changed the language and said the United States shall "*protect*" each of the States against invasion. In the one instance, the duty of the Government is to repel; in the other, the guarantee is that they will protect. In other words, the United States are not permitted to wait until the enemy shall be upon your borders; until the invading army shall have been organized and drilled and placed in march with a view to the invasion; but they must pass all laws necessary and proper to insure protection and domestic tranquility to each State and Territory of this Union against invasion or hostilities from other States and Territories.

Then, sir, I hold that it is not only necessary to use the military power when the actual case of invasion shall occur, but to authorize the judicial department of the Government to suppress all conspiracies and combinations in the several States with intent to invade a State, or to molest or disturb its government, its peace, its citizens, its property, or its institutions. You must punish the conspiracy, the combination with intent to do the act, and then you will suppress it in advance. There is no principle more familiar to the legal profession than that wherever it is proper to declare an act to be a crime, it is proper to punish a conspiracy or combination with intent to perpetrate the act. Look upon your statute-books, and I presume you will find an enactment to punish the counterfeiting of the coin of the United States; and then another section to punish a man for having counterfeit coin in his possession *with intent* to pass it; and another section to punish him for having the molds, or dies, or instruments for counterfeiting, *with intent* to use them. This is a familiar principle in legislative and judicial proceedings. If the act of invasion is criminal, the conspiracy to invade should also be made criminal. If it be unlawful and illegal to invade a State, and run off fugitive slaves, why not make it unlawful to form conspiracies and combinations in the several States with intent to do the act? We have been told that a notorious man, who has recently suffered death for his crimes upon the gallows, boasted in Cleveland, Ohio, in a public lecture, a year ago, that he had then a body of men employed in running away horses from the slaveholders of Missouri, and pointed to a livery stable in Cleaveland which was full of the stolen horses at that time.

I think it is within our competency, and consequently our duty, to pass a law making every conspiracy or combination in any state or territory of this Union to invade another with intent to steal or run away property of any kind, whether it be negroes, or horses or property of any other description, into another State, a crime, and punish the conspirators by indictment in the United States courts, and confinement in the prisons or penitentiaries of the State or Territory where the conspiracy may be formed and quelled.—Sir, I would carry these provisions of law as far as our constitutional power will reach. I would make it a crime to form conspiracies with a view of invading States or Territories to control elections, whether they be under the garb of Emigrant Aid Societies of New England, or Blue Lodges of Missouri. (Applause in the galleries.) In other words, this provision of the Constitution means more than the mere repelling of an invasion when the invading army shall reach the border of a State. The language is, it shall protect the State against invasion; the meaning of which is, to use the language of the preamble to the Constitution, to insure to each State domestic tranquility against external violence. There can be no peace, there can be no prosperity, there can be no safety in any community, unless it is secured against violence from abroad. Why, sir, it has been a question seriously mooted in Europe, whether it was not the duty of England, a power foreign to France, to pass laws to punish conspiracies in England against the lives of the princes of France. I shall not argue the question of comity between foreign States. I predicate my argument upon the Constitution by which we are governed, and which we have sworn to obey, and demand that the Constitution be executed in good faith so as to punish and suppress every combination, every conspiracy, either to invade a State or to molest its inhabitants, or to disturb its property, or to subvert its institutions and its government. I believe this can be effectually done by authorizing the United States courts in the several States to take jurisdiction of the offence, and punish the violation of the law with appropriate punishments.

It cannot be said that the time has not yet arrived for such legislation. It cannot be said with truth that the Harper's Ferry case will not be repeated, or is not in danger of repetition. It is only necessary to inquire into the causes which produced the Harper's Ferry outrage, ana ascertain whether those causes are yet in active operation, and then you can determine whether there is any ground for apprehension that that invasion will be repeated. Sir, what were the causes which produced the Harper's Ferry outrage? Without stopping to adduce vidence in detail, I have no hesitation in expressing my firm and deliberate conviction that the Harper's Ferry crime was the natural, logical, inevitable result of the doctrines and teachings of the Republican party, as explained and enforced in their platform, their partisan presses, their pamphlets and books, and especially in the speeches of their leaders in and out of Congress. (Applause in the galleries.)

