State Library

THE OREGON SENTINEL.

$4 IN ADVANCE. JACKSONVILLE, OREGON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 31, 1861. VOL. VI.—NO. 33.

BUSINESS CARDS.

SAMUEL E. MAY,

NOTARY PUBLIC,

OFFICE IN "SENTINEL" BUILDING,

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dentistry.

DR. J. HERBOLD

WOULD respectfully announce to the citizens of Jacksonville and vicinity that he is now prepared to do

VULCANITE OR RUBBER WORK

for artificial teeth in the best style, and at prices to suit the times.

All kinds of Dental operations attended to in a skillful manner.

Jacksonville, June 2d, 1861. 20tf

WAR SCRIP, WAR SCRIP.

B. F. DOWELL,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

Will practice in all the Courts of the Third Judicial District, the Supreme Court of Oregon, and in Yreka, Cal.

He has an agent at Washington, and expects to visit that city and the Atlantic this Summer and Fall, and any business will receive prompt attention. my25:1y

W. G. T'VAULT,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

WILL attend to business in the several Courts in the First Judicial District of Oregon, and in the Supreme Court. Office on California St., opposite "Sentinel" Office.

JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.

May 25th, '61. 19:6m

SEWALL TRUAX,

SURVEYOR & CIVIL ENGINEER,

OFFICE, AT THE COUNTY BUILDINGS,

Jacksonville, Oregon.

ALL business pertaining to Land or Land Laws promptly attended to.

Jacksonville, May 11th, 1861. 17tf

REED & BERGEN,

Attorneys at Law,

JACKSONVILLE, OGN.,

Will attend to any business confided to them in the several Courts of the First Judicial District of Oregon, and in the Supreme Court. 18.

CHAS. B. BROOKS, M. D.,

HAS LOCATED IN JACKSONVILLE, and offers his professional services to this community in the practice of *Medicine, Surgery and Obstetrics.*

Office on California street, next door to Neuber's Jewelry store.

Calls attended to at all hours of day or night.

G. W. GREER,

PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON,

OFFICE, JACKSONVILLE DRUG STORE.

Oregon.

L. H. DEWEY

HAS opened a shop opposite Anderson & Glenn's, on California street, in Dr. L. Gasung's drug store, for repairing

WATCHES, CLOCKS, JEWELRY, ETC.

All work warranted to give satisfaction.

Jacksonville, Dec. 22d, 1860. 49:1y

PETER BRITT,

PHOTOGRAPHIC ARTIST

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Is prepared to take Pictures in every style of the Art, with all the latest improvements. If

PICTURES

do not give satifaction, no charges will be made. Call at Funk's Cigar Store, or at the Gallery on the Hill, and see his Pictures. 11tf

D. WM. DOUTHITT,

Attorney and Counselor

AT LAW,

Jacksonville, Oregon.

BY APPOINTMENT.

NOTARY PUBLIC

For Jackson County.

C. P. SPRAGUE,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

KERBYVILLE, JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OGN.,

Will punctually attend to business entrusted to his care. April 13, 1861.-13tf

GREAT REDUCTION!

ON the First of January, '61, the prices of WHEELER & WILSON'S

Sewing Machines

were reduced *twenty per cent.* on the Pacific coast.

A few of these, the best and cheapest machines made, at San Francisco rates.

E. C. SESSIONS, Agent.

Jacksonville, Jan. 12. 52tf

DAN'S

Barber Shop,

Opposite the Post Office.

SHAVING, Hair-cutting, Shampooing Curling and Hair Dyeing.

Also, a genuine article of Fish's HAIR RESTORATIVE, and Cristadora's *Excelsior Hair Dye* for sale. Jacksonville, June 22d. . 23tf

DR. G. W. BROWN'S

MEDICAL AND SURGICAL OFFICE.

California st., opposite Sentinel Office,

Jacksonville, Oregon.

TO those who can appreciate truth. Such will not fail to call upon Dr. G. W. Brown.

He also invites the attention of all who are suffering with diseases of the Eye to call at his office.

THE EYES! THE EYES!

No Cure, No Pay.

☞ Office hours from 8 A. M. to 4 P. M.

June 1, '61. 20:tf

JOB PRINTING of all descriptions neatly executed at the SENTINEL OFFICE.

THE OREGON SENTINEL.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, BY

DENLINGER & HAND,

HENRY DENLINGER, WM. M. HAND,

EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

Office over Clugage & Drum's Stables.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

(INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.)

One Copy, One Year..... $4 00

One Copy, Six Months..... 250

ADVERTISING RATES:

One Square, of Twelve Lines or less, First Insertion, $3 00; and for each subsequent insertion, $1 00.

