





THE UNION AS IT IS, AND THE CONSTITUTION AS
OUR FATHERS MADE IT.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MASON W. TAPPAN, OF N. H.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, U. S., February 5, 1861.

The House having under consideration the report from the select committee of thirty-three, Mr. TAPPAN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: As one of the members of the committee of thirty-three, I joined with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASHBURN] in submitting a minority report, and in recommending the following resolution for the consideration of the House:

Resolved, That the provisions of the Constitution are ample for the preservation of the Union, and the protection of all the material interests of the country; that it needs to be obeyed rather than amended; and that extrication from present difficulties should be looked for in efforts to preserve and protect the public property, and in the enforcement of the laws, rather than in new guarantees for particular interests, or compromises and concessions to unreasonable demands."

And I desire now, very briefly, to submit my reasons why I could not concur in the report of the majority, and in support of my belief that the passage of this resolution is all the action the House ought to take in regard to the present crisis in our national affairs.

Sir, I was one of the very few members of this body who voted against the raising of this committee at the outset. I did so, not because I did not fully understand and appreciate the perilous condition of the country; not because, at the proper time, I would be unwilling to make any reasonable concessions, not involving the sacrifice of principle, to any portion of my countrymen who might present grievances to be redressed; but because, in the first place, I believed that the appointment of such a committee would be the initiative step towards some sort of a "compromise," when any compromise, under the peculiar circumstances that surrounded us, would be degrading and humiliating to

the North; and, secondly, such was the "madness that ruled the hour" in the Southern portion of the country, I did not believe that any measures we should be able to pass would be productive of any good; and the attempt to make compromises that might fail would only add fuel to the flame. And, as events have rolled on, every hour has only confirmed me in the correctness of my convictions then. I believed then, as I believe now, that the furor at the South had taken the form of an epidemic, and, like a raging fever in the human system, it must have its run. In such cases, if the constitution of the patient is strong enough to grapple with the disease, he will live; and if not, in spite of all the nostrums that may be administered by quacks around the bedside, he will die. And so with this epidemic in the national system. If the Constitution of the country has not strength enough to carry the nation through this crisis, no prescriptions that this Congress can apply will be likely to effect a cure.

But, sir, I have faith in the patriotism of the great mass of the people. I have faith in the Constitution. It is apparently weak now, and the demon of a treacherous disease seems to be running riot throughout its whole framework. But it is strong, nevertheless; and in the end will put forth its power, and the country will rise from its prostration healthier and more vigorous than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, if I am mistaken in the result that is now to follow from the present condition of public affairs, I am sure that I cannot be mistaken that such would have been the result if a square, bold, and manly issue had been made up at the outset for the Union and the preservation of the Government. That portion of the American people who had just succeeded in electing their President, in the mode and forms recognised by the Constitution, had done

nothing that required apology, nothing that they ought to take back. I, for one, did not go into that election to have the principles for which I contended given up and abandoned at the first howl of those who were disappointed at the result. The Republicans nominated a moderate, conservative, and honest man, and placed him upon a moderate, conservative, and patriotic platform of principles—principles that embraced every portion of the Union, and protected every material interest of this great Confederacy, and which in no wise conflicted with the fundamental law of the land.

It will scarcely be contended, even by the opponents of the Republican party, that there was no necessity for a change of administration. Every avenue of the Government reeked with fraud; speculation and corruption prevailed in every department, until it culminated at last in one of the most stupendous official robberies that ever astonished the American people: all going to show that the change did not come a moment too soon.

Other parties went into the election, as well as the Republicans, with their respective declarations of principles; and it was the duty of every good citizen, of whatever party, to abide peacefully by the result. If the Republicans had been beaten, they would cheerfully have done so; for they are Union-loving, law-abiding citizens. But no sooner was the election of Mr. Lincoln definitely ascertained, than the fires of revolution broke out at Charleston, and in other portions of the cotton States. Without just cause, without allowing time even for parley, without waiting to see if a friendly understanding could not be brought about, with indecent haste, the *disunionists* of the country, who, by their own confessions, have been plotting its overthrow for the last thirty years, have seized the public property, taken possession of the depositories of the public funds, insulted the American flag, and, with jeers at the Government which has protected them so long, have declared themselves out of the Union.

