

STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

Civil War Text

Civil War

8-21-1855

Speech of Hon. Salmon P. Chase.

Salmon P. Chase

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/civilwar-text>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

S P E E C H

OF

HON. SALMON P. CHASE,

DELIVERED AT THE

REPUBLICAN MASS MEETING

In Cincinnati, August 21, 1855;

TOGETHER WITH EXTRACTS FROM HIS SPEECHES IN THE SENATE
ON KINDRED SUBJECTS.

COLUMBUS:
PRINTED BY THE OHIO STATE JOURNAL COMPANY.
1855.

SPEECH

HON. SALMON P. CHASE

DELIVERED AT NEW

REPUBLICAN MASS MEETING

In Cincinnati, August 31, 1850.

PRINTED BY THE OHIO STATE JOURNAL COMPANY
COLUMBUS

MR. CHASE'S SPEECH

AT THE REPUBLICAN MASS MEETING,

Cincinnati, August 21, 1855.

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Citizens :

More than thirty years have passed away since I, then a mere boy, became a dweller in this city. Few of those whom I now see before me have been here so long: to none of you, I am sure, is the prosperity of this beautiful city, or the advancement, in all respects, of her noble institutions, more dear. A boy citizen of the city before most of you were born, I have witnessed her progress with mingled pride, joy and gratitude; and in my measure and sphere have diligently sought, and shall always seek, to promote her welfare. Here in Cincinnati are all my interests centered. If she prospers, I partake in her prosperity. If she suffers, I, as well as the rest of you, must share the reverse.

Bound thus to you by common interests, and common hopes, and common affections, I stand before you to night in a position which, not many months since, I little dreamed of occupying: as the nominee of a great and powerful party for a high and responsible position—not one, it is true, invested with any control over Legislative action, nor indeed with any considerable power of any kind; but high and respectable nevertheless, because he who fills it must be taken to represent, in the great leading principles which he avows, the opinions of the people by whom he is elected.

You are aware, fellow citizens, that it has been my fortune, since my nomination as a candidate for Governor, to be assailed with envenomed bitterness. My whole past life—my entire political history has been ransacked for topics of accusation. Why I am thus pursued it seems hard to conjecture. I have never been the enemy of those who now start up as my enemies. They have suffered no wrong, no unkindness from me. And while I do not claim any immunity from error or freedom from faults, I dare boldly say that there is nothing in my political life which I hesitate to submit to the severest scrutiny.

The convention which placed me in nomination was composed of citizens from all political organizations, united by a common determination to resist the aggressions of the Slave Power, and especially to right the great wrong of the repeal of the Missouri Restriction. Among its members were numerous citizens whose experience in public affairs, genuine love of country and eminent abilities, entitled them to that large share of public confidence which they en-

joyed. By this convention, and by a majority unusually large, I was placed in nomination. I had asked no human being to support me. I had even sought the permission of my friends to withdraw my name from the canvass. I would cheerfully and zealously have supported either of the distinguished gentlemen who were proposed for nomination. Nominated under such circumstances, I could not but be sensible that it was not because of any superior merit of mine, but because circumstance which have transpired during the last two years have identified me with a struggle in which the people of the country take a deep and abiding interest. In the Senate of the United States I have labored incessantly and to the uttermost of my ability to resist and arrest the greatest outrage of our generation, the ruthless subversion of that guarantee of Free Institutions which our Fathers had provided for the Northwest in the Missouri Prohibition. It was to mark its own abhorrence of this outrage, and to afford to the people of Ohio an opportunity of testifying their abhorrence of it, that the convention selected me as the standard bearer of Freedom during the political campaign in which we are now engaged.

It gratifies me to know that whatever may have been the political differences between myself and great numbers of those whom the Repeal of the Missouri Prohibition aroused to a lively sense of the necessity of resisting the aggressions of Slavery, the vast majority of the People who united last fall in the People's movement against Slavery, acquiesced cheerfully in the action of the Convention, and are giving me a cordial and vigorous support. Discontented men there must be in all organizations. In an organization like ours, such men are necessarily somewhat more numerous than in parties hardened by time and consolidated by interest. Opposition from such men was to be expected; and such opposition we encounter.

We had a right, however, to expect that it would be conducted with fairness and candor. I had a right to expect that in dealing with my public conduct and character, the obligations of truth and justice would not be wholly disregarded. But the most reckless charges are perseveringly made, without foundation. These charges are not all new. Some of them are old calumnies revived for the new occasion.

Hitherto, fellow citizens, I have never noticed these calumnies. My time, I thought, might be more profitably devoted to the public service. I felt, also, an abiding confidence that if it should please God to continue my life, I should live down these imputations; while, on the other hand, if I descended to a premature grave, Death, the great revealer, would bury all these calumnies in my grave.

The position in which I now stand before the People of Ohio, imposes upon me, however, a different duty. As the representative of a great political organization, which may receive damage from a belief in the truth of these charges, it becomes my duty to repel them. I break, therefore the silence which I should prefer to maintain, and will reply briefly but decisively to these accusations.

You, my fellow citizens, are my judges. You constitute that great tribunal of the country to which every public man must appeal. I know you are just. My appeal is to your justice. I do not invoke your sympathy. I wish only to be assured, and of that I am assured, that in your hearts there is no disposition to condemn me unheard, without reason and against proof.

The first charge which I shall dispose of to-night, relates to my election to the Senate six years ago. It has been made in this place, from the platform, during my absence in the Eastern States, and reiterated in the public prints by the same accuser. I never saw a paper containing this revamped accusation over a responsible name, until to-day. I mean to reply to it frankly, to-night. It would have given me more pleasure could I have seen the author, and convinced him of it before. But as that has been impossible, I now repel it publicly, and leave it to the author to retract it if he sees fit.

The charge is this: that Messrs. Townshend and Randall decided the constitutional question whether Messrs. Pugh and Pierce, or Messrs. Spencer and Runyan, were entitled to seats in the Ohio Legislature, at the session of 1848-9, in favor of Messrs. Pugh and Pierce, in consideration that "Mr. Chase should be elected to the United States Senate;" that "this decision was in pursuance of express contract, reduced to writing, signed by the parties;" that "this contract was in Mr. Chase's own hand-writing, and for many months on exhibition at a printing office in this city." This is the charge.

Now, it so happens that Mr. Randall was not a member of the House, but of the Senate, that winter, and uniformly from first to last opposed my election. This, however, is an inaccuracy which is only worth mentioning, because it shows how carelessly the charge was made. It is with the main charge that I have to deal, and that charge I meet with a broad, unqualified denial of its truth. No such contract was ever made. No such decision was ever made upon any such consideration. No such contract exists or ever existed in my handwriting, or in the handwriting of any body else. I will not say that the maker of the charge did not believe it to be true; for I will not follow his example, and impeach motives; but I will say that the charge was rashly and carelessly made—more rashly

and carelessly than became a man who has once occupied a judicial station. It is untrue in all its parts.

What was the transaction which actually took place? The Legislature had passed an act dividing Hamilton county into two districts, and had assigned to the county five Representatives—two to be elected by the city district and three by the county district. The democrats denied the constitutionality of this division, and voted for five Representatives from the whole county. The whigs, on the other hand, asserted its constitutionality, and voted for two Representatives from the city district, and for three from the county district. The democrats had a majority in the whole county; the whigs had a majority in the city district. If the act was constitutional therefore, the whigs had elected two members; if the act was unconstitutional the democrats had elected five.—The question finally assumed this form: are Messrs. Spencer and Runyan, whigs, having received a majority of votes in the city district, entitled to seats as Representatives from Hamilton county, or are Messrs. Pugh and Pierce, who received a majority of all the votes in the county, entitled to those seats?

Now, the House of Representatives is the sole judge, under the Constitution, of the returns and qualifications of its members. The question which arose was therefore to be decided by the House, and by the House alone. If the House should adjudge the division law unconstitutional, the two democrats must necessarily be admitted to their seats—if constitutional, the whigs must be admitted.

Now, the question whether this division law was constitutional or not had been much debated. Some eminent whigs had declared that the Legislature possessed no power to divide counties for election purposes. Of this opinion were nearly all the democrats. The great majority of the whigs asserted the contrary position.