Mr. MASON. I trust the order of the Senate will be preserved. I am sure it is only necessary to suggest to the presiding officer the indispensable necessity of preserving the order of the Senate; and I give notice that, if it is disturbed again, I shall insist upon the galleries being cleared entirely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will pause for a single moment. It is impossible for the Chair to preserve order without the concurrence of the vast assembly in the galleries. He trusts that there will be no occasion to make a reference to this subject again.

Mr. TOOMBS. I hope that the presiding officer will place officers in the galleries, and put a stop to this thing. It is a very bad sign of the times. It is unbecoming this body, or the deliberations of any free people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presiding officer has not the force at his command to place officers in the gallery.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senate will pardon me for a digression an instant, I was about to suggest to the presiding officer that I thought it would be necessary to place officers in different parts of the gallery, with instructions that if they saw any person giving any signs of approbation or disapprobation calculated to disturb our proceedings, they should instantly put the guilty person out of the gallery.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That has been done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was remarking that I considered this outrage at Harper's Ferry as the logical, natural consequence of the teachings and doctrines of the Republican party. I am not making this statement for the purpose of crimination or partisan effect. I desire to call the attention of members of that party to a reconsideration of the doctrines that they are in the habit of enforcing, with a view to a fair judgment whether they do not lead directly to those consequences, or the part of those deluded persons who think that all they say is meant, in real earnest, and ought to be carried out. The great principle that underlies the Republican party is violent, irreconcilable, eternal warfare upon the institution of American slavery, with the view of its ultimate extinction throughout the land; sectional war is to be waged until the cotton fields of the South shall be cultivated by free labor, or the rye fields of New York and Massachusetts shall be cultivated by slave labor. In furtherance of this article of their creed, you find their political organization not only sectional in its location, but one whose vitality consists in appeals to northern passion, northern prejudice, northern ambition against southern States, southern institutions, and southern people. I have had some experience in fighting this element within the last few years, and I find that the source of their power consists in exciting the prejudices and the passions of the northern section against those of the southern section. They not only attempt to excite the North against the South, but they invite the South to assail and abuse and traduce the North. Southern abuse, by violent men, of northern statesmen and northern people, is essential to the triumph of the Republican cause. Hence the course of argument which we have to meet is not only repelling the appeals to northern passion and prejudice, but we have to encounter their appeals to southern men to assail us, in order that they may justify their assaults upon the plea of self-defence.

Sir, when I returned home in 1858, for the purpose of canvassing Illinois, with a view to a re-election, I had to meet this issue of the "irrepressible conflict." It is true that the Senator from New York had not then made his Rochester speech, and did not for four months afterwards. It is true that he had not given the doctrine that precise name and form; but the principle was in existence, and had been proclaimed by the ablest and the most clear-headed men of the party. I will call your attention, sir, to a single passage from a speech, to show the language in which this doctrine was stated in Illinois before it received the name of the "irrepressible conflict." The Republican party assembled in State convention in June, 1858, in Illinois, and unanimously adopted Abraham Lincoln as their candidate for United States Senator. Mr. Lincoln appeared before the convention, accepted the nomination, and made a speech—which had been previously written and agreed to in caucus by most of the leaders of the party. I will read a single extract from that speech:

"In my opinion, it [the slavery agitation] will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently, half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States—old as well as new, North as well as South."

Sir, the moment I landed upon the soil of Illinois, at a vast gathering of many thousands of my constituents to welcome me home, I read that passage, and took direct issue with the doctrine contained in it as being revolutionary and treasonable, and inconsistent with the perpetuity of this Republic. That is not merely the individual opinion of Mr. Lincoln; nor is it the individual opinion merely of the Senator from New York, who four months afterwards asserted the same doctrine in different language; but, so far as I know, it is the general opinion of the members of the Abolition or Republican party. They tell the people of the North that unless they rally as one man, under a sectional banner, and make war upon the South with a view to the ultimate extinction of slavery, slavery will overrun the whole North and fasten itself upon all the free States.—They then tell the South, unless you rally as one man, binding the whole Southern people into a sectional party, and establish slavery all over the free States, the inevitable consequence will be that we shall abolish it in the slaveholding States. The same doctrine is held by the Senator from New York in his Rochester speech. He tells us that the States must all become free, or all become slave; that the South, in other words, must conquer and subdue the North, or the North must triumph over the South, and drive slavery from within its limits.

