

Holmes County Republican.

J. CASKEY, Editor and Proprietor.

OFFICE—Washington Street, Third Door South of Jackson.

TERMS—One Dollar and Fifty Cents in Advance

VOL. 5.

MILLERSBURG, HOLMES COUNTY, OHIO, THURSDAY, JANUARY 3, 1861.

NO. 20.

The Great Speech of Andy Johnson, of Tennessee.

Made in the Senate of the United States, Dec. 19th and 20th, 1860.

A Union Speech from a Southern Democratic Senator.

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

This, I think, the Government clearly has the power to do; and so long as the Government executes all the laws in good faith, denying the right of a State constitutionally to secede, so long the State is in the Union, and subject to all the provisions of the Constitution and the laws passed in conformity with it. * * * It is not an invasion of a State for the Federal Government to execute its laws, to take care of its public property, and to enforce the collection of its revenue, but if, in the execution of the laws; if, in the enforcement of the Constitution, it meets with resistance, it is the duty of the Government, and it has the authority to put down resistance, and effectually to execute the laws as contemplated by the Constitution of the country.

Mr. Johnson quotes largely and most pertinently from the fathers of the Republic on these points. From Jefferson thus: Mr. Jefferson, in his letter to Colonel Monroe, dated Paris, August 11, 1786, speaks thus:

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

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

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

THE WHISKY INFRECTION—HOW WASHINGTON EXECUTED THE LAWS. Mr. Johnson referred to the whisky infraction in Pennsylvania. Mr. Johnson says on this head:

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

were to defend their rights against usurpation."

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

Mr. Johnson referred to Gen. Jackson in nullification times, and remarked: Then we see where General Washington stood. Now how does the present case stand? The time has come when men should speak out. Duties are mine; consequences are God's. I intend to discharge my duty, and I intend to avow my understanding of the Constitution and the laws of the country. Have we no authority or power to execute the laws in the State of South Carolina as well as in Vermont and Pennsylvania? I think we have. Now, sir, what is the Government to do in South Carolina? If South Carolina undertake to drive the Federal Courts out of that State, yet the Federal Government has the right to provide the means for retaining possession of that property. If she makes an advance either to dispossess the Government of that which it has purchased, or to resist the execution of the revenue laws, or of our judicial system, or the carrying of the mails, or the exercise of any other power conferred on the Federal Government, she puts herself in the wrong, and it will be the duty of the Government to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

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

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

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

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

TEXAS. But we need not stop here; let us go to Texas. Texas was engaged in a revolution with Mexico. She succeeded in her rebellion and establishment of her independence, and she became a sovereign and independent Power outside of the Union. She applied for admission, and she was admitted into this family of States. After she was in, she was oppressed by the debts of her war which resulted in her separation from Mexico; she was harassed by Indians upon her border; and in 1850, by way of relief to Texas, what did we do? There was an extent of territory that lies north, if my memory serve right, embracing what is now called the territory of New Mexico. Texas had it not in her power to protect the citizens that were there. It was a dead limb, paralyzed, lifeless. The Federal Government came along as a kind physician, saying, "We will take this dead limb from your body and vitalize it, by giving protection to the people, and incorporating it into a territorial government, and in addition to that we will give you \$10,000,000, and you may retain your own public lands, and the other States were taxed in common to pay the \$10,000,000. Now, after all this is done, Texas, so-called, upon her own volition, is to say, "I will walk out of this Union." Were there no other parties to that compact? We are told the compact is reciprocal. Did we take in California, did we take in Texas, just to benefit them? No; but to add to this great family of States; and it is apparent, from the fact of their coming in, that the compact is reciprocal; and having entered into the compact, they have no right to withdraw to the consent of the remaining States.

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

FLORIDA. So sensitive have been the people of my State upon the free navigation of that river, (Mississippi) that as far back as 1796, now sixty-four years ago, in their bill of rights, before they passed under the jurisdiction of the United States, they declared: "That an equal participation of the free navigation of the Mississippi is one of the inherent rights of the citizens of this State; it cannot, therefore, be conceded to any prince, potentate, Power, person, or persons whatever." This shows the estimate that the people fixed on this stream sixty-four years ago; and now we are told, if Louisiana does go out, it is not her intention this time to tax the people above. Who can tell what may be the intention of Louisiana hereafter? Are we willing to place the rights of our citizens, are we willing to place the travel and commerce of our citizens, at the discretion of any Power outside of this Government? I will not; I do not care whether the other Powers be Louisiana or the moon.

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

THE OSTEND MANIFESTO. Mr. Johnson here quoted from the ostend manifesto. That manifesto would justify taking Cuba, "on the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor, if there were no other means of preventing flames from destroying his own home." Mr. Johnson called this "pretty sound doctrine," and added: We find this document signed by our three ministers, and approved by the American people, the doctrine laid down clearly that if the United States believed that the United States believed that Cuba was to be transferred by Spain to England or to France, or to some other Power inimical to the United States the safety of the American people, the safety of our institutions, the existence of the Government being imperiled, we should have a right without regard to money or blood, to acquire it.