It was my opinion, never concealed from any body, that the Legislature possessed no power to divide a county. It is now no sort of consequence whether this opinion was right or wrong. I only mention it because I understand that some persons have been reckless enough to say that I declared myself at first in favor of the division, and afterwards took the opposite ground.

Well, the constitutional question which then arose was decided in favor of the democratic claimants, and they were admitted to their seats. And it was this decision which is alleged to have been "made upon express contract, reduced to writing"—"in Mr. Chase's own hand writing."

If there were truth in this charge, no man should vote for me for any office. Such a contract would be as objectionable as a contract with a Judge, that some friend or relation should be appointed to an office in consideration of a judicial decision in favor of parties able to control the appointment. I give up such a character to whatever reprobation my assailant may choose to bestow upon it. But, I repeat, no such condemnation touches me. The

charge that such a contract was written by me—that such a contract was written by any body—that such a contract was ever made at all—has not a word of truth in it. No such writing exists, unless such a writing has been forged for villainous ends. Neither I nor any friend of mine knew how either of the gentlemen then admitted to seats would vote in the Senatorial election, until weeks afterwards. The gentlemen live among you, and one of them (Mr. Pugh) is my successor in the Senate; the other (Mr. Pierce) is well known in this community. Both are now political opponents of mine—but neither would hesitate to speak the truth in this behalf. Why did not my assailants ascertain the truth from them before they ventured upon his accusation? Was it fair, or just, or manly, to seek the injury of me, who had never injured him, by making charges, even though he believed them to be well-founded, without the ability to produce evidence in support of that belief? Let him now produce his evidence, if he has any, or let him retract his accusation. I defy him or any other accuser to show in my whole action in reference to this matter of my election, any deviation whatever from the path which honor or duty would prescribe.

It is true that my election, as well as all the other elections of that winter, were effected through the joint action of the Democratic and Independent Democratic or Free-soil members of the Legislature; and that this joint action was the result of a political understanding or arrangement. There were three parties in the Legislature—the Old Line Democrats, the Independent Democrats or Free-soilers, and the Whigs. The Free-soilers were anxious to have a Senator independent of old party organizations, who would resist the aggressions of the Slave Power, without being trammelled by party associations. They did not care what party the Judges of the Supreme Court should belong to, provided they were qualified for their stations. They were willing to elect Whig Judges or Democratic Judges, if otherwise capable and fit, provided either Whigs or Democrats would unite with them in the election of an Independent Senator. The Whigs could not agree to vote for any man whom the Free-soilers wished to elect—the Democrats were willing to vote for me. Of course I was elected. On the same day Judge Spalding and Caldwell were elected to the Supreme Bench. The former is now among the ablest and truest champions of the Republican cause—the other enjoys the confidence and respect of the People in as large a measure as he. This was the whole arrangement, so far as Senator and Supreme Judges were concerned.

There was a further understanding in reference to the other appointments to be made by the Legislature. I do not remember its details, I do remember, however, that the plan which I thought equitable, and which I took the liberty of suggesting to some prominent members of the Legislature, was to elect Associate Judges for the counties according to the political character of the respective counties, as indicated by the pluralities at the Presidential election—giving to counties where Democrats had pluralities, Democratic Associates; to Whig counties

Whig Associates, and to Free-soil counties, Free-soil Associates. Such, however, was the force of party feeling, that the suggestion was disregarded, and the Associate Judges, as well as all other public officers, to be appointed by the Legislature, were selected from the Democratic and Free-soil parties.

Now, will anybody tell me how any appointments at all could have been made without some such union as actually took place? No one could be appointed to any office, without a majority of votes. Neither party by itself had a majority. Each party by itself was in a minority. To effect any appointments at all therefore, two of the minorities must unite. They would naturally and almost necessarily select their appointees from one or the other of the parties represented by them. This is what actually took place, and this is all that did take place at the session of 1848-'49. The union was then between the Democrats and Free-soilers. The very next session the Legislature was again divided between the same three parties, neither having a majority. What then took place? The Whigs and Democrats made an agreement for united action, and divided the appointments between Whigs and Democrats, excluding the Free-soilers altogether.

The difference between the last arrangement and the first was only in the fact that the former was between parties holding at that time the same general political principles, though differing in organization, while the latter was between parties decidedly opposed in principle as well as in organization.

After all, the great question in regard to appointments made by such unions, is the same as that which should be made in respect to appointments made by a majority party:—Are the appointees fit and capable? Do they represent the principles—will they be faithful to the interests of the People of the State? It is of very little consequence whether they represent a majority organization or not.

Now, as to the Judges appointed at the session of 1848-'9, I have heard no complaint. It is not denied that they were all able and upright men. As to the fitness or capability of the Senator, it is not for me to speak. It is enough for me to know, that during my term of service, no one has reproached me with want of fidelity, either to the interests or to the people of Ohio. No one accuses me of having lost an opportunity of promoting the interests either of the State or of this great city, or of any place or citizen needing my services. It was my hand which drafted the first appropriation for the erection of Public Buildings in the West for the accommodation of Customs, the Courts, and the Post Offices in the United States. In virtue of that first appropriation, the United States Public Buildings are now rising in this city. Similar structures are soon to be erected under provisions drafted by me, in several of the Lake cities. Through my exertions a bill to cede to the State all the Public Lands of the United States was twice carried through the Senate. Uniformly, zealously, perseveringly I have supported the policy of improving the Rivers and Harbors of the West. Through

the weary hours of the night I have watched, even till the dawn of day, for an opportunity to propose an appropriation for these and other objects beneficial to Ohio. During the very last session, I had the pleasure of carrying through the Senate an appropriation of two hundred thousand dollars for the improvement of the Ohio, and twenty-five thousand dollars a year to make the Louisville and Portland Canal free, and keep it in repair. Let me be pardoned, fellow-citizens, for referring to them.—I do it only that you may be induced to acquaint yourselves with the whole course of my public life. I feel a proud consciousness that it will bear investigation, and the more you investigate, the less you will be willing to permit one who has served you faithfully to be prejudiced in your esteem by misrepresentation and detraction.

I shall proceed now to expose another groundless charge. I find copied in the *Ohio Statesman* a resolution which it is alleged sanctions the doctrine that a public officer may take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, with a mental reservation that he will set at nought any part of it which, in his judgment, is inconsistent with moral duty. I will read the resolution if any one desires it. (Cries of Read, Read.) Here it is:

“Resolved, That we hereby give it to be distinctly understood that Abolitionists”—[here the *Statesman* editor inserts the injunction to his readers, ‘Mark the emphatic and deliberate language’]—“considering that the strength of our cause lies in its righteousness, and our hopes for it in our conformity to the laws of God and our support of the rights of man, we owe to the Sovereign Ruler of the universe as a proof of our allegiance to Him in all our civil relations and offices, whether as friends, citizens, or as public functionaries sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, to regard and treat the third clause of the instrument, whenever applied in the case of a fugitive slave, as utterly null and void, and consequently as forming no part of the Constitution, whenever we are called upon or sworn to support it.”

Now the editor of the *Statesman*, in the article from which I have just read, speaking of this very resolution, says: “We happen to have at our hand a resolution, drawn by his own hand and presented by him to a State Convention of his old peculiar party, in which he applies the term Abolitionist to himself and his party. In this resolution Mr. Chase confesses it to be his duty as an Abolitionist, ‘when he takes an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, to resolve at the same time to violate a portion of that instrument.’” He then quotes the resolution itself just as I have read it.

Now, fellow-citizens, would anybody suppose that a charge like this would be deliberately put forth without a single particle of evidence in support of it? Observe how circumstantial it is:—“We happen to have at hand a resolution drawn by his own hand.” Would you not suppose that the editor had lying before him a resolution in my hand writing? (Cries of Yes, certainly.) What then must you think of this editor, when I tell you neither this resolution

nor any similar one was ever written by me at all. (Laughter.) I understand that he has since explained that he only meant to be understood as saying that he had at hand a printed resolution, the original of which was written by me. But I never wrote the resolution at all, and he ought to know it.