Professional or Business Cards, Each Square, per annum, $30 00; for Six Months, $15 00; for Three Months, $10 00.

A liberal discount will be made to persons who advertise to the extent of four squares.

The number of insertions should be marked on the margin of advertisements.

Speech of Milton S. Latham.

Delivered in the U. S. Senate, July 20, 1861.

The Senate having under consideration the joint resolution (S. No. 1) to approve certain acts of the President of the United States for suppressing insurrection and rebellion—

Mr. Latham said: Mr. President, when I took my seat at the opening session of Congress, I was perfectly content to perform my duty by merely casting my vote on the several bills which might be presented. Whatever might be the consequences of my acts, or the responsibility assumed, it was a question between my constituents and myself, and I held myself amenable to them. There is, however, such a marked discrepancy, not only in the record of votes, but in many of the sentiments uttered by those gentlemen with whom I have always been in political affiliation, that it may be proper to make known to this body, as well as to the country, the reasons for this difference.

It is the painful duty of many gentlemen on this floor, in the present trying crisis, to differ with those with whom their political relations have been of the most cordial character; and even those whom we have recognized as party leaders.

Mr. President, I listened on Wednesday with marked pleasure to the eloquence of my friend from Kentucky, (Mr. Breckinridge,) whom I have always delighted to support and honor. I listened also yesterday to the legal argument made by the honorable Senator from Delaware, [Mr. Bayard,] with many of the sentiments uttered by both of these gentlemen I cordially agree. But, sir, I was pained, after they had taken their seats, that I had not heard from the lips of either, one a single word of denunciation of the heinous, infractious, and outrages committed upon the Constitution of our country by those States arraying themselves in hostility to it. Gentlemen can find almost infinite venial flaws on the part of the constituted authorities of the Government, but not one single word in condemnation of those who are boldly trampling under foot the Constitution of the country itself. It may well be quoted: "Why behold'st thou the mote in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

So far as the acts of the President of the United States which are to be inclosed by this joint resolution are concerned, the Senate is probably conversant with the view which I took on a former occasion in regard to them. I hold the line of demarkation in indorsing the Executive to be this: whatever imperious necessity required him to do to support the Government, to enforce the laws, and secure obedience to the constituted authorities, it was right and proper he should do, even though in the doing he may have committed a technical infraction of the authority delegated to him. Wherever there was not that imperious necessity, I do not justify him. So far as the violation of the writ of *habeas corpus* in the State of Maryland was concerned, I refuse to give him my sanction for that act. I refuse it because the State has shown, by the return of her delegates to the other House, her allegiance to the Government of the United States; and though there may be many citizens in her midst who sympathize with the disloyal spirit of the Southern States; though there may have been disgraceful mobs and riots in the city of Baltimore; unless there was clear evidence that the judiciary of that State was tainted with that disloyalty, and were unwilling to do their duty, under the Constitution, in acting upon those writs of *habeas corpus*, I would not justify any officer in the suspension of that sacred privilege. No Senator for one moment doubts the loyalty of the Chief Justice of the United States who issued the writ, or, if he does, he has never made it known upon this floor. His character is pure, spotless, and untainted; his life has been one of devotion to his country and the enforcement of its laws; and now, in his honored old age, he could scarcely stigmatize a long list of years of service by refusing to obey those laws and those principles of justice which he has sworn to carry out. Hence I regard the act of the President of the United States in suspending the writ of *habeas corpus*, as this joint resolution says, "between the city of Philadelphia and the city of Washington," as an unnecessary violation of the powers possessed by him under the Constitution; and, as a conscientious guardian of the liberties of the people, I refuse him my indorsement for that act.

So, too, as to the increase of the regular standing army of the country. The purposes for which he was striving could have been as easily accomplished by the volunteer force of the country; and therefore the exercise of power in increasing the regular standing army was not warranted by exigencies. I decline, therefore my indorsement for this act also. But, sir, as to the other acts of the Government—ordering the blockade, calling out the volunteers of the country; suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* in Florida, it being in open rebellion to your Government; and all the other acts enumerated in this joint resolution—he has my hearty approval; and I now say, as the representative of a sovereign State and a loyal people, that if he had not exercised these powers, I would have voted to impeach him as unworthy the place he occupies, and most derelict in his duties to the Government. Seeing a settled determination on the part of those States in rebellion to march upon and destroy your Capital (as was announced by the Secretary of War of the Southern Confederacy)—to wipe from the map the country of the United States, if he had not resorted to every power and every means within his control to sustain that Government he would have deserved the execrations and scorn of all living men, as well as of posterity.