Mr. President, in order to show that I have not misinterpreted the position of the Senator from New York, in notifying the South that, if they wish to maintain slavery within their limits, they must also fasten it upon the northern States, I will read an extract from his Rochester speech:

"It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces; and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina, and the sugar plantations of Louisiana, will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men."

Thus, sir, you perceive that the theory of the Republican party is, that there is a conflict between two different systems of institutions in the respective classes of States—not a conflict in the same States, but an irrepressible conflict between the free States and the slave States; and they argue that these two systems of State cannot permanently exist in the same Union; that the sectional warfare must continue to rage and increase with increasing fury until the free States shall surrender, or the slave States shall be subdued. Hence, while they appeal to the passions of our own section, their object is to alarm the people of the other section, and drive them to madness, with the hope that they will invade our rights as an excuse for some of our people to carry on aggressions upon their rights. I appeal to the candor of Senators, whether this is not a fair exposition of the tendency of the doctrines proclaimed by the Republican party. The creed of that party is founded upon the theory that, because slavery is not desirable in our States, it is not desirable anywhere; because free labor is a good thing with us, it must be the best thing everywhere. In other words, the creed of their party rests upon the theory that there must be *uniformity* in the domestic institutions and internal polity of the several States of this Union. There, in my opinion, is the fundamental error upon which their whole system rests. In the Illinois canvass, I asserted, and now repeat, that uniformity in the domestic institutions of the different States is neither possible nor desirable. That is the very issue upon which I conducted the canvass at home, and it is the question which I desire to present to the Senate. I repeat, that uniformity in domestic institution of the different States is neither possible nor desirable.

Was such the doctrine of the framers of the Constitution? I wish the country to bear in mind that when the Constitution was adopted the Union consisted of thirteen States, twelve of which were slaveholding States, and one a free State. Suppose this doctrine of uniformity on the slavery question had prevailed in the Federal convention, do the gentlemen on that side of the House think that freedom would have triumphed over slavery? Do they imagine that the one free State would have out-voted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus have abolished slavery throughout the land by a constitutional provision? On the contrary, if the test had then been made, if this doctrine of uniformity on the slaver, question had then been proclaimed and believed in, with the twelve slaveholding States against one free State, would it not have resulted in a constitutional provision fastening slavery irrevocably upon every inch of American soil, North as well as South? Was it quite fair in those days for the friends of free institutions to claim that the Federal Government must not touch the question, but must leave the people of each State to do as they pleased, until under the operation of that principle they secured the majority, and then wield that majority to abolish slavery in the other States of the Union?

Sir, if uniformity in respect to domestic institutions had been deemed desirable when the Constitution was adopted, there was another mode by which it could have been obtained. The natural mode of obtaining uniformity was to have blotted out the State governments, to have abolished the State Legislatures, to have conferred upon Congress legislative power over the municipal and domestic concerns of the people of all the States, as well as upon Federal questions affecting the whole Union; and if this doctrine of uniformity had been entertained and favored by the framers of the Constitution, such would have been the result. But, sir, the framers of that instrument knew at that day, as well as we now know, that in a country as broad as this, with so great a variety of climate, of soil, and of production, there must necessarily be a corresponding diversity of institutions and domestic regulations, adapted to the wants and necessities of each locality. The framers of the Constitution knew that the laws and institutions which were well adapted to the mountains and valleys of New England were ill-suited to the rice plantations and the cotton-fields of the Carolinas.—They knew that our liberties depended upon reserving the right to the people of each State to make their own laws and establish their own institutions, and control them at pleasure, without interference from the Federal Government, or from any other State or Territory, or any foreign country. The Constitution, therefore, was based, and the Union was founded, on the principle of dissimilarity in the domestic institutions and internal polity of the several States. The Union was founded on the theory that each State had peculiar interests, requiring peculiar legislation, and peculiar institutions, different and distinct from every other State. The Union rests on the theory that no two States would be precisely alike in their domestic policy and institutions.