Why, this resolution was first attributed to me some ten years ago in the Cincinnati *Gazette*, then edited by Judge John C. Wright. I knew him to be an upright and honorable gentleman, and that he must have been misinformed. I therefore addressed a note to him denying the authorship, which was printed in the *Gazette*. There I supposed the thing would rest. Some years afterwards, however, when I entered the Senate of the United States, some wretched scavenger, such as the North always furnishes to purvey materials for attacks on Northern men who will not bow the knee to the Slave Power, raked up this resolution and handed it to Mr. Butler of South Carolina, who made it the basis of an assault upon me. I repelled the charge at once, and so decisively that it was never afterwards alluded to even in the Senate. Here is part of what I said, taken from the Appendix to the Congressional Globe for 1849. “I am not sorry, Mr. President, that the Senator from South Carolina has deemed my humble life worthy of his investigation. He can find nothing in the history of that life which I am unwilling to have known—nothing in any opinions advanced by me which I am not ready to defend. But, Sir, I do not choose to be held responsible for opinions not mine. This newspaper ascribes to me the paternity of a resolution supposed to recognize the propriety of a mental reservation in a certain case. I have only to say that I never proposed the resolution—never voted for the resolution—never would propose or vote for such a resolution.”

Later in the same debate, in reply to some inquiry from Senator Mason of Virginia, I said:

“The resolution was presented at a mass convention of what was called the Liberty party. I was present, and was a member of the committee on Resolutions. The resolution in question was submitted to this committee, who declined to report it for the action of the convention. It was opposed by me in the committee room, but I cannot say how far the action of the committee was attributed to this. It was afterwards introduced to the convention when I was not present, and was adopted, after a speech, as often happens in such cases, without discussion or examination. It did not express, in my judgment, the views of the convention or of the party. Is the Senate satisfied?”

To this question Mr. Mason responded, “Perfectly, sir,” and there the matter rested.

Now the editor of the *Statesman* is an active and veteran politician. Is it possible that the refutation of this charge in the *Gazette* and in the Senate could have escaped his notice? His own files furnish the evidence that it did not. Not only so, but after the correction in the speech to which I have just referred, he noticed its occurrence in the *Statesman*, stated that I denied the charge made, and that “Southern members expressed themselves satisfied.”

What excuse, under these circumstances, can the editor of the Statesman give for reviving this charge? Why, if it was made inadvertently, has he not manfully and honorably retracted it? The great English poet, enumerating the different degrees of falsehood, mentions the lie circumstantial, the lie inferential, etc., and finally the lie direct. This lie in the Statesman may not come under the third head, but certainly, if uttered understandingly and persevered in after a knowledge of the facts, is included in both the others.

Next comes the charge of Disunionism. This is the great cry by which the adherents of the administration, imbecile for good and powerful only for evil, hope to arrest the great popular movement for freedom, which endangers their political ascendancy. This too is the cry by which the bolters from the ranks of the People seek to justify the aid and comfort which they give to the administration party in the State and in the Nation. This cry is directed against me alone, not because I hold any opinion or propose any course of action not held or proposed by every other nominee upon our State ticket, but because they well know that if they can defeat the Republican nominee for Governor, future union among the opponents of the State and National Administrations will be rendered well nigh impossible, and the power and patronage of the State and Nation will be permanently secured to the party which now exercises and abuses both.

But this accusation is as groundless as the others. I a disunionist! Much that I have written, much that I have spoken, has found its way into the public prints. Many addresses and speeches of mine have been published and widely circulated. What I have said in the Senate remains and must remain in the public records of the country, open to the inspection of all men. Let my accusers point to a single paragraph, a single sentence, a single word, containing a disunion sentiment. Let them point to a single paragraph or a single sentence upon the subject of the Union, that is not full of loyalty to it. Let them do this, or else forever hereafter hold their peace.

No man, fellow-citizens, cherishes a warmer or more earnest devotion to the Union of these States, than the man who now stands before you. Founded on the principles of the Declaration of Independence, cemented by the Constitution, and protected by the patriotism of the People, it seems to me fit to endure forever. God himself prepared this place for it. In the place which he prepared, our Fathers framed it. Here it has expanded, and strengthened as it has grown into a mighty confederacy of thirty-one States, stretching from the gulf of Mexico to the Northern extremity of Maine, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. Its great Mountains and their vast range from North to South, seem to keep guard over it. Grand Rivers flowing through every part, unite, while they divide its States. Iron bands, provided by the genius of commerce, gird all round the mighty structure. Nothing but madness and folly, trampling on freedom, and contemning justice, can ever justify, can ever destroy or

weaken it. God grant that it may endure forever, a monument of his goodness, of the wisdom of our Fathers and the patriotism of their sons.

It is true, fellow-citizens, that in both sections of our country, there are men who lightly esteem the Union. Mr. Garrison and his associates in the North, despairing of the redemption of our land from the evils of Slavery, while the Union remains, seek the deliverance of the Slave through its dissolution. With the disunion doctrines of Mr. Garrison and his associates, I have no sympathy. The nullifiers of the South, insisting that through the Union the system of Slavery is endangered, cry also for dissolution. With the disunion doctrines of the nullifiers of the South, I have no sympathy.

But there is one remarkable difference between those who cry disunion in the North, and those who utter the same cry in the South. The disunionists of the North take no part in political conflicts, and exert no political influence. The disunionists of the South engage actively in political strife, and at the present moment control the action of that party in the Slave States which dictates to the present administration its policy of slave propagandism.

I have a sample of the sentiments of the Slave State disunionists, taken from the *Charleston Mercury*, a paper which sustains Franklin Pierce. It is an account of a meeting of a party of these nullifiers at Whippy Swamp—suggestive name—in South Carolina. It was held on the 4th of July, and this was one of the applauded sentiments:

"The Day we celebrate—It was consecrated to Freedom by the Disunionists of 1776. We do well to keep the day—we should do better to imitate the deed."

These gentlemen of Whippy Swamp, you see, not only brand our Fathers who made the Union, as disunionists, but broadly intimate that our Republican Government is as obnoxious to them as the British Monarchy, and propose to get rid of it by disunion!

Have our political opponents—the supporters of the existing State and National administrations—any thing to say against the Whippy Swamp disunionists? Do you not know that when they say any thing at all of these men, they always speak under the whole apprehensions which the name of Whippy Swamp inevitably suggests? Do you not know that when the Whippy Swamp disunionists get to Washington, they are invited to the highest seats at the Democratic—I beg pardon—the Administration feast? Do you not know that from the Whippy Swamp disunionists are selected Chiefs of Committees in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, Foreign Ministers, and heads of Departments? Why, the disunionists of Whippy Swamp are the rulers of our National Rulers. Not in the North—not in free Ohio, where the Nebraska-Kansas outrage was greeted with thunder tones of indignation—does the National Administration find its chief strength and main support, but in the Whippy Swamps of the Carolinas and the Slave States.

This disunionism is very tolerable to our po-

litical opponents; for these disunionists supply their leaders.

But neither this disunionism nor any disunionism is acceptable to me.

In Whippy Swamp, and elsewhere in South Carolina, there are expert calculators of the value of the Union. Their political economists and political mathematicians have cyphered it all out. They can tell you how much the Union is worth to a very vulgar fraction.

I have no skill in such computations, and I want none. Standing in the Senate, and addressing its presiding officer as your Representative, fellow-citizens, I said: "Mr. President, I have never calculated the value of the Union. I know of no arithmetic by which the computation can be made. We of the West are in the habit of looking upon the Union as we look upon the arch of Heaven, without a thought that it can decay or fall."—"Sacred to Ohio," I exclaimed on another occasion, "is the Union of the States." Did I misrepresent you, my fellow-citizens, when I thus declared my own sentiments and yours? (Cries of no, no.) If then hereafter any propagator of slander shall charge me with disunion, I feel that I may safely rely on your justice as well as your generosity to rebuke the calumniator and vindicate the truth.

And now let me say a few words about Abolitionism—that word of terror, by repeating which, in every variety of intonation, our opponents hope to scare full grown men.