The golden maxim is: "Do unto others even as you would they should do unto you." Mr. Lincoln being the constitutionally elected President of the United States, the people, through the medium of the Constitution, had declared that he was vested with the authority of Government, which he is now exercising. When the result of that election was known in November, as a citizen, and as I esteemed every good citizen should, I gave my acquiescence to the vote of the people, and considered him entitled to the support of all good citizens in the administration of that Government; taking it for granted that if any had cause of complaint against his political tenets, that same Constitution pointed out the method of their remedy.

Now, sir, bringing this home to myself, I gave my support cheerfully and willingly to my honorable friend from Kentucky. Anxious to see him elevated to the position now occupied by Mr. Lincoln, whatever I could do in my humble ability to secure that end, satisfied that he stood on a platform that was right and proper, according to my honest convictions, was done, and done faithfully. Had he been elected to the Presidency of the United States, and the New England States, led by Massachusetts, had pursued the course of these Southern States; if they had said, "We are unwilling to belong to a Government which proposes to protect the institution of slavery, or recognize it in any capacity; we are tired of what these gentlemen call the copartnership—the compact; we wish to break it up and erect a Government of our own;" if they had seized upon the forts and arsenals and other public property of the whole country—and arrayed themselves in hostility to the Government, and erected an alien one within our own, I believe *he*, and I know *I*, should have felt it my bounden duty to use all the powers possessed to see to it that the laws were there enforced, the public property retaken, and the dignity and honor of your Government sustained. The rule is not changed because my party and friend did not happen to be the successful ones.

Mr. President, a great deal has been said throughout the whole of this contest against the power of your government to enforce its laws by the use of the strong arm; a great deal about it being in contravention of the spirit of the fathers to the Republic to seek to coerce those States into obedience to the laws of the country, and to force the restoration of the public property which they have seized. Last Winter, in common with many of my political associates, I also openly advocated the doctrine as a question of policy, that this Government should not attempt coercion against these States; that it was better to wait for reason and judgment to resume their sway rather than use the power which I never once denied was truly possessed of asserting its authority by the strong military arm. Further, it was the settled, fixed policy of our government, up to a certain period, to pursue this course, until it was definitely ascertained that it would only result in what we were trying, with all our ability and might, to prevent.

After the election of Mr. Lincoln, on the 6th of November last, South Carolina's Senators never appeared upon this floor. Her Convention met on the 17th of that month, and on the 20th—long before Mr. Lincoln was to be inaugurated, long anterior to the time when this party, to whose principles they were so much opposed, was to be vested with the power of your Government—declared that they no longer owed allegiance to the United States. They seized at once upon the arsenal in the city of Charleston, and Fort Moultrie and Pickney were taken possession of. Did the Government of the United States attempt to retake this property, to reassert its title over these respective forts and this arsenal which had been thus unlawfully, illegally and unconstitutionally seized upon? South Carolina, by that act, had done what the world in arms could not have done with impunity. The Government quietly and tacitly submitted to it, trusting to the restoration of cooler judgement to the excited and misguided people.

This very act of unwillingness to exercise the strong power of the Government against South Carolina in the assertion of her right to property thus unlawfully seized, was but the signal for all of those States which have since followed her footsteps, one after the other, to pursue the same line of conduct. In Georgia your forts were seized upon; in Alabama the same thing; in Louisiana your arsenal at Baton Rouge, your Mint in the city of New Orleans, and what other property lay in that territory; and no act, on the part of your Government was attempted to protect or defend this property. In Texas—where you had troops, troops who had seen service, men who had gallantly defended the flag of our country in many a hard fought battle on the plains of Mexico; when the Texans demanded a surrender of the forts held by them, rather than precipitate the country in civil war, quietly folded the flag of their country about its staff, leaving the State to its complete possession—an agreement made by the officers that they should be allowed to depart in peace was openly violated, and the troops are now held as prisoners. State after State passed laws preventing Northern creditors from collecting their debts within their limits, thus repudiating millions of dollars due people of the North, adding thereby State injustice and dishonor to their national turpitude.

I need not continue the enumeration of these acts of aggression committed by the Southern States, for they are familiar to all here, as well as to the country. They are only alluded to now for the purpose of showing that it was the settled, fixed policy of your Government—a false policy as it was and turned out—in allowing these first acts with impunity. It failed, utterly failed, to convince these people that they were not only committing outrages, but violating the Constitution of the country.