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

Mr. President, I have spoken of the possibility of a State standing in the position of South Carolina making alliances with a foreign Power. What do we see now?—Ex-Governor Manning, of that State, in a speech made not long since at Columbia, made these declarations: "Cotton is king, and would enable us in peace to rule the nations of the world, or successfully to encounter them in war. The millions in France and England engaged in its manufacture, are an essential guarantee of the friendship of those nations. If necessary, their armies would stand to guard its uninterrupted and peaceful cultivation, and their fleets of war would line our coasts to guard it in its transit from our ports."

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

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

THE PROPOSED COERCION OF BORDER SLAVE STATES BY THE GULF STATES. Mr. Johnson read extracts from the message of Governors and the fire-eating Congressmen from the Gulf States, showing their determination to drag the Border States into revolution. He said: Now, our sister, without consulting her sisters, without caring for their interest or their consent, says that she will move forward; that she will destroy the Government and that she will have lived, and that hereafter, when she forms a Government or a Constitution, unless the border States come in, she will pass laws prohibiting the importation of slaves into her State from those States, and obstruct the slave trade among the States, and throw the institutions upon the principle laid down by the Abolition party. That is the road held over us! I tell our sisters in the South that so far as Tennessee is concerned, she will not be dragged into a southern or any other confederacy until she has had time to consider; and then she will go when she believes it to be her interest, and not before. I tell our northern friends, who are resisting the execution of the laws made in conformity with the Constitution, that we will not be driven on the other hand into their confederacy, and we will not go unless it suits us, and they give us such guarantees as we deem right and proper. We say to you of the South, we are not to be frightened and coerced. Oh, when one talks about coercing a State, how maddening and insulting to the State; but when you want to point out a means by which to coerce them! But, sir, we do not intend to be coerced.

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

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

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

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

THE ASSOCIATIONS OF THE UNION. Mr. Johnson spoke eloquently on this subject, concluding on this head by saying: Here, too, in the center of the Republic, is the seat of Government which was founded by Washington, and bears his immortal name. Who dare appropriate it exclusively? It is within the borders of the States I have enumerated, in whose limits are found the graves of Washington, of Jackson, of Polk, of Clay. From them it is supposed that we will cherish these endearing associations with the hope, if this Republic shall be broken, that we may speak words of peace and reconciliation to a distracted people. Angry waves may be lashed into fury on the one hand; on the other blustering winds may rage; but we stand immovable upon our basis, as on our own native mountains—presenting their craggy brows, their unexplored caverns, their summits "rock-ribbed and as ancient as the sun"—we stand speaking peace, association, and concord, to a distracted Republic.

WHAT KIND OF A GOVERNMENT WILL THE SOUTH HAVE? Mr. Johnson proceeded in this place to inquire what sort of a government the South would have if the Union were dissolved.

He read extracts from Georgia and South Carolina papers showing that the people there were actually thinking of the establishment of a monarchy. Commenting on these extracts he said: Is it not better to "Than fly to others that we know not off?" We see, by these indications, that it is contemplated, to establish a monarchy. We see it announced that this Government has been a failure from the beginning. How has it been a failure? Now, in the midst of a revolution, while chaos reigns, it is supposed by some that we can be induced to return to a constitutional or absolute monarchy. Who can tell that we may not have some Louis Napoleon among us, who may be ready to make a coup d'etat, and enthrone himself upon the rights and upon the liberties of the people? Who can tell what kind of a government may grow up!

RED HOT MADNESS. Speaking of the State of Tennessee, Mr. Johnson said: Sir, I will stand by the Constitution of the country as it is, and by all its guarantees. I am not for breaking up this great Confederacy. I am for holding on to it as it is, with the mode and manner pointed out in the instrument for its own amendment. It was good enough for Washington, for Adams, for Jefferson, and for Jackson. It is good enough for us. I intend to stand by it, and to insist on a compliance with its guarantees, North and South. We intend to act in the Union, and under the Constitution, and not about it. We do not intend that you shall drive us out of this house, that was reared by the hands of our fathers. It is our house. It is the constitutional house. We have a right here, and because you come forward and violate the ordinances of this house, I do not intend to go out; and if you persist in the violation of the ordinances of the house, we intend to eject you from the building, and retain the possession ourselves. We want, if we can, to stay the heated, and I am compelled to say, according to my judgment, the rash and precipitate action of some of our southern friends that indicates red hot madness.

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

I was going on to say that the want of protection to slavery in the Territories cannot be considered a grievance now. This is not the reason she is going out, and going to break up this Confederacy. What is it, then? Is there any issue between South Carolina and the Federal Government? Has the Federal Government failed to comply with, and to carry out, the obligations that it owes to South Carolina? In what has the Federal Government failed? In what has it neglected the interest of South Carolina? What law has it undertaken to enforce upon South Carolina that is unconstitutional and oppressive? If there were grievances, Mr. Johnson said they should be specially stated.