Now, sir, under these circumstances, I believe, and I still believe, that the first question to be ascertained is, whether we have a Government or not? And I am for postponing all other questions and all other "compromises" until this great and vital fact is ascertained. And I put it to the candor of gentlemen on the other side—I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN] who has just taken his seat—whether, in case they had succeeded in electing their candidate upon the platform of slavery "protection" in the Territories, and Massachusetts and New Hampshire, dissatisfied with the result, had committed the same acts which South Carolina and Georgia have committed—they would have made haste to get on to their knees with an apology; or if they would not rather, in the first place, have taken measures to ascertain whether the Government of the country had any binding force? If a de-

cent self-respect would have prevented them from doing this, I may be pardoned for declining to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government is a mere cobweb, with no power for its own preservation, it is utterly useless to try to tinker and patch it up by "compromises." If the Union is so utterly weak and helpless that the first breath of treason is sufficient to destroy its vitality, it will be good for nothing after it is "saved," and the time spent in trying to save it will be worse than thrown away. So believing, Mr. Speaker, I was for narrowing the issue as soon as possible to the question of Union or no Union, Government or no Government, and ascertaining who was for the Government and who against it. And I solemnly believe, if the entire mass of the Republican party, in Congress and out, had, from the start, boldly maintained this position, instead of frittering away the time in feeble attempts at "compromising" what cannot be compromised—in half apologizing for having had the temerity to elect their President—we should have stood stronger to-day; the crisis would before now have been passed, and the revolution stayed. We would, by that course, have presented an issue around which the moderate, patriotic men in the border slave States—who know that the charges against the Republicans of designing to interfere with any of their constitutional rights are *false*—could have rallied, and, standing with us on the common platform of the Constitution and the Union, the flood of secession which now threatens to overwhelm them would have been rolled back. The eloquent and patriotic speeches of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. HAMILTON,] and of the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. STOKES,] but a day or two since, and other speeches of like tone, from gentlemen of the border States, unmistakably indicate that such would have been the case if the right stand had been taken at first. I hope it is not too late now. Firmness on the part of the Executive, and firmness and courage on the part of the people of the free States, is, in my judgment, the best antidote for the insanity that prevails at the South, and the best remedy to avert the horrors of a civil war. Every time the people of the free States have wavered; every time her Representatives have evinced a disposition to fall back one step from their position, the secessionists, with fiercer yells, have advanced two. And so it will be to the end. If we compromise to-day, we will be required to yield more to-morrow; and when the North is sufficiently humiliated, there will be no difficulty, I apprehend, in "reconstructing" the Government so as to place it in the hands of the slave power forever. Sir, I am for making a stand somewhere; and I prefer to make it before I start to run at all.

Mr. Speaker, as much as I detest the treason of South Carolina, there is an audacity in her mode of doing things that almost compels my respect. She does not attempt to disguise her

long and deep-seated hatred to the Union, and she makes no scruples at turning her guns upon the glorious flag of her country. She flings defiance at us in every form. I would to God that somebody, somewhere, who had authority to speak for the Government, would exhibit half the zeal for the Union that South Carolina does against it!

But it is said that some sort of a compromise is necessary in order to keep the border States from joining in the secession movement. Sir, if the security and prosperity these States now enjoy by means of the Union; if the exposed position they would occupy should it be dissolved, and the utter ruin and disaster which such an event would bring on them, whatever might be its effects in other parts of the country; if the patriotic memories of the past, and the love of the Constitution and "Union as it is," which most of these States have been supposed particularly to cherish; if a better knowledge of the people of the free States than prevails further South, and of the falsity of the charges brought against them; if all this is not sufficient to cause them to pause before they take the fatal step which shall sever their connection with a Government that has covered them with blessings, it will be in vain to think of placating them with any half measures that we can adopt.

What guaranty have we, Mr. Speaker, that the border States will be satisfied with the propositions reported by the majority of the committee of thirty-three? What assurances have we that any terms of settlement, short of the recognition and protection by the General Government of slavery in the territory that we now possess or may hereafter acquire south of 36° 30', will be acceptable to them? The honorable gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. NELSON,] whose opinions I greatly respect, and whose character and patriotism command my admiration, while disposed to look favorably upon the proposition to amend the Constitution prohibiting the interference with slavery in the States, is opposed to admitting New Mexico as a State, and gives many and cogent reasons why it would not be accepted by his State, and showing also that it would probably be productive of more harm than good.