When Congress adjourned in the month of March last, it was the belief, at separation, that between the time of our adjournment and the regular meeting in the month of December, there would be a restoration to good sense, and that in a spirit of Compromise they would come forward to settle the disturbances by which the country was agitated. Such, however, has not been the case. Magnanimity was construed into pusillanimity, and forbearance shown into conclusive evidence, to their minds, that the Government was too weak, too cowardly or supine, to assert its dignity or power. A fort in the harbor of Charleston, in the possession of a handful of soldiers, commanded by a brave officer, was held by this Government and the civilized world, day after day and week after week, to be girdled and hemmed in by fortifications totally impregnable in their character. Its commander on the one hand menaced and really by the dire necessity of hunger; they, on their side, anxious to enlist in the common cause the wavering border States, an assault was commenced with the very guns of the nation upon the already conquered fort. Not content, as the Senator from Texas (Wigfall) said upon this floor, with "slapping the Government of the United States in the face"—alluding to the firing upon the Star of the West—they found it necessary for their purpose to trample the flag of our country under their feet in humiliation and disgrace. Then it was that the people of the United States at once responded as one man: "We will assert the dignity of our Government, and show to the civilized world that we belong, as we have been classified, among the first Powers of the universe.

Mr. President, this is not a war of the Republican party against the Southern States. The fact that it has the cordial support of one million of the people of the North, who cast their votes for the Democratic nominees, negatives any such idea. Men who have been classed as leaders of the Democratic party are among your volunteers; yes sir, the majority of those in command, as well as the volunteers, as far as my knowledge extends, have been, and are now, the supporters of the principles of the Democratic party. In my own native State, Ohio, sixteen out of twenty-three Colonels are Democrats, and the rank and file are of greater proportion. Many of the ablest advocates of the Democratic party are in command; and the Chairman of the National Committee of the party of which my friend from Kentucky was the nominee, tenders his services, from the far-off shores of the Pacific, to the Government in any capacity. The issue is simply whether you will have a Government *at all*; and not by what political principle it is to be kept in existence after its vitality is restored. It is not whether this party or that party is to be predominant in your country, but whether you will maintain the position which, as a Government you have heretofore occupied in the eyes of the civilized world.

The honorable Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bright), in his classification of the shades of opinion upon this floor, alleged there were three. Sir there are four opinions represented here. There is the opinion of those who occupy the other side of the chamber. A majority of their number, I believe, prosecute this war merely for the purpose of sustaining and upholding the constituted authorities of the Government in all constitutional efforts to carry out its great objects. There is a portion of that party who seek to make this the occasion to raise a hue and cry against the institutions of slavery; and, under the plea of serving the Union and the Constitution, to destroy the rights of the Southern people in their slave property. Upon this side of the chamber are those belonging to the democratic party, who can find no condemnation for the acts of these Southern States; who withhold their support from the government of the United States in sustaining itself in this great controversy; who have in their minds a settled determination to let these States do as they please, even to dismemberment and separation. There are still others on this side of the chamber, myself among that number who have never changed one jot or tittle of our opinion in regard to the institution of slavery as a property right; who believe it their bounden duty to give both voice and vote to sustain the constituted authorities by all constitutional means.

I allege that so far as my observation has gone, the purposes, the only purposes, in the carrying out, if not in the inauguration of this war, are those which the majority of this body have, in their votes, unmistakably indicated—not to deprive the people of the South of their property; not to wage a crusade against the institutions of slavery; not, under the banner of the Union, to seek to deprive these men of their property; but, as a Democratic General from Massachusetts said, it is by the strong arm of the Government to enforce law among both the black and the white population in the States now in rebellion against your Government.

Sir, I saw the other day a resolution which, according to my idea, comes up to the whole spirit of this contest, adopted by the State of N. Hamshire by an almost unanimous vote:

"*Resolved*, That the contest now existing between the Government and the federal States that have commenced an unjustifiable war against the constitutional authority, should be regarded by all loyal men, not as a sectional war, not as an anti-slavery war, nor a war of conquest and subjugation, but simply and solely a war for the maintainance of the Government, the suppression of rebellion, and the preservation of the Magna Charta of our liberty and national unity."

The Convention of so-styled Breckinridge Democrats of my State, held in June last, had also a resolution offered in a minority report, which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That it is the duty of every Administration to uphold the Federal Constitution, maintain the integrity of the Union, and, at all hazards, enforce the laws in every section thereof; and that it is the duty of every citizen, in these times of impending danger to popular Government, to stand loyally and firmly by the constitution and laws of his country."