I shall not undertake to define abolitionism, or to describe an abolitionist. But I will tell you frankly what my position is now, and ever has been, in relation to slavery.

It is that of Washington, Jefferson and Franklin; it is that of the founders of the Republic.

The great men who framed our Constitution, conferred on Congress no power to institute or maintain slavery by national legislation; nor did they confer on Congress any power to interfere by national legislation with slavery in the States.

At the time of the promulgation of the Constitution, slavery was allowed in most of the States by State Constitutions, and regulated by State Laws—but there was not a foot of National territory in which a slave could be held, unless in violation of positive law. At that time there was no national territory except that Northwest of the Ohio, and in that territory, by the Jefferson proviso, incorporated into the Ordinance of 1787, and by the unanimous consent of all the States in the Congress of the Confederation, slavery had been forever prohibited. Our National Government, therefore, went into operation upon the principle of **NO SLAVERY OUTSIDE OF SLAVE STATES**—upon the principle that **SLAVERY IS LOCAL, NOT NATIONAL**.

At that time, also, there were seven free States in the Union—not, it is true, of States in which slavery had been absolutely abolished, but of States in which the ultimate extinction of slavery was certain, and the State policy was on the side of Freedom. The number of slave States was only six, and in some of them it was confidently expected that provision would soon be made by law for the eradication of slavery.

Then there was a majority of free States in

the Union at the outset of the national career, and the Ordinance of 1787 made provision for the permanence of the majority by declaring that not less than three nor more than five States should be created out of the territory in which by its own action Slavery was forever prohibited.

Thus fellow-citizens, our National Government may be fairly said to be based on three great principles in respect to Slavery—non-interference by the National Government with Slavery within slave States—non-extension of Slavery beyond the limits of the slave States—a perpetual majority of free States in the Union.

Our actual history demonstrates the fact, that only one of these three principles has been practically applied. The national government has never interfered with Slavery in the slave States, but slavery has been extended far beyond State limits; and the slaveholders have insisted, and during much the greater part of our historical period, have actually been allowed to have as many slave States as there have been free States in the Union.

The original policy of the fathers of the Republic has been subverted. We simply demand its restoration. We "want indemnity for the past and security for the future." (Cheers.) Neither I nor any other Republican, so far as I know, proposes any interference with slavery in any State. What we demand is, that slavery shall not be extended or permitted in any territory outside of slave States. None among us would change any constitutional right or privilege now belonging to a State allowing slavery within its limits; but we insist that no such right or privilege shall be abused to the subversion of liberty in free States. *Ohio Freedom will not interfere with Kentucky Slavery—Kentucky Slavery must not interfere with Ohio Freedom.* (Earnest applause.)

If this be abolitionism, then Washington, Jefferson, Henry, Madison, Adams, Franklin, and a great host of patriots, of names only less conspicuous than these, were abolitionists. All these illustrious men hated slavery. Most of them have left on record to be transmitted from generation to generation, their stern condemnation of the system. All of them longed for the coming time in which the whole land should be delivered by the constitutional action of the National and State Government, from this its greatest curse. Where they stood, I stand.—What they felt, I feel. What they labored to accomplish, I labor—but oh! with what disproportionate energy and ability, to accomplish. In the methods and by the rules also which they observed, I aim to act—not seeking or expecting to interfere by national legislation, or by the legislation of any free State, with the internal affairs of any slave State; but firmly resolved to "to resist the spread of slavery," to "oppose its existence in any national territory," and to oppose also "the further increase of slave territory or slave States in this Republican confederacy."

If this be abolitionism, who of you is not abolitionist? But we well know that the charge of abolitionism is always intended to convey more than this. It is always designed to impute a

rash, headlong zeal to get rid of slavery, by whatever means, fair or unfair, without regard to the constitution, without respect to the rights of the States, and in contempt of our obligations to the Union. In this sense, I certainly am not, and I think that none of you, my fellow-citizens, are abolitionists. When therefore, you hear such a charge made against me hereafter, treat it, I beseech you, with the contempt it merits.

Fellow-citizens, I have endeavored to state to you with clearness and precision, the principles and policy of the Republican party on the great and prominent question of slavery. What, on the other hand, are the principles and policy of our opponents?—of the supporters of the existing State and National Administrations? They claim to be the Democracy—but their Democracy is like the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet omitted. It is the thing in name only—nothing more. They go no longer up to the Jerusalem of the true worship, but have made for themselves calves at Bethel and Dan. They have abandoned the creed taught by Jefferson, the great apostle of the Democratic faith, and have hitched themselves to the teachings of the new political saints, St. Stephen and St. Franklin. With these new leaders, instead of battling for equal rights and exact justice for all men, they boldly march upon a crusade against Freedom.

Is not this true? Let history answer. In 1848 the democratic party in Ohio assumed a bold and decided anti-slavery position. Here is their resolution, adopted in State Convention on the 8th of January of that year:

Resolved, That the people of Ohio, now as they have always done, look upon the institution of Slavery in any part of the Union, as an evil, and unfavorable to the full development of the spirit and practical benefits of our free institutions; and that, entertaining these sentiments, they will at all times feel it to be their duty to use all power clearly given by the terms of the National compact, to prevent its increase, to mitigate, and finally to eradicate the evil."

This was the year in which Gen. Taylor was elected. The incoming of a whig administration left the democracy free from temptation to bow down to the slave power, and for a time they maintained their anti-slavery position with apparent courage and decision. When the compromise measures of 1850, abrogated the Mexican prohibition of slavery in New Mexico and Utah, and placed the Fugitive Slave act on the Statute Book, democratic presses took strong ground against them. Governor Wood, in his message, declared for the repeal of the fugitive slave act and for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. At this time, the democratic party, having no pro-slavery national administration with immense revenues and thousands of offices at its disposal to check or thwart the natural action of democratic principles, seemed resolved to throw off the domination of the slave power, and to restore the Jeffersonian policy of restriction and denationalization in respect to slavery. It now seemed to me and to many other democrats who had stood

aloof from the democratic organization on account of its pro-slavery action, that we ought to waive our separate organization, and unite in endeavoring to uphold the Ohio democratic platform and the liberal anti-slavery policy which the party proposed to adopt. In conformity with this view I acted, and in a letter which was printed with approbation in nearly every democratic paper in the State, gave my reasons for my action. At the same time, in the same letter, I distinctly declared that should "sinister influences hereafter prevail with any future democratic convention to set up another slave platform, either State or National, either by resolutions or nominations," I, for one, should resume my independent position, and refuse support to platforms and candidates of principles antagonizing "those now proclaimed by the Ohio democracy."

This was in 1851. In 1852 the National Democratic Convention assembled at Baltimore, and did set up a national platform utterly irreconcilable with that of the Ohio democracy, and nominated a candidate for the Presidency whose boast was that no act of his life was inconsistent with the national platform. The candidate was Franklin Pierce. The platform on slavery was contained in these three resolutions:

Resolved, That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are free to be and proper judges of their own affairs, where not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

Resolved, That the foregoing proposition covers and was intended to embrace the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress; and therefore the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this National platform, will abide by and adhere to the faithful execution of all the acts known as the Compromise Measures, settled by the last Congress, the act for the reclaiming of fugitives from service or labor included, which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot with fidelity thereto be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

Resolved, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

I was present at the Convention, not as a delegate, but as a deeply interested spectator, when these things were done.

Not a moment did I hesitate as to the course which fidelity to true democratic principles required of me. I repudiated at once both the platform and the candidate. My opponent in the present canvass, Col. MEDILL, was also present in this Baltimore Convention. He was a

delegate. He did not vote against the platform, and he did support the candidate.

Many earnest democrats, also, reluctant to give up their party organization, and hoping on against hope that the Democracy of Ohio would remain on the whole, true to their own platform and to freedom, notwithstanding the inconsistency of supporting a Presidential candidate of opposite principles, adhered to the organization and supported the nominee.