But, Mr. Speaker, suppose that the measures proposed by the committee, or some others short of the ultimatum laid down by the cotton States, of slavery protection in all future acquisitions, would be received by the border States, or most of them, as a final settlement of the slavery question: what then? The question still remains, what is to be done with the seceding States? The question still remains, whether we have a Government or not, capable of maintaining the integrity of the Union? The question would still press itself upon us, whether a single State, or half a dozen States combined, could, by their rebellious action, destroy the unity and nationality of the Government? And these vital

questions, as I have said, I am for meeting *à limine*. Not by raising armies and marching them to the South, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN] seems to suppose, to lay the country waste by fire and sword, in order to "coerce" them into the Union; but by firmly adhering to the Constitution of the country, and enforcing obedience to the laws by all the power of the Government. And before I consent to concessions, even for the conciliation of the border States, I desire to know where *they* will be found on this great question of maintaining the laws of the Union?

Sir, this country presents a most melancholy and humiliating spectacle before the nations of the earth. A great nation of thirty million people, ranked as one of the first-class Powers of the world, at the first dawn of treason in its borders retires ingloriously before it, and to-day is seen crumbling to pieces, without an effort being made to maintain its integrity, or a finger raised to defend the honor of its flag. In all the tide of time the world never witnessed so cowardly an exhibition.

Now, sir, I desire to inquire what would be the effect of such a policy as I have indicated? I would defend this capital at all hazard, and protect the public property. I would collect the revenue in the ports of every seceding State, either on the land or on the sea—or I would repeal the laws making them ports of entry. Does it follow that this would result in a general civil war? Not at all. The Government would be clearly in the right, and every arm raised against it would be clearly in the wrong. Every act of the Government would be strictly on the defensive, while every blow struck against it would be the act of an *aggressor* upon its rights. The Government would be defending the priceless inheritance of liberty, which our fathers bequeathed to us at the expense of so much blood and treasure, while its enemies would be fighting for its overthrow, because they have been deprived of political power by the constitutional fiat of the people. The sympathies of every Government on the earth would be on the side of the constituted authorities of the United States; and the prayers of every friend of constitutional liberty, whether in the Old World or the New, would ascend to the throne of Jehovah, that this Government, founded in the principles of human freedom and the rights of man, might not be destroyed by the enemies of both.

But, under such a policy, who are the rebels to fight? If they had ships, and could man them, they might attack the vessels blockading their harbors. But the contest will be unequal. Will they raise armies to invade the loyal States? This is an "entertainment" to which they would hardly "invite" themselves.

Sir, I will indulge in no threats of what would be the result in such an event. I will make no boasts of the prowess of any particular section of the country. I desire to say no word

that can exasperate or inflame, but simply to plant myself on the side of my country, and the integrity of its Government, whose Constitution I have sworn to support. I deprecate a war in which brother shall be arrayed against brother, and kindred against kindred; and I pray that God may avert such a calamity from this land! Nevertheless, wisely, but firmly, I would have the Government make a trial, at least, for its own protection, that it might not be a scoff and by-word among the nations. And then, if it shall be found to be the weak and impotent thing which its enemies imagine it to be, then it will be time enough to talk about "compromises," and a division of the country into two confederacies. For one, I do not care to live under a Government which is so feeble as to excite only the contempt of mankind, and which exists merely at the sufferance of those who may at any moment conspire for its overthrow, in spite of all the concessions we may now make. And I repeat, that I desire, first, to know whether we have a Government or not; whether we have a country to love and support.

Mr. Speaker, I know the anxiety that is felt by every true friend of his country in such a fearful crisis as the present. I know the feeling that is uppermost in many a patriotic heart, to try and "do something" to avert the great calamity which seems impending. But what can we do? There are some things that the North might do without dishonor. And although I cannot support the measures recommended by the committee, because I think they involve a surrender of principle; yet, if the South should tender the restoration of the Missouri compromise simply as it was before "ruthless hands" wrenched it from its place, where it had given peace to the country for over thirty years, and the reckless repeal of which has been one great cause of all our woes, the North, I think, would be bound to take it fairly into consideration.