These resolutions announce the doctrine to which I give my support. Whenever it is discovered that the purpose of this war is not to assert the principles laid down in the resolutions that I have just read, but that, under the hue and cry of loyality to the United States, warfare is waged against the institutions of slavery, to deprive the people of the Southern States of the exercise of their property rights, I shall raise my voice, and by my vote put my seal of condemnation on any such purpose. This I am confident is the wish of my constituency, and I am proud of it. They want no such purpose. They are unwilling, as every man who respects humanity and country should be, to see 81,608,758,656 of property rest to Southern citizens, and four million slaves turned loose upon the land, hopeless, houseless, wandering mendicants. I say still more emphatically, that whenever it appears that it is the settled policy of the constituted authorities of the land, not to take "possession of the public property," not to enforce the laws," not to "collect your revenues," not to give protection to the people of the Senator from Virginia, (Mr. Carlile), and all other States, in the exercise of their inestimable privileges under the Constitution; but is to destroy their property and to liberate their slaves, this Government, belonging essentially to the "sovereign people," who have taken this matter in their own hands and under their own control, will be just as ready, and as willing, to lay down their lives against such outrageous infraction and violation of that sacred instrument, as they are now to support the Government in exercising every function within its constituted sphere.

Mr. President, I have said that in common with other gentlemen upon the floor, who have always been ardent advocates of the principles of the Democratic party, and who have not changed their views, we do condemn every single act of these Southern States, in arraying themselves in hostility to your Government. I assert further, that when the truthful pen of history comes to record all of the events so rapidly in our midst, it will inscribe that no revolution, no act of rebellion, was ever so unjustifiable, so inexcusable, so unwarantable.

Has any legal wrong been done to these States? Can any gentleman who advocates their cause point to any law upon your statute book, showing that any outrage has been committed upon them or their rights? Not one, sir. Was there any thing in the mere election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency which should have caused them to throw off their allegiance and array themselves against your Government? Nothing, nothing. Was it because he was a sectional President? We had a sectional President and Vice President as far back as 1828, when Mr. Jackson and Mr. Calhoun filled the respective positions of President and Vice President. Was it because the Government of the United States had failed to do justice to them? Not so, sir. They were, when Mr. Lincoln was elected President, if they had held their seats in this body and in the House of Representatives, in just as complete possession of your Government as they ever were. By the returns of the elections they held last year, they would have had over twenty majority in the House Representatives, and a majority of four upon this floor.

But this is not all. When I come to examine whether, in the several Departments outside of the head of the Government, any injustice has been done, what do I find upon record? As regards the Secretaries of State, you have had ten Northern Secretaries and fourteen Southern; as to the Secretary of the Treasury, fourteen Northern and nine Southern; as to the Secretary of War, fifteen Northern, sixteen Southern; as to the Secretary of the Navy, twelve Northern and thirteen Southern; as to the Postmaster General, ten Northern and seven Southern; the Attorney General, ten Northern and sixteen Southern; seventy-five of the officers of your respective Cabinets have been citizens of the South, and but seventy-one of the North. Taking from 1841 down to the present period, as to the foreign appointments, which is a fair criterion the most important period of the country—I find that to England there have been five Ministers from the North and one from the South; at the Court of France, two from the North and three from the South; to Russia, two from the North and three from the South; altogether, nine from the North and seven from the South. Going into your Executive Departments, during the late Administration, which is also a fair criterion, you find that from the Northern States there were four hundred and fifty-eight appointments, and from the Southern States four hundred and thirty-six.

No injustice, then, has been done to these gentlemen in the control of your Government and in the administration of its affairs. Their intellect and their genius, which I admire, and which I am proud to think belonged to our country, have had a far greater influence than they were entitled to, according to population, in forming the institutions of the country. That, then, is not the reason. Is it because the Government has not acted fairly towards them upon the local institution of slavery? Why, Sir, in 1793 they wanted a Fugitive Slave Law passed, and Congress gave it to them. In 1820 they wanted the Missouri Compromise, and it was given to them. In 1850 they wanted an amendment to the Fugitive Slave Law, and it was given to them. In 1854 they wanted the Missouri Compromise repealed, and it was done. Not one act have they ever asked from this Government, or from the American people, except one, to which I shall allude directly, but what has been cheerfully given; and that, too, by the support of those same Democratic Northern people who now are raising their arms and their voices to uphold and support the enforcement of the laws against the ill-miserable return of deep ingratitude.