The Baltimore nominee was elected, and then the patronage of the National Government was employed to induce the Ohio Democracy to endorse the Baltimore Pro slavery Platform. In 1853, at the first State Convention of the new administration, an attempt was made to add the Baltimore to the State Platform, but was unsuccessful. At the next State Convention, in 1854, the attempt was renewed and was successful. Here is the Resolution by which the Ohio Democracy bound itself to the banner of the Slave power:

Resolved, That the Democrats of Ohio, in Convention assembled, hereby recognize and adopt as our creed, the Baltimore platform of 1852, adopted by the Convention which nominated Franklin Pierce for President of the United States."

This resolution was adopted after the introduction of the Nebraska bill, with clauses repealing the Missouri Prohibition, into the Senate of the United States, by Stephen A. Douglas, and was a fitting prelude to the election of a Nebraska Senator by the Legislature then in session.

Hitherto, since the adoption of the liberal resolution of 1848, the Ohio Democracy had triumphed at every election. In the fall of 1848, indeed, its success was only partial—in the subsequent year, however, it was complete. The indorsement of the pro-slavery resolutions of Baltimore, and the indorsement given to the Kansas-Nebraska bill by the election of a Nebraska Senator, heralded its most disastrous discomfiture. The people, outraged beyond measure by the repeal of the Missouri prohibition, and alarmed by the dangers to freedom everywhere, from the aggressions of the slave power, rallied in overwhelming numbers, with a generous oblivion of past party differences, and overthrew the Administration party. Every member of Congress who had voted for the Nebraska bill was rejected by his constituents. Several who had voted against the bill were also rejected because they adhered to the Administration under whose auspices these outrages against freedom had been perpetrated. An unbroken delegation of twenty-one members, pledged against the iniquity, was sent to the next Congress to utter the voice and execute the will of our great State.

Notwithstanding all this, the Administration party, at its State Convention in January last, as if in reckless contempt of the people, renewed its affirmation of the Baltimore Platform in these words:

Resolved, That this Convention, in behalf of the Democracy of Ohio, hereby affirm the platform of resolutions adopted at the National Democratic Convention, which assembled in

Baltimore in June, 1852, as a clear and distinct declaration of our political principles."

Not content with hoping apparently nothing from the people, and determined to do whatever was possible to conciliate the slavery propaganda at Washington, in order to secure for its members and their friends the favors of the Administration, the Convention adopted another resolution, which I will read:

Resolved, That we recognize in the Democratic Administration, State and National, fearless, consistent and patriotic auxiliaries in the above and kindred measures of Democratic policy, and therefore worthy of the support and confidence of every Democrat."

More than this. To leave no doubt as to the fullness of its acquiescence in the schemes of the propagandists of slavery, the Convention adopted this resolution also:

Resolved, That we demand from the Democratic majority in Congress:

4. The acquisition and annexation to the Union of Cuba and the Sandwich Islands at the earliest moment consistent with our national honor, and the securing of a passage across the Isthmus for our commerce in peace and our armies in war."

The same resolution included other demands upon the democratic majority in Congress, which the Convention declared to be of "immediate and urgent" importance; but none of which obtained the least notice from that democratic majority.

As if in order to prove the uttermost of its contempt upon the old anti Slavery resolutions, and to demonstrate the hollowness of all its professions in favor of real progress and real reform, the Convention suffered the old anti-slavery resolutions to appear in the new pro-slavery platform, crucified between the resolution endorsing the Baltimore platform and that endorsing the Administration of Mr. Pierce.

The demand for the acquisition of Cuba and the Sandwich Islands of course found favor with the administration, which was ready enough to create a National debt to the amount of two hundred millions of dollars to strengthen the Slave Interest, and burden all other interests by the purchase of Cuba, and ready enough also to convert the Sandwich Islands, redeemed from heathenism by the self-denying labors of Christian Missionaries, into marts for Slaves. Happily, the schemes of the Administration for the extension of slavery in these directions, have thus far proved unsuccessful, notwithstanding the countenance and encouragement of this resolution of the Administration Convention in Ohio.

It was quite natural that this Convention should nominate for reelection all the members of the State Administration which it indorsed in the second resolution I have just quoted, as a "fearless, patriotic and consistent auxiliary" in the "measures of Democratic policy" set forth in the Baltimore platform, as well as in this new State platform.

It is thus clear, beyond all question, that the Administration Ticket now presented to the People represents the extreme pro-slavery policy of the existing Administration; and that to

vote for this ticket is to give a direct and potential sanction to that policy.

I have already glanced at some of the features of that policy. Permit me now to remind you of them.

In 1820 Missouri applied for admission into the Union as a slave State. Her application was strenuously and persistently opposed. A vast majority of the people of the Free States were against it. At length, however, by the nearly unanimous votes of the slave States, and a few votes from the Free States, a Compromise was forced through Congress. Its conditions were that Missouri should come in as a slave State, and that the territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. should be forever dedicated to freedom. This Compromise in the prints of the day was styled a compact, and was regarded as such, when finally acquiesced in, by the people at large. Not long after it was made, the slave interest claimed that the compact embraced a third stipulation not expressed in its terms; namely, that the territory South of 36 deg. 30 min. should be created into slave States. This claim was conceded by the free States for the sake of peace. Then Arkansas came into the Union as a slave State, and, under the alleged equity of the compact, Florida and Texas came in as slave States. The residue of the territory South of 36 deg. 30 min. was partitioned among several slaveholding Indian tribes. Thus the slave interest had taken every foot South of the line for slavery, claiming all the while under the compact. Iowa, north of the line, had been admitted as a free State, and Minnesota had been created as a free territory. So far the compact had been fulfilled. The slave interest had realized all it was entitled to under it, and now the time had come for the organization of a territorial government for the vast residue of the country north of the line, large enough to make twelve States, equal in size to Ohio.

Public faith demanded that this territorial government should be organized with a prohibition of slavery. The compact required it.

Religion and Humanity demanded it also. Slavery is utterly inconsistent with the great injunction "Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

The principles of Democracy demanded it. "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." "To protect and defend their rights governments are instituted among men." Congress was to institute a government for the territories. What could be plainer than its duty to institute it that it would be incapable of destroying inalienable rights?

Sound policy required it. Free labor makes great and prosperous States. Slave labor blights the soil and retards the progress of the communities in which it is allowed.

The interests of commerce and manufactures required it. In the territory organized without slavery, agriculture would soon extort its treasures from the earth; and these would be found along all the lines of railroad and through every other channel of communication, quickening industry in all its forms everywhere. As

the settlements should multiply, ranges of States stretching westward from Missouri and Iowa to the borders of California would come into existence. In these States railroad systems would spring into being. Missouri, a slave State, with an immense grant of land from Congress, has, as yet, been able to do next to nothing in pushing her railroads west from the Mississippi. Iowa, younger, with far less of natural resources, and without any aid whatever from Congress, is fast pushing to completion two lines of iron way from the Mississippi to the Missouri. If the territorial governments of Kansas and Nebraska should be organized under the compact, the States to be afterwards created would come in as free States, and not a railroad only, but railroads, to the Pacific, would be built by the irresistible energies of free labor, even though Congress might never contribute a dollar in aid.

Such, fellow-citizens, were some of the weighty considerations which demanded that the compact which prohibited slavery should be faithfully observed in the organization of territorial governments for the vast Northwest.

But the slave power willed otherwise, and we had, and yet have, a National Administration entirely subservient to its will. Stephen A. Douglas, placed by the Administration party at the head of the committee of Territories, devoted himself to the task of effecting the repeal of that prohibition which, itself guarded by the affections of the people, had protected through thirty-four years the inheritance of Free Labor against the approaches of slavery. His bad zeal was seconded by the whole power of the Administration. Every appliance was put in requisition to seduce or intimidate Senators and Representatives to disregard the wishes of their constituents and vote for the repeal. The contest was protracted. In the Senate, every inch of ground was disputed. You know the part I took, and the courage and constancy with which my colleague and other Senators resisted the outrage. In the House, the struggle was equally earnest. The gentleman who now sits near me [Mr. Campbell] always at his post and ever ready in resources, was among the foremost in that band of gallant spirits, who day after day and night after night, struggled against the wrong. At length, however, over violated rules and outraged rights, the slave power and its allies forced their way to nefarious victory. The compact was broken. The barrier of freedom was broken down. The angel of prohibition, who through so many years had guarded with flaming sword turning every way the entrance to the tree of life placed in the midst of that Eden, was sacrilegiously driven away—and Death, the Death of Slavery, entered in.