Much stress is laid on the personal liberty laws, and they are blazoned to the world as the pretended cause of all our difficulties; and the President himself, in his annual message, treated them as the great act of wrong on the part of the North, justifying, if not repealed, a dissolution of the Union. And yet, when, in the committee of thirty-three, we first set ourselves to the task of correcting this grievance, as far as possible, we were told by Southern gentlemen that it was useless to spend time on such trifling matters, and that it did not reach the seat of the disease. No, Mr. Speaker; it does not reach the seat of the disease. The seat of the disease is the lost *prestige* of political power; it is the lust of dominion on the part of those who have administered the Government so long, that they think they have an indefeasible right to control its destinies forever.

And because the free States, in consequence the thrift, enterprise, and progress, which free-

labor institutions impart to a community, have acquired the numerical majority in the councils of the nation, and decline to use it to extend, "protect," foster, and nationalize the system of slavery, the Union is to be destroyed and the Constitution trampled under foot! Nor, sir, is the settlement of this question, so far as our present territory is concerned, of any particular consequence to those who have "precipitated this revolution." Days were spent in committee, endeavoring to contrive some way to settle the *status* of slavery in territory which we do not now possess!

And the proposition for adjustment which has been talked of most, and which, it is said, would probably be acceptable to most of the Southern States—that of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. CRITTENDEN,] provides for the recognition and "protection" of slavery in all territory "hereafter acquired" south of 36° 30'. Sir, this is a premium offered to filibustering, and aggressive inroads upon friendly Powers, for the purpose of "making room" for the spread of slavery. It is the adoption into the Constitution of the creed of the ultra portion of the Democratic party, who broke up the Charleston Convention because the dogma of "protection" to slavery was not inserted in the Democratic platform. It is the arrogant demand of the revolutionists of the country—who, if the conservative, Union sentiment of that section could find expression, are in a meager minority, even in the Southern States—not only to all those who voted for Lincoln, but to those who voted for Douglas, and most of those who voted for Bell, to surrender their convictions and principles, on pain of breaking up the Confederacy. Sir, this will never be done; and the free States will never concede these terms of settlement, let the consequences be what they may. And I appeal to the honest masses of the Democratic party in my own State who voted for Mr. Douglas, if they are willing, because their opponents rise in treason against the Government, to adopt the doctrine of constitutional and legislative "protection to slavery" in all the Territories which may be "hereafter acquired?"

Sir, the proposition known as the "border States compromise," which is similar to that of the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. KELLOGG,] if I understand it, is scarcely less objectionable. It provides that the Constitution shall be so amended that, in all the territory south of 36° 30', neither Congress nor the people of the Territory shall ever interfere with or prohibit slavery. What sort of a proposition is this to those who hold that the people shall be left "perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way?" Sir, by this measure, although nine-tenths of the people might be opposed to the introduction of slavery, the other tenth could force it into the Territory, and compel it to come into the Union as a slave State. This is as effectually "pro-

tection to slavery" as though it were provided for in express terms. It is only another way of reaching the same result.

Sir, the Union is dear to the people of the Northern States; they would sacrifice much to preserve it as it is; but a Union founded on the protection of slavery, as its "chief cornerstone," is not the Union for which our fathers fought, and is not the precious boon which they supposed they had transmitted to their posterity. If the only terms upon which the Union can be preserved are, that the General Government, by constitutional provision and Congressional enactment, shall, through all time, wherever the adventurous spirit of our people shall plant the American banner, be pledged to the protection of an institution condemned by the whole civilized world, outside of the slave States—an institution which Mr. HUNTER, in his speech at Charlottesville, in August last, said that "Southern men themselves, with but few exceptions, admitted to be a moral evil," not twenty years ago—then, indeed, will the North begin to "calculate the value" of such a Union.

Mr. Speaker, I will consider, briefly, the particular propositions reported by the majority of the committee.