Is it because the Fugitive Slave Law was not faithfully executed? If so, why did they not break up the Government when Franklin Pierce was elected President, in 1852? Every one knows that immediately after the Fugitive Slave Law was passed, in 1850, greater infractions of it occurred than at any former period; because it was a law peculiarly odious to the Northern people, inasmuch as it gave double fees to the Commissioner for returning the fugitive than what it did if he turned him loose. It was more odious then than at any prior period; so odious that when the late distinguished Senator from Illinois went back to his constituency in the city of Chicago, immediately after its passage, you all recollect what a reception he met. In 1852 the old ball still continued. It continued in 1854 quite as great as, if not greater, than in 1850; and if that was any reason why the Government should be broken up and dismembered, it should have been done when Mr. Pierce or his successor was elevated to the Presidency. But, sir, in 1860, I heard concurrent testimony of the Senators from Indiana (Mr. Bright and Mr. Fitch), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas), and Mr. Pugh from the State of Ohio, and Mr. Bigler from Pennsylvania, all of whom testified before this body that in the year 1860 no law of your Government was more faithfully executed in the North than the Fugitive Slave Law.

Was it the passage of those Personal Liberty Bills? Why, sir, some of them have been upon the statute books so long that they are absolutely obsolete. The personal liberty bills of New Hampshire and Vermont, that were complained of so bitterly, had gone out of the memory almost of even the best informed statesmen of that section of the country, really because—I believe I am correct in asserting—not a fugitive slave was ever arrested in either of those States. Therefore, it could not have been the passage of these bills. Neither South Carolina, Alabama nor Georgia had any right to complain, because whatever property was lost by the passage of those bills—unconstitutional, improper and unjust as they were—came from the States of Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia and the Border States, some of whom—and I wish I could say all—are even yet loyal. Those who lead the van in this rebellion have never been the sufferers from the passage of any of these laws.

Is it because they have been deprived of the enjoyment of any of the Territories of the country? Why, sirs, Senators all recollect very well that when the resolutions of the Senator from Mississippi (Davis) passed this body by an overwhelming vote, and Brown of Mississippi offered an amendment, asserting that the time had then arrived when the Government should exercise its duty in the passage of a law protecting the Southern people in their right of slave property within the Territories, there were but three members then from the South who voted for it: Mr. Mallory of Florida, Mr. Brown of Mississippi and Mr. Johnson of Arkansas. The very Winter before Mr. Lincoln was elected to the Presidency, it was declared in this body, by a vote of forty-two to three, that there was no such exigency, nor any necessity for Congress to pass any such law.

Did anything occur, I ask you, between the adjournment of the first session of the last Congress and the election of Mr. Lincoln, that had changed the features of the case? So far as your territory was concerned, I allege that in every foot of it within which slavery could exist, and within which it could in any respect be profitable, it did exist, and was protected by local, territorial legislation. I refer to New Mexico, which is not confined to the line of 36 deg. 30 min., the old Missouri Compromise line, but goes a half degree beyond it. By the legislation of that Territory, slavery, as an institution, is protected; and yet after all there are but twelve domestic slaves, and but thirty in all, according to the census of 1860. I assert still further, that so far from their being deprived of any rights which they might have according to the natural character of these Territories, the only one where any man dreams slavery as an institution could exist, is the Territory of New Mexico; and there I am satisfied it can never be profitable, even though the Territorial Legislature, Congress, and every other legislative body throughout the whole country, would give it their sanction and protection. God Almighty has placed a barrier between the institution of slavery and that Territory. It is an arid soil. It is a soil from which none of the productions for which slave labor is so admirably adapted can be forced. It is a soil utterly destitute of all the peculiar qualities necessary for or adapted to the cultivation of cotton, rice, sugar, or any other productions of slave labor. I speak upon this question knowingly, having passed over that Territory twice. Why, sir, as late as the months of August and September, upon that high table land, the nights are so cold, it was with the utmost difficulty, in passing over, I could preserve any degree of comfortable warmth.

Their fifteen States gave them thirty Senators. There was a Democratic Senator here from Oregon, two from California, one from Indiana, one from Minnesota, one from Illinois and one from New Jersey; making twenty seven. That gave a majority, as against the dominant party of the country, of six. The death of Mr. Douglas reduced the majority to four. There was a working majority in this body of four in antagonism to the principles of the party whose elevation of power they complained of, and a majority of over twenty in the House of Representatives. They had the control of the President of the United States so far that he could not have a Cabinet officer, a Minister, nay, sir, not a single appointment, without their sanction and consent. More than this; in this particular body—and I do not speak of it complainingly, because I respect the men who occupied the several positions here—they had the supreme and absolute control of all your Committees. Every important Committee (a majority of the Senate selecting them) was in the hands of a Chairman representing those States now in rebellion, and they could have moulded and controlled your policy just as completely as any former period.