Never—never can I forget with what feelings I witnessed the final passage of the Repeal Bill in the Senate, nor with what feelings when the great Wrong had been consummated. Midnight, fit hour of darkness for a deed so dark, I, with some brother Senators, descended the western steps of the capitol towards our temporary homes. A great sorrow filled my heart, but even that was far less bitter than the doubt and apprehension which would seize upon me lest,

after all, you, the people, should acquiesce even in this last outrage, and thus surrender the country, finally and forever, to the power which had inflicted it. As I meditated on these things, the thunder of a cannon which had been planted north of the capitol by triumphant confederates against Freedom, echoed and re-echoed over the silent city, proclaiming the victory of Slavery over Freedom.

But, thank God! the smoking thunder of that night awoke the people. From our Northern Maine—up the Allegheny crags, and over their summits—across our broad prairies, and over mighty rivers—till it reverberated from the Rocky Mountains, and filled the ears of young but gigantic Iowa—that mocking thunder pealed, everywhere summoning the people to the redress of the great wrong. Everywhere the people obeyed the summons.

In our own noble State, with a unanimity and stern decision worthy of the first-born of the ordinance of Freedom, you rejected the servants who had betrayed you in Congress—rejected even men who had voted against the wrong, but still purposed to adhere to the Administration, and sent twenty-one Representatives to execute, in the Legislature of the Nation, the will of the people of Ohio.

Such, fellow-citizens, was the occasion, and such the result of the Union of the Freemen of Ohio for the sake of Freedom last fall.

The simple questions for our present decision are—Shall this union be continued, or shall it be broken up? Shall the twenty-one members elected last fall to Congress, be sustained by your judgment this fall, or shall they be allowed to take their seats next winter with the disheartening consciousness that you do not prove by works the abiding nature of the faith which you then professed?

If there was reason for the union last fall, is there not ten-fold greater reason now? Then, the only consummated wrong was that of the Repeal. Slavery had not actually entered Kansas. Every where it was asserted by the partisans of the administration, that Slavery never would find admission into the Territory.

Now, it is actually there. The great crime of planting the curse of Slavery upon the soil consecrated by compact as free homes for free men, is a fact accomplished. And by what shameful means! Many of our young men went to the Territory, trusting to the declaration of the supporters of the administration, that the people of the Territory would be left to settle the question for themselves. They went, not with arms for murderous conflict, but with arms for the conquest of nature. They took with them the plough and the hoe; the plain and the adze—the implements of agriculture and the mechanic arts. They took with them the Spelling-Book and the Bible—intending to establish the institutions of the Territory upon the basis of learning, morality and religion.

In March last, they assembled at the polls for the purpose of electing the members of their first Legislature. But who met them there? Ruffian bands of Missourians, armed with bowie knives and revolvers, under the lead of Atchison and Stringfellow, marched into the terri-

tory, seized upon the polls, and fraudulently deposited their Missouri ballots as Kansas ballots, and elected Missourians as Kansas men, to be members of the Legislature. It was but a few days ago that I saw in a newspaper a letter from a traveler in Western Missouri, who called at a farmer's house, and found him actually mounting his horse to ride into Kansas, where he was to take his seat as member elect of the Kansas Legislature.

When and where, in the history of the world, was such atrocious outrage as this perpetrated or endured?

The whole action of this Legislature has been a prolonged crime. Its enactments for the establishment of slavery, rival in atrocity the worst edicts of Caligula or Nero. The red code of Draco whitens in comparison with the Missouri-Kansas code denounces death for acts of mercy, humanity and religion.

When the law itself is iniquity, what but violence and outrage is to be expected from its authors and approvers? At this moment one young man from Ohio lies in prison, charged with murder, for having defended himself to the last extremity against an unprovoked assault of these confederates in crime; and it was but the other day that another citizen of our state, who was lately described to me by his neighbors of Ashland county as a Christian Minister of the Disciples Church, irreproachable in character and of a mild and forbearing spirit, charged only with avowing himself in favor of making Kansas a free state, and with refusing to sign a declaration in favor of Slavery, was seized by a mob of ruffians led by one Kelly, and dragged to the river's brink, where his face was painted black, and marked with the letter R, and then, upon two pine logs lashed together, this Minister of Christ was pushed out into the turbid waters of the Missouri, to live or die, as the event might determine. But why speak further of these things? Who has forgotten the assault by this Missouri mob on the Quarterly Conference of the Methodist Church in Platte County—the seizure of the minister while preaching, amid shouts of "Hang him! Shoot him!"—the escape of the other ministers amidst threats of tar, feathers and hemp, from the mob, amply provided with these things?

If there be any manhood left in us—if we are not utterly bereft of understanding—if any love of justice, if any touch of pity, if any sense of right yet dwells in our hearts—can we fail to see and feel that if there was cause why we should unite last fall to stay the desolating march of slavery aggression, there is, at this hour, tenfold greater occasion for such union?

But we are often told that the administration and its supporters are not responsible for these infamous transactions. Not responsible! Is not the President charged with the duty of executing the laws of the United States? Is not Franklin Pierce President? When has he attempted to enforce these laws in Kansas? If

Anthony Burns follows the North Star from his house of bondage in Virginia, to Bunker Hill in Massachusetts, the army and navy are put in requisition, the City Military is ordered out, the telegraph wires tremble under the messages they bear from Washington to Boston, and from Boston to Washington. The whole energy of the Government is exerted to force the poor fugitive slave back to bondage. When Kansas was invaded, the United States troops were idle at Fort Leavenworth: not a soldier was employed to protect the settlers. Not even a proclamation was issued in condemnation of the outrages: not even a smile of Presidential favor or a crumb of executive patronage was withdrawn from the instigators and leaders.— At the instauce of the sham Legislature of Kansas, backed by Atchison, Stringfellow and Jefferson Davis, Reeder was removed from office. Stringfellow and Kelly were rewarded for the incendiary articles with which their paper, the *Squatter Sovereign*, were crowded, with the printing of the Laws of Congress, and other governmental patronage. Kelly, one of the editors, was made Postmaster. And finally Wilson Shannon, one of the Ohio Members who voted for the iniquity, and for that treason to his constituents was rejected by the People, was appointed Governor, to recognize the illegal and fraudulent assemblage which undertook to legislate for Kansas, as the actual legislature, and its acts as valid laws.

If these facts do not prove the complicity of the Administration in the Kansas outrages, it is impossible to establish any proposition by evidence.

And now, my friends, what will you do? Hold on to the party and let the tide of aggression roll on? Or will you, with the noble indignation of men, whose principles have been betrayed, whose rights invaded, whose liberties endangered, rally to the rescue of freedom?

We make no war on the Constitution. Let every section of the country have the full benefit of all its provisions. But let it not be wrested from its original intention to the sanction of injustice and crime. Let it be construed and administered rather, in the light of its own great purposes, the establishment of justice and the security of freedom.

We make no war on our brethren of the Slave States. We would deal justly and generously with them in every respect, even as we would wish them to deal with us. We do not seek to impose our Liberty upon them: let them not seek to impose their Slavery on us, or to involve us in its support. This is the plain path of duty for both sides, and it is also the path of peace.

There are thousands in the Slave States who abhor that violation of plighted faith through which the Missouri Prohibition was abrogated. But they need the support of the United Free States. A distinguished Southern gentleman once said to me. "Your Northern People never sustain their own men who faithfully represent their principles. The only crown with which fidelity to Northern Principles has been rewarded is the crown of Martyrdom. How then can you expect Southern men to resist such a meas-

ure as this Nebraska Bill, unjust and dangerous as it is, when proposed by a Northern Senator and sustained by a Northern President?" Let the Free States only be true to themselves, sustaining persistently their faithful representatives, and there will be no lack of just and generous Southern men to stand with them.