In addition to the reasons already given, I am opposed to the proposed amendment to the Constitution, providing against future amendments to that instrument, touching slavery in the States, not because I have any wish myself, or because I know of a single Republican anywhere who wishes or believes he has any right to interfere with slavery in the States, but because there is no need of such an amendment. I am opposed to any alteration of the Constitution unless upon the most urgent necessity; and then, never at the demand of those, or to placate those who are in actual rebellion against it. The Republican party, in their platform of principles, are solemnly pledged against any such interference, or the belief in any right to interfere with slavery in the States. But I am further opposed to the amendment, because, as has been so well shown by the honorable chairman of the committee, it is morally impossible that slavery in the States should ever be interfered with by any amendment to the Constitution. With no more slave States than exist to-day, there must be *forty-five* free States before any such amendment can receive the sanction of three-fourths of all the States. And, lastly, I am opposed to it because it gives to slavery new and additional guaranties, which the illustrious framers of the Constitution did not think necessary to insert in that instrument. They were careful to exclude from the Constitution the very word "slave;" and they regarded slavery as an institution which was inconsistent with the great ideas upon which the Government was based, and which, at a period not very remote, would gradually be done away. I am therefore unwilling to go further than they

went, in giving it constitutional sanction, especially as the workings of the system do not particularly commend it to the enlightened civilization and Christianity of the age. What the Constitution gives it, I will give—no more, no less.

Nor can I admit the force of the appeal that, because the people of the South have been made to believe the falsehoods circulated there against the Republican party, we must make concessions that otherwise would be improper, in order to appease their fury. Because the leaders of the Breckinridge Democracy have made the people of the South believe that Mr. Hamlin is a mulatto, that Lincoln is in favor of having the white people intermarry with the negroes, and that the Republicans are to invade their States with armies of "Wide Awakes," and set their slaves all free, I shall not consent to change the fundamental law of the land, and thereby virtually admit the charges to be true. Many of the Southern people are evidently in that condition of mind where they "see men as trees walking." They would not now believe it, even if every Republican should vote in favor of this proposition. I prefer to wait till the "madness" passes away, and then see if we cannot "reason together." If that time never comes, it will not be my fault, nor the fault of the Republican party.

Sir, I cannot sympathize with the argument of those who attempt to draw a parallel between the present condition of affairs in some of the Southern States and the revolt of the colonies against the Government of Great Britain. I would not dignify the causeless rebellion which now exists among a portion of the slaveholding people of the country, so as to elevate it alongside of the great American Revolution, which will forever stand forth as one of the most sublime epochs in the history of the world. If, every time a discontented minority, after having participated in an election, shall refuse to acquiesce in the constitutional result, and threaten to pull down the pillars of the Government, we treat them in the same way that Burke advised towards the American colonies, how long will it be before the great fundamental principle on which this Government rests, to wit, that *the majority shall rule*, would be trampled under foot and the Government destroyed?

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to go into a detailed statement of all the reasons which operate on my mind against the admission of New Mexico as a State. These are fully set forth in the report which I signed in conjunction with the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. WASHBURN.] It would be a sufficient reason for voting against it, that, as a measure of peace to those for whom it is intended, it will fail to be satisfactory. If it fails to be acceptable to the gentleman from Tennessee, moderate and conservative as he is, I do not think it will commend itself to the people of his State, or those of the other border States. But, my chief ob-

jection to it is, that it virtually surrenders (although covered up under specious disguises) the entire position of the Republican party in reference to the extension of slavery into free territory. When New Mexico was acquired, it was free territory. Since then, through influences from this capital, and at the instigation of prominent Southern men, slavery has been established there, by the enactment of a barbarous code, disgraceful to the civilization of the age.

By the organic act of the Territory, Congress has the reserved right to annul these laws, and at the last session a bill to that effect passed this House, but failed in the Senate. By now admitting her into the Union, on an equal footing with the other States, we, in effect, approve this barbarous legislation, sanction the proceedings which forced slavery into the Territory, and bring her into the Union as a slave State.

But it is said by some of those who advocate this measure, that it will be a free State. If this is so, then it is no concession to the slaveholding States; and it is absurd to suppose that secession is to be prevented by the admission of another free State. No; if it comes in at all, it comes as a slave State, carved out of territory that is free, or which it is the duty of Congress to make free. The same influences that established slavery there will also cause it to remain. It is true there never may be but few slaves; but still, to all intents and purposes, it will be a slave State. To this I cannot consent; and I only reiterate the language of Mr. Clay, in one of the last speeches he ever made, when I declare that "no earthly power can compel me to vote for the extension of slavery over territory that is now free!"