Now, sir, what is the fact in regard to the Committees? Virginia had the Chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was held by Mr. Mason. The Chairmanship of the Committee on Military Affairs was held by Mr. Davis; on Finance, Mr. Hunter of Virginia; on Naval affairs, Mr. Mallory of Florida; on Commerce, Mr. Clay of Alabama; on the Judiciary, Mr. Bayard of Delaware; on Post Offices and Post Roads, Mr. Yulee of Florida. The little State of Florida, which has not as many votes as one of the counties of the State that I represent, held the Chairmanship of two of the most important Committees in this body, and every Senator here knows how much influence the Chairman of these respective Committees have in controlling the legislation and action of your Government. Mr. Crittenden was Chairman of the Committee on Revolutionary Claims; Mr. Johnson of Arkansas, of the Committee on Public Lands; Mr. Iverson of Georgia, of the Committee on Claims; Mr. Benjamin of Louisiana, of the Committee on Private Land Claims; Mr. Brown of Mississippi, of the Committee on the District of Columbia; Mr. Sebastian of Arkansas, of the Committee on Indian Affairs; Mr. Green of Missouri, of the Committee of Territories; Mr. Johnson of Tennessee, of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; Mr. Saulsbury of Delaware, of the Committee on Enrolled Bills; and Mr. Pearce of Maryland, of the Committee on the Library. The only positions allowed to gentlemen on this floor representing the Northern Democracy, or North ern constituency, of Mr. Thomson of New Jersey, as Chairman of the Committee on Pensions; Mr. Bigler of Pennsylvania, as Chairman of the Committee on Patents and Patent Office; Mr. Bright of Indiana, as Chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; Mr. Lane of Oregon, as Chairman of the Committee on Engrossed Bills; and Mr. Fitch of Indiana, as Chairman of the Committee on Printing. Sir, these Committees would have continued so by a majority of four, and these gentlemen would have occupied these several positions if the Southern Senators had remained in their seats.

Look, then, has any outrage ever been done to these States in depriving them of their privileges in controlling and administering your Government? They have always held the Government in their power. Sir, I assert, as a member of the Democratic party, one who has raised his voice always in support of their principles and who has never changed his views relative to their institutions, that they have held and controlled the Government of the country, although they have now nine million of people, and two thirds of the population of the United States reside in the free States. Why, sir, during the seventy-two years of our political existence under the Constitution of 1787, they have had control of the Government for forty-nine years and three months. They have had eight Southern Presidents and seven Northern Presidents. The Northern Presidents have had control of the Government but twenty years and nine months. For over two-thirds of the time since its formation, this Government has been administered by gentlemen the direct representatives of those States.

Then, Mr. President, these were none of the reasons. The history of the country shows they had no cause of complaint as to the action of the Government upon any of the questions I have cited. The only cause ever attempted to be given on this floor was apprehension for the future; that notwithstanding they had the control of both branches of Congress and an impartial Supreme Court, and no one law on the statute book prejudicial to their interests, yet at some future time, from the foreshadowed policy of the dominant party, they feared their institutions might be in jeopardy. Now, sir, I assert that if they had remained on the floor, doing but their duty to the country, to act wrongly the party in power could ever have been consummated. I allege further, that having the control of both branches of Congress they could, as the record proves, have amended the Constitution by a two-thirds vote, and, having appealed to the States for a three-fourths vote, so ratified it that neither Congress nor the Executive could interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in the several States. Why, sir, even after they had left this body, and when we were reduced to barely thirty-six members, there were then twenty-four on this floor who did vote for such an amendment to the Constitution. It passed then by two thirds of the House of Representatives, and requires but the sanction of three-fourths of the States of the Union to make the amendment a permanent portion of the Constitution.

Mr. President, being last Winter a careful eye witness of all that occurred, I soon became satisfied that it was a deliberate, willful design on the part of some Representatives of Southern States, to seize upon the election of Mr. Lincoln merely as an excuse to precipitate this revolution upon the country. One evidence to my mind is the fact that South Carolina never sent her Senators here. An additional evidence is, that when gentlemen on this floor, by their votes, could have controlled legislation, they refused to cast them, for fear that the very propositions submitted to this body might have an influence in changing the opinions of their constituencies. Why, sir, when the resolutions submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Clark) were offered as an amendment to the Crittenden propositions, for the manifest purpose of embarrassing the latter; and the vote taken on the 16th of January, 1861, I ask, what did we see? There were fifty-five Senators at that time upon this floor in person. The *Globe* of the second session Thirty-Sixth Congress, part on page 403, shows that upon the call of the yeas and nays immediately preceding the vote on the substituting of Mr. Clark's amendment, there were fifty-five votes cast. I will read the vote, from the *Globe*:

Yeas—Anthony, Baker, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, King, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson and Wilson—25.