Hence, I assert that this doctrine of uniformity in the domestic institutions of the different States is repugnant to the Constitution, subversive of the principles upon which the Union was based, revolutionary in its character, and leading directly to despotism if it is ever established. Uniformity in local and domestic affairs in a country of great extent is despotism always. Show me centralism prescribing uniformity from the capital to all of its provinces in their local and domestic concerns, and I will show you a despotism as odious and as insufferable as that of Austria or of Naples.—Dissimilarity is the principle upon which the Union rests.—It is founded upon the idea that each State must necessarily require different regulations; that no two States have precisely the same interests, and hence do not need precisely the same laws; and you cannot account for this confederation of States upon any other principle.

Then, sir, what becomes of this doctrine that slavery must be established in all the States or prohibited in all the States? If we only conform to the principles upon which the Federal Union was formed, there can be no conflict. It is only necessary to recognize the right of the people of every State to have just such institutions as they please, without consulting your wishes, your views, or your prejudices, and there can be no conflict.

And, sir, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States confers upon Congress the power coupled with the duty of protecting each State against external aggression, and inasmuch as that includes the power of suppressing and punishing conspiracies in one State against the institutions, property, people, or government of every other State, I desire to carry out that power vigorously. Sir, give us such a law as the Constitution contemplates and authorizes, and I will show the Senator from New York that there is a constitutional mode of repressing the "irrepressible conflict." I will open the prison door to allow conspirators against the peace of the Republic and the domestic tranquility of our States to select their cells wherein to drag out a miserable life, as a punishment for their crimes against the peace of society.

Can any man say to us that although this outrage has been perpetrated at Harper's Ferry, there is no danger of its recurrence? Sir, is not the Republican party still embodied, organized, confident of success, and defiant in its pretensions? Does it not now hold and proclaim the same creed that it did before this invasion? It is true that most of its representatives here disavow the *acts* of John Brown at Harper's Ferry. I am glad that they do so; I am rejoiced that they have gone thus far; but I must be permitted to say to them that it is not sufficient that they disavow the act, unless they also repudiate and denounce the doctrines and teachings which produced the act. Those doctrines remain the same; those teachings are being poured into the minds of men throughout the country by means of speeches and pamphlets and books and through partisan presses.—The causes that produced the Harper's Ferry invasion are now in active operation. It is true that the people of all the border States are required by the Constitution to have their hands tied, without the power of self-defence, and remain patient under a threatened invasion in the day or in the night? Can you expect people to be patient, when they dare not lie down to sleep at night without first stationing sentinels around their houses to see if a band of marauders and murderers are not approaching with torch and pistol? Sir, it requires more patience than freemen ever should cultivate, to submit to constant annoyance, irritation and apprehension. If we expect to preserve this Union, we must remedy, within the Union and in obedience to the Constitution, every evil for which disunion would furnish a remedy. If the Federal Government fails to act, either from choice or from an apprehension of the want of power, it cannot be expected that the States will be content to remain unprotected.

Then, sir, I see no hope of peace, of fraternity, of good feeling, between the different portions of the United States, except by bringing to bear the power of the Federal Government to the extent authorized by the Constitution—to protect the people of all the States against any external violence or aggression. I repeat, that if the theory of the Constitution shall be carried out by conceding the right of the people of every State to have just such institutions as they choose, there cannot be a conflict, much less an "irrepressible conflict," between the free and slaveholding States.

Mr. President, the mode of preserving peace is plain.—This system of sectional warfare must cease. The Constitution has given the power, and all we ask of Congress is to give the means, and we, by indictments and convictions in the Federal courts of our several States, will make such examples of the leaders of these conspiracies as will strike terror into the hearts of the others, and there will be an end of this crusade. Sir, you must check it by crushing out the conspiracy, the combination, and then there can be safety. Then we shall be able to restore that spirit of fraternity which inspired our revolutionary fathers upon every battle field; which presided over the deliberations of the convention that framed the Constitution, and filled the hearts of the people who ratified it. Then we shall be able to demonstrate that there is no evil unredressed in the Union for which disunion would furnish a remedy. Then, sir, let us execute the Constitution in the spirit in which it was made. Let Congress pass all the laws necessary and proper to give full and complete effect to every guarantee of the Constitution. Let them authorize the punishment of conspiracies and combinations in any State or Territory against the property, institutions, people or government of any other State or Territory, and there will be no excuse, no desire, for disunion.—Then, sir, let us leave the people of every State perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. Let each of them retain slavery just as long as it pleases, and abolish it when it chooses. Let us act upon that good old golden principle which teaches all men to mind their own business and let their neighbors alone. Let this be done and this Union can endure forever as our fathers made it, composed of free and slave States, just as the people of each State may determine for themselves.