But more than this. There are thousands also in the Slave States who abhor slavery itself. Let the people of the Free States cease from the extension of slavery—let them withdraw from it the support of National Legislation—let them place the fair and legitimate influence of the National Government on the side of Freedom—and then thousands will take up the work of emancipation at home, in their respective States, and the glorious result of Freedom for all will be reached at no very distant period, in modes entirely consistent with the safety of all, the prosperity of all, and the constitutional rights of all.

Permit me now, my fellow citizens, to direct your attention to some other matters, of momentous interest to you, involved deeply in the pending political contest. I refer to the State Reforms which the Convention of the 13th of July proposed in their Platform; and to certain National Reforms of a kindred character.

The Platform of the 13th July demands retrenchment in public expenditures; a thoroughly economical State administration; a just and equal basis of taxation, and the election of members of the Legislature by single Districts.

Other reforms are doubtless needed: but the Convention deemed it best and wisest to refer all other matters to the people of the counties, who, in the election of members of the Legislature will execute their own wishes, and to the Legislature itself, whose members, comparing opinions with a sincere desire to meet the wants and promote the welfare of all classes in the State, will be able to mature and enact such laws as will guard the rights and secure the prosperity of all the great interests of the State, Commercial, Manufacturing, Mechanical and Agricultural. In respect to these matters I have only to say, should I be chosen to fill the office for which I have been nominated, that whatever just and proper influence belongs to it would be exerted in harmony with the will of the representatives of the people.

Of the Reforms proposed by the Convention I wish to speak more fully. And, first, of the equalization of political power by the Single District system. Hamilton county, under the present system, elects eight Representatives and three Senators. No other county, except Cuyahoga for this year only, elects more than two Representatives; and no other single county elects a Senator except Cuyahoga. This system, then, gives to whatever party may happen to control Hamilton a vastly disproportioned power. In most other counties each elector votes for but one Representative; in Hamilton county each elector votes for eight. The eight when elected are substantially a unit, and united, have equal political power in the Legislature with eight counties having each a single Representative, and outweigh any number of

counties so divided that the majority either way is less than eight. Thus unjust to the other counties, this system is injurious to Hamilton county also. It gives occasion to combinations among candidates by which the true expression of the popular will is often defeated, and it subjects all the various interests of city and country to the accidental control of one particular interest, or, perhaps, of influences hostile to all. A Single District System would remedy these evils, bringing each Representative into the closest possible contact and sympathy with his constituents, and compelling each to depend upon his own merits and qualifications, rather than upon mere political combinations. The Convention of the 13th, therefore, thought proper to demand an amendment of the Constitution, establishing the Single District System.

Reform in taxation and expenditure is also urgently demanded. It needs no argument to prove that the people are oppressed by taxation. Everybody feels the fact. Within a few short years the burden of taxation has grown from something over four millions of dollars, collected annually from the people, to over nine millions. We will be absolutely exact, and say from \$4,227,708 to \$9,092,339. So enormously has this burden increased that the people have become tenants rather than citizens; the State a landlord rather than a Government; and the charge upon industry and property a rent rather than a tax. Of course expenditure keeps pace with taxation, and is out of all proportion to the outlay in better times. These facts call loudly for reform.

I do not say indeed that any State Administration can relieve the people from taxation. I seek to create no illusive expectations. What I do say is that there is no necessity, in my judgment, that its burdens should be so enormous, or that the public expenditures should be so lavish.

But not only is the amount of taxation excessive; but the principles upon which it is levied are wrong. The statute permits the deduction of debts from credits. In other words it allows each individual, in listing his property for taxation, to deduct what he owes from what is owing to him. It taxes each upon what he actually has, and not upon what he has not. But the provisions of the statute allowing these deductions have been declared unconstitutional by a majority of the Judges composing the Supreme Court of the State, all of whom are members of the Administration party, State and National. The State Auditor has accordingly issued his instructions to the township Assessors requiring that all credits should be listed for taxation, without any deduction whatever. In some counties, I understand, these instructions are obeyed and the statute is disregarded, while in other counties the statute is followed and the instructions disregarded. The necessary result is confusion, inequality, injustice. One county is taxed upon all the credits of the people without deduction; another county with perhaps an equal amount of credits, is not taxed at all if the debts equal or exceed the credits.

In my judgment, all this is wrong. The judicial construction of the Constitution which abrogates

the statute seems to me erroneous, and the Auditor's instructions, in my opinion, are founded on a principle which cannot be vindicated.

Let me state a case or two, in illustration of the operation of the Auditor's rule. A man, without property, borrows a hundred dollars and gives his note for it; then lends the same hundred dollars and takes a note. Is he any richer than before? Has he here acquired any property upon which he should be taxed? Common sense answers in the negative; but the Auditor's rule says he must be taxed upon a hundred dollars. A shoemaker buys a hundred dollars worth of leather, and gives his note to the leather dealer. He converts the leather into shoes, which he sells to his neighbors, and thus creates small book accounts against a score of persons. If he sells to safe customers and at fair prices, he will have a little surplus after paying the leather dealer; but, if otherwise, he may sustain a loss. The Auditor's rule is inflexible in either case, and requires him to pay tax upon the whole value of the accounts, without any deduction of his outstanding debt, although it may take all he can collect from them to pay his creditor. A rule which operates thus, is manifestly unjust.

But we are told that it brings a large amount of new taxables upon the grand levy. That is true. A still greater amount might be obtained by altering the principle of the rule a little. Just list all the people own, and then add all the people do not own, and you will have a very respectable amount of property on the grand levy; and if you can make the people pay taxes on the whole, you will have a revenue as large as the greediest hungerer after public plunder could desire.

Let me illustrate. Let somebody in New-York lend me a thousand dollars and take my note; let me lend the same sum to my neighbor and take his note; let the borrower from me lend the same sum to another and take his note; and thus let the process go on until the same thousand dollars shall have been lent to every person in the State, the first lender being the last borrower and taking back his money to New-York. There are two millions of people in the State, each of whom will then have borrowed and lent a thousand dollars. The aggregate amount of notes will be two thousand millions of dollars, and these notes will represent not property, but debt. Now, according to the rule, all these notes will go upon the grand levy, and thus we shall have an addition of two thousand millions of dollars of new taxables, and not a cent of additional property in the State. The insolvency of the people constitutes, according to this rule, the wealth of the State! Now, tax those taxables—suppose the tax only one per cent; (we shall have sufficient cause of thankfulness if we ever get our taxation down to that rate)—and the result will be that each person in the State, for the privilege of owning a thousand dollars and having a thousand dollars due to him, or in other words for the privilege of being worth just nothing at all, must pay the sum of ten dollars. The aggregate will be twenty millions of dollars—a very pretty revenue to be raised by a tax upon nothing.

Nobody can deny, I think, that this supposition fully illustrates the practical operation of the rule. I know of nothing which is more like it than the case of the two Yankees, who were, for some offence, condemned to six months imprisonment in the same jail. When they went in, one of them had an old jackknife, and the other had nothing at all. Now, Yankees, under all circumstances, will trade; and these Yankees commenced trading on the jackknife; and so successful were their operations, that, at the end of their term, they came out of jail each worth fifty dollars, but with nothing belonging to either except the same old jackknife. They had got rich by trading in debt, just as our State is to get rich by taxing debt. Taxation by the Auditor's rule may well enough be called the jackknife theory of taxation.

Now, the party in power—the administration party—which claims to be the Democratic party, but certainly is not a Democratic party—boldly challenges your approbation both of the amount and the principle of this enormous and oppressive taxation, by nominating for reelection all the members of the State administration under whose auspices the present system has been imposed upon the people.

What emboldens the party to do this it is hard to tell. Perhaps they will insist that those who have proved themselves so vigorous, skillful and successful in levying taxes on, must needs be most competent to take taxes off. I have read somewhere, not I think in any accredited medical work however, that the "sovereignest thing on earth" for the bite of a mad dog is a hair of the same dog. Our opponents seem to have availed themselves of the suggestion afforded by this specific; for they recommend as the true cure for the evils of a bad administration, the reelection of all its members. They improve indeed upon the hint; for whereas a single hair suffices in the case of the bite, they generously offer, as a remedy for the bad administration, to continue nine of the same or similar officials in power.