Nays—Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Clingman, Crittenden, Douglas, Fitch, Green, Gwin, Hemphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Pugh, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Saulsbury, Sebastian, Slidell and Wigfall—30.

The vote being taken immediately after on the Clark proposition, was as follows:

Yeas—Anthony, Baker, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, King, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson and Wilson—25.

Nays—Bayard, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Clingman, Crittenden, Fitch, Green, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Saulsbury and Sebastian—23.

Six Senators retained their seats and refused to vote, thus themselves allowing the Clark proposition to supplant the Crittenden resolution by the vote of 25 to 23. Mr. Benjamin of Louisiana, Mr. Hemphill and Mr. Wigfall of Texas, Mr. Iverson of Georgia, Mr. Johnson of Arkansas, and Mr. Slidell of Louisiana, were in their seats, but refused to cast their votes. I recollect full well the joy that pervaded the faces of some of these gentlemen at the result, and the sorrow manifested by the venerable Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden). The record shows that Mr. Pugh, from Ohio, despairing of any compromise between the extremes of ultra Republicanism and disunionists, working manifestly for the same end, moved, immediately after the vote was announced, to lay the whole subject on the table. If you will turn to page 443, same volume, you will find, when, at a later period, Mr. Cameron, from Pennsylvania, moved to reconsider the vote, appeals having been made to certain those who were struggling to preserve the peace of the country, that the vote was reconsidered; and when, at last, the Crittenden propositions were submitted on the 2d day of March, these Southern States having nearly all seceded, they were then lost by but one vote. Here is the vote.

Yeas—Bayard, Bigler, Bright, Crittenden, Douglas, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Polk, Pugh, Rice, Sebastian, Thompson and Wigfall—19.

Nays—Anthony, Bingham, Chandler, Clark, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Harlan, King, Morrill, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson and Wilson—20.

If these seceding Southern Senators had remained, there would have passed, by a large vote, (as it did without them), an amendment by a two-thirds vote, forbidding Congress ever interfering with slavery in the States. The Crittenden proposition would have been inclosed by a majority vote, the subject finally going before the people, who have never yet, after consideration, refused justice, for any length of time, to any portion of the country.

I believe more, Mr. President, that these gentlemen were acting in pursuance of a settled and fixed plan to break up and destroy this Government. I believe also, there has been a scheme of these leading politicians of the Southern states for nearly a quarter of a century, who have been constantly working with a view to destroy this Government of the United States in order to form a Government of their own, the corner stone of which should be the institution of slavery, as is alleged by the present Vice President of the Southern Confederacy that they have never ceased working, year in and year out, towards the consummation of their purpose. Why, sir, immediately after the election of Mr. Lincoln, in the month of December, he whom I regard as their master spirit in this attempt, both from his eloquence and sagacity, published a letter in which he asserts that though the people of the United States as represented on this floor, may give them compromises, even constitutional compromises, the favorable moment having arrived, the South must still declare its independence of the United States of America.

Referring to the Hon. William L. Yancey, I call the attention of the Senate to a communication of his, written and published early in the month of December of the past year:

"I hope that Georgia and Alabama, the mother and daughter States, will not be found separate and in opposing position in this great struggle for State rights and Southern liberties. Alabama will, most assuredly secede first, and make efforts at co-operation for a Southern Confederacy afterwards. No proffered compromises, no amendments to the Constitution, no proffered additional guarantees, can delay her actions for independence a moment. There is no defect in our fundamental law; therefore it needs no alteration. The great defect in the Union is the public conscience and education of the Northern masses upon the slavery question, which begets an irreconcilable conflict between them and that institution, and of course between them and all constitutional provisions which protect that institution. When parties and rulers can control such conscience and eradicate such education, and can then propose new guarantees, it might be worth our while to pause and consider them; but not till then. In the language of my far seeing, deep thinking and fearless friend, Judge Benning, there should be but one watchword now for all the sons of the South, and that, Ho! for independence!"

This was the pronunciamento of the leading spirit of the whole movement as early as the month of December last, before even the Electoral College had met, or the votes were counted, and it was distinctly ascertained who was elected President of the United States. "Ho for independence!" had been the cry for a quarter of a century of these conspirators, who have been seeking under the pretext of nullification, and now the constitutional right of secession, the favorable moment and excuse to assert their independence and array themselves in hostility to the Government. This doctrine of secession is but the shadow of an excuse. I do not believe there are many intelligent men in the South who sincerely believe in this new-fangled doctrine of the constitutional right of a State to secede from the Union. I do not believe that they can be so lost to reason, so lost to the objects of our Government, as to assert that any State, at a notion, may withdraw itself from the Union, itself being the only judge of the cause and the necessity for such withdrawal.