AN EASTERN WONDER.—A friend translates from the Star of the Cyclades, a Greek paper, the following account of an eastern wonder: "In the island of Sicinus, near Crete, nine years ago, the wife of a potter, named Constantine Maroule, gave birth to a female child, the hinder part of which, from the neck to the knees, are entirely covered with a hairy skin like that of a hog; so also in front, from the breast to the knees. On the lower limbs this appearance is seen only in spots. The rest of the person, the face particularly, exhibits nothing unusual. The child, now in its ninth year, enjoys perfect health, and seems to have no other defect than this marvelous skin, the hairs of which behind have to be sheared frequently, as they grow precisely like those on the back of a hog.

The father, being a poor man, once brought this child, whose name is Irene, to Athens to exhibit it for sake of gain; but being forbidden by the police, he took her to Constantinople for the same purpose. He was there also brought to answer before the Greek Ambassador, and sent back to Sicinus under penalties in case of the repition of such selfish treatment of his unfortunate child"

Dedication of the Equestrian Statue of Washington.

The inauguration of Clark Mills' equestrian statue of Washington took place Wednesday at Washington, D. C., despite the weather, which destroyed the interest of the ceremonies, and interfered terribly with the comfort of all who took part in them. The procession to the place where the statue was inaugurated was both civic and military. The President, members of the Cabinet, both Houses of Congress, the Legislature of Maryland, and other bodies constituting the former division, whilst the New York Regiment formed the principal part of the latter. The Avenue was decorated with flags, mottoes, &c., thousands of visitors were in the city, and the unfavorable weather only interfered to prevent the inauguration being a grand affair.

There was a general suspension of business upon the avenue and other leading streets, and at various points patriotic displays were made in the way of decorations.

THE CEREMONIES AND ORATIONS.—The procession and display of military was very fine, but the murky atmosphere and muddy thoroughfares rendered what would of otherwise have been a grand affair, dull and inanimate. The procession did not start until 3 o'clock, and the avenue was lined with spectators, on the whole route to the circle overlooking Georgetown, in the centre of which the equistrian statue is erected.

On reaching the ground, the military took their stations therein, and an oration suitable to the occasion was delivered by the Hon. Thomas S. Bocock, of Virginia, concluding as follows:

Upon this representative and similitude of the great and honored dead, which we this day put forth before the world, the winds shall blow, the rains shall fall, and the storms shall beat, but it shall stand unhurt amid them all. So shall it be with the fame of him whose image it is. The breath of unfriendly criticism may blow upon it; the storms that betoken moral or civil change may break upon it; but it shall stand firmly fixed in the hearts and memories of every true and honest and liberty-loving man who inhabits our land and cherishes our institutions.

The inhabitants of this city, as they behold this statue day after day, will look upon it as the Palladium, of their privileges, and the silent guardian of their prosperity. And the thousands and tens of thousands, that from every nation, kingdom and tongue, yearly go forth to gaze upon and admire the wonders of the earth, when they shall come up to this "Mecca of the mind" shall pause with reverential awe as they gaze upon this similitude of the mighty Washington.

Year after year shall that dumb image tell its eloquent story of patriotism, devotion and self-sacrifice; year after year shall it teach its holy lessons of duty and of faith; with generation after generation shall it plead for institutions founded in wisdom and a country bought with blood. To the clouds and storms that gather and break upon it, it will tell of the clouds and storms through which its great antitype did pass, in his devoted course on earth, and when the great luminnary of the heavens, descending with his golden shower of beams like imperial Jove, shall wrap it in its warm embrace, it shall tell the sun that he who gave his beams and bade him shine, has decreed that one day the darkness of eternal night shall settle on his face; but then the spirit of the mighty Washington, basking in an eternal sunlight above shall still

"A darkening universe defy
To quench his immortality,
Or shake his trust in God."

THE DEDICATION AND UNVEILING.

The ceremonies were concluded with the dedication of the Statue by the President, (when he wore the Masonic apron and used the Masonic gavel once worn and used by Washington;) and the unveiling of the Statue, followed by a national salute by the artillery in honor of the occasion.

The procession on its return mar