But it is hardly possible that the people will feel inclined to take the administration nostrum. They want some guarantee, not merely of the ability to reform, but of a disposition to do so; and they see no evidence of such a disposition in any action of the party in power.

Nor are they satisfied with the excuses offered by the administration apologists for the vast increase of taxation. These apologists indeed say that a large proportion of the nine millions of taxes is imposed for county and township purposes. This is admitted; but the question recurs, who made the laws under which *all* the taxes were levied? And the answer puts the whole responsibility in the right place. That answer is: The party which now endeavors to fasten the existing State administration upon the people for another term.

It cannot be denied, fellow citizens, that the State officials now in nomination for reelection, and the party which supports them, are responsible for our present grievous taxation, and for the oppressive and unjust principle upon which it is levied.

We want a reform. If it can be effected

without an amendment of the Constitution, well and good—if not, we want an amendment which will effect it.

But it is not only in State matters that we want reform. We demand it also in the action of the National Administration. Our national taxation has swelled to an enormous sum. More than seventy millions of dollars are every year collected by the Government from the people in the form of duties. Of this vast revenue, the people of Ohio pay at least one-tenth. Seven millions of dollars a year, at least, are paid into the coffers of the Federal Government by the citizens of this State.

Now there is no necessity whatever for this enormous taxation. The legitimate operations of the Government—all of them—can be carried on at less than half this cost. The necessary effect of an overflowing treasury is extravagance and corruption. Hence steam mail jobs costing millions; and hence vast grants of lands to railroads in some States, while similar grants are denied to other States equally entitled, but not so much in favor with the ruling power. Hence, too, extravagant appropriations for army and navy, out of all proportion to the benefits derived from either; and hence such measures as the assumption of the Texas State debt, and the payment of Ten Millions of dollars to Santa Anna for a Texan railroad route to the Pacific. Hence, too, the armies of Federal officials swarming over the land like the locusts of Egypt, and the tendency, so painfully visible every where, to exalt the Federal and depress the State Governments.

This is the direct road to consolidation—and the road to consolidation is, for us, the road to ruin. The old theory of our fathers is the true theory. Let us have a poor Government and a rich people—light taxes and abundant individual enterprise—economical expenditure and steady prosperity—a General Government strictly limited to its sphere, and State Governments respected and honored, because competent and ready to protect the rights and guard the interests of the people.

There is another point of view from which we of the West should heedfully consider this subject of National expenditure. I have already said that the people of Ohio pay into the National Treasury more than seven millions of dollars a year. What do we get back? Not the salaries of the postmasters—these are paid out of the postages; not the compensation of Marshals and Clerks of the Federal Courts—they are paid out of the fees of their offices. What then? Why, the salaries of two District Judges, and a few appropriations for public buildings. When we ask for a small portion of the vast sum which we pay for the improvement of our Rivers and Harbors, in order that the products of our agriculture and manufactures may find safe and cheap access to market, it is denied to us. It was but a little more than a year ago that a bill making appropriation for our Ohio river and our Erie Harbors, passed both Houses; but it encountered the veto of the President, or rather of that slave power whose instrument the President is. At the same session a bill for Cape Fear river in North Carolina received the Pres-

ident's signature. At the last session, a bill was passed to remove obstructions to the navigation of the Savannah river in Georgia, and it was signed. Another bill was passed to remove the obstructions to the navigation of the St. Clair Flats, above Detroit, and it was not signed. It was not vetoed. If it had been, it would probably have been passed, notwithstanding the veto, by a two-thirds vote; and, therefore, to make the denial of the appropriation certain, and to put it in the most offensive form, the President put the bill in his pocket and never returned it to Congress at all.

It is in view of all these things, fellow citizens, that we unite for Freedom and Reform. Our opponents call us Fusionists. Well, there is no harm in that name. We stand together; Whigs, to whom the Whig principles of 1776 are dear; Democrats, who believe in the democracy of Jefferson, and do not believe in the democracy of Pierce and Davis; Americans, who regard Freedom and not Slavery as the corner stone of American Institutions—we stand together to resist the spread of Slavery; to rescue our national territories from the grasp of the slave power; to reform our State administration; to reduce the mountainous taxation under which all interests labor; to deliver our country from the affliction of the Pierce administration; to punish the authors of the Nebraska iniquity; and to vindicate for the West and its great interests, their just claims upon the National Government. For these objects we unite and are proud of our union. Arrayed under the banner of Freedom and Reform, with honest and patriotic purposes, we are confident of triumph. Assured that our cause is just, we confide it cheerfully to the support of the people.

There was a time, I confess, when I greatly doubted of the future. The American Party sprang suddenly into being. Old organizations disappeared before its triumphant march. In the Free States, it took the side of freedom; and the election of an entire anti-Nebraska delegation in Ohio, and the return of such men as Wilson and Hale to the Senate of the United States, attested the reality of its sympathies. In the Slave States, on the other hand, it assumed the championship of slavery and of slavery extension. For one I greatly feared, and I know my apprehensions were shared by many enlightened and patriotic members of the organization, that when its representatives from Slave States and Free States should meet in National Convention, the Slave State members would succeed as they have heretofore succeeded in similar Conventions of other political parties, in securing the adoption of a pro-slavery platform, and the nomination of pro-slavery candidates, and that the Free State members would acquiesce. This fear of mine—these apprehensions of others were realized in part. An American National Convention, as we all know, did assemble in Philadelphia. The Slave State members did succeed in securing the adoption of a pro-slavery platform. But—and I devoutly thank God for it—the Free State members DID NOT ACQUIESCE. The bold and true-hearted gentleman—whose name is associated with mine upon our State ticket, and who will

soon speak for himself to you—[cheers]—led the van of freedom in denouncing the platform, and called upon his associates from the Free States to rally to the rescue of Freedom. [Cheers.] From that hour hope revived. The action of the intrepid Ford and his fearless associates demonstrated the existence of a quality, supposed to have become nearly extinct in Northern men—I mean *back bone*. [Loud applause.] And when my friend and his fellow delegates came home to Ohio and declared their concurrence in the purpose already avowed by the Cleveland State Council—to unite in open Convention with all who were willing to unite with them for Freedom and Reform, I felt that there was but one course for me and those who felt as I did, the paramount importance of these objects, to meet this generous and patriotic movement half way, and, laying aside every jealousy and every prejudice, go into the Convention frankly and sincerely, and honestly abide its result. We did so, and the result is before the people in the platform and ticket of the 13th of July.

For myself I owe no allegiance to any other than the Republican organization. I am not a member of any other. I proscribe no man. The rights of all my fellow-citizens, native or naturalized, are as dear to me as my own. For my associates on the State ticket I dare vouch also that they are governed by no narrow or proscriptive ideas. Some of them—perhaps all of them—are members of the American organization, but they represent not the bigoted and proscriptive spirit which can see no worth even in any man born upon foreign soil, and whose blind fanaticism seeks its ends even through violence, and bloodshed; but that liberal Americanism which makes principles and character and not birth place the test of qualification for citizenship, and which proposes to accord freely to all, wherever born, who are in heart Americans, all the privileges of American citizens. Whether I am mistaken in this or not in one thing I cannot be mistaken. The Americans whom these gentlemen represent do at this moment unite in regarding Freedom and Reform as the paramount objects of political action at this moment, and they do join with all who, outside of their organization, are willing to join with them in the attainment of these objects. It is not, I am sure, an unreasonable expectation that men animated by such a spirit will so revise their declaration of principles and policy as to leave in them nothing justly obnoxious to the charge of proscriptiveness or intolerance. Let us unite now for the great objects of our union, and generously and fearlessly trust the future.

But what are our opponents, who denounce us as fusionists—who seek to hold us responsible for the destruction of the ballot boxes at Cincinnati, and for the bloodshed at Louisville—who hurl at their fellow citizens throughout the State such epithets as dark lantern conspirators, midnight assassins, murderers of women and children—what are they doing? Have they not a pet fusion of their own? What says the Cincinnati Enquirer, the principal administration paper of Southern Ohio, edited by the United