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

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

Am I to be so great a coward as to retreat from duty? I will stand here and meet the encroachments upon the institutions of my country at the threshold; and as a man, as one that loves my country and my constituents. I will stand here and resist all encroachments and advances. Here is the place to stand. Shall I desert the citadel, and let the enemy come in and take possession? No. Can Mr. Lincoln send a foreign minister, or even a consul, abroad, unless he receives the sanction of the Senate? Can he appoint a postmaster whose salary is over a thousand dollars a year, without the consent of the Senate? Shall we desert our posts, shrink from our responsibilities, and permit Mr. Lincoln to come with his cohorts, as we consider them, from the North, to carry off everything? Are we so cowardly that we are defeated, not conquered, we shall do this? Yes, we are defeated according to the forms of law and the Constitution; but the real victory is ours—the moral force is with us. Are we going to desert that noble and patriotic band who have stood by us at the North? Who have stood by us upon principle? Who have stood by

us upon the Constitution! They stood by us and fought the battle upon principle; and now that we have been defeated, not conquered, are we to turn our backs upon them and leave them to their fate? I, for one will not. I intend to stand by them. How many votes did we get in the North? We got more votes in the North against Lincoln than the entire southern States cast. Are they not able and faithful allies? They are; and now, on account of this temporary defeat, are we to turn our backs upon them and leave them to their fate, as they have fallen for us in former controversies.

We find, when all the North is summed up, that Mr. Lincoln's majority there is about two hundred thousand on the popular vote; and when that is added to the other vote cast throughout the Union, he stands to-day in a minority of nearly a million votes. What, then, is necessary to be done? To stand to our posts like men, and act upon principle; stand for the country; and in four years from this day, Lincoln and his administration will be turned out, and the worst defeated and broken down that ever came into power. It is an inevitable result from the combination of elements that now exist. What cause, then, is there to break up the Union? What reason is there for deserting our posts and destroying this greatest and best Government that was ever spoken into existence.

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

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

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

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

The New York Tribune has a correspondent in Charleston. He says in his communication dated Dec. 7th: I desire to renew my compliments to the Mercury, which so much wishes to know who I am, and this morning I mounted a new cockade and walked down Broad street, read the blue banner stretched across from the Mercury office, and thought it had a deeper blue than usual, probably on account of the election, read the Bulletin, and then concluded that, on the whole, I would not "go home," although I would, in general, do almost anything to oblige the Colon. In fact, the correspondent of the Tribune will remain in town for some time yet.

CONGRESSIONAL JOKE.—Mr. Porecher Miles, of the Charleston district, excused himself and his colleagues from voting on the question of a select committee, intimating, in substance, that before it could report its conclusions South Carolina would be out of the Union, and be himself, instead of being Miles in Congress, would be Miles away.

They stood by us and fought the battle upon principle; and now that we have been defeated, not conquered, are we to turn our backs upon them and leave them to their fate? I, for one will not. I intend to stand by them. How many votes did we get in the North? We got more votes in the North against Lincoln than the entire southern States cast. Are they not able and faithful allies? They are; and now, on account of this temporary defeat, are we to turn our backs upon them and leave them to their fate, as they have fallen for us in former controversies.

We find, when all the North is summed up, that Mr. Lincoln's majority there is about two hundred thousand on the popular vote; and when that is added to the other vote cast throughout the Union, he stands to-day in a minority of nearly a million votes. What, then, is necessary to be done? To stand to our posts like men, and act upon principle; stand for the country; and in four years from this day, Lincoln and his administration will be turned out, and the worst defeated and broken down that ever came into power. It is an inevitable result from the combination of elements that now exist. What cause, then, is there to break up the Union? What reason is there for deserting our posts and destroying this greatest and best Government that was ever spoken into existence.

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

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

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

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

The New York Tribune has a correspondent in Charleston. He says in his communication dated Dec. 7th: I desire to renew my compliments to the Mercury, which so much wishes to know who I am, and this morning I mounted a new cockade and walked down Broad street, read the blue banner stretched across from the Mercury office, and thought it had a deeper blue than usual, probably on account of the election, read the Bulletin, and then concluded that, on the whole, I would not "go home," although I would, in general, do almost anything to oblige the Colon. In fact, the correspondent of the Tribune will remain in town for some time yet.

CONGRESSIONAL JOKE.—Mr. Porecher Miles, of the Charleston district, excused himself and his colleagues from voting on the question of a select committee, intimating, in substance, that before it could report its conclusions South Carolina would be out of the Union, and be himself, instead of being Miles in Congress, would be Miles away.

They stood by us and fought the battle upon principle; and now that we have been defeated, not conquered, are we to turn our backs upon them and leave them to their fate? I, for one will not. I intend to stand by them. How many votes did we get in the North? We got more votes in the North against Lincoln than the entire southern States cast. Are they not able and faithful allies? They are; and now, on account of this temporary defeat, are we to turn our backs upon them and leave them to their fate, as they have fallen for us in former controversies.