There are other and all-sufficient reasons, outside of the slavery question, why New Mexico ought not to be admitted as a State. Her system of peonage, or "white slavery;" the paucity of her white inhabitants; the mongrel character of the mass of her people, and their entire unfitness to be incorporated into the Union, having equal weight at the other end of the Capitol, and upon equal footing in all respects with the old States, are enough of themselves to deter me from voting for this measure. Added to this, is the fact that the people of New Mexico do not ask to be admitted into the Union as a State, but are understood to be opposed to it. Her people have never paid any taxes, and, it is said, cannot be made to do so for any purpose whatever. So that, if she is admitted into the Union, we shall be compelled to make appropriations to defray the expenses of her State Government out of the national Treasury—thus forcing a slave State into the Union against her will, and footing her bills after we get her in!

And now, sir, I have said all that I propose to say on these questions. If this Union is to be broken up, it will have been done by the fanaticism of slavery propagandism, and the

vaulting ambition of political leaders, who, to do its bidding in 1854, by the breaking down of a time-honored compromise, let loose upon the land the fearful agitation which has rocked it, as with a tempest, from that hour to this. But, if such is to be our fate, the "Government of the United States of America" will still exist, with a territory and people teeming with all the elements of greatness and of freedom, of unsurpassed progress, and of future glory. If that time shall speedily come, then I say:

"Let us press the golden cluster on our brave old flag
In closer union; and, if numbering less,
Brighter shall shine the stars that still remain."

But, Mr. Speaker, I will not look beyond the present Union to see what is behind the veil that divides us from the future. I have no desire to do so.

The State I have the honor, in part, to represent on this floor, is small in area, but she yields to none in patriotic attachment to the Union and the Constitution; and I believe the united voice of her people, irrespective of party, is for the "Union as it is," and the Constitution as our fathers made it. While her people will faithfully respect all the rights guaranteed by that Constitution to the people of the South, they will not consent to the formation of a new Constitution, giving to slavery new and additional guarantees, which those who originally framed it refused to grant.

It is a mistake to suppose that New Hampshire has any laws upon her statute-book which are in conflict with the Constitution touching the rendition of fugitive slaves. But when her personal liberty bill was in force, if any State, feeling aggrieved by such legislation, had come to her in the spirit of kindness and conciliation, there never has been a time when she would not have been met in a like spirit, and every grievance complained of would have been cheerfully redressed. But she understands what is due to her own dignity, and will yield nothing to menaces or threats of a dissolution of the Union.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that the people of New Hampshire are attached to this Union. Her patriot sires did much to achieve its glorious blessings, and their sons, not less patriotic, will peril their lives in its defence. New Hampshire was the ninth State—the last one required to complete the formation of the Union, and she will be the last to desert it in its hour of peril. Her people understand their own duties and relations to the General Government, and they understand, too, the duties and relations of the people of her sister States to that same Government. State Legislatures and Conventions may resolve themselves out of the Union; but the Union nevertheless stands. And, even if the Union is nothing more than a compact between the different States, the people of no State can be absolved from their allegiance to the United States until the bond of union between them shall be dissolved by the consent

of all the States who were originally parties to the compact. I do not, then, misstate the sentiments of her people when I proclaim that, as one of the loyal and patriotic States of the Confederacy, whenever the people of any other State shall, from whatever cause, trample down and violate the laws of the Union, the motto of New Hampshire will be, "The Constitution, the Union, and the enforcement of the laws!" If the maintenance of this doctrine shall result in strife and bloodshed, the responsibility must rest with those who provoked the conflict. There can be no Union unless the laws of the Union are enforced. There can be no Government unless that Government puts forth efforts to have its own authority respected. And when the hour of trial comes, and patriotic hearts are necessary to maintain and defend the integrity of the Union, the people of my gallant State will respond promptly to the call of patriotism, and whether from foes without or foes within, will defend to the last her country's flag. They will, as one man, adopt the recent language of one of her most gifted poets—

"By the many hopes the living cherish;
By our faith in freedom's sacred trust;
By the patriot names that cannot perish;
By the soil made dear by Langdon's dust;
By the deeds of Stark, enshrined in story;
By the voices speaking from the past;
By our priceless heritage of glory,
We'll defend the Union to the last!"

But I do not apprehend any serious collision. I do not believe that this land is to be drenched in the blood of fratricidal strife. Unless some mad attempt should be made upon this capital—which will never be yielded to the enemies of the present Government, let the cost to

save or retake it be ever so great—I believe in the final peaceful solution of all our difficulties. I do not believe it will be accomplished, however, by any unmanly yielding, or any humiliating concessions on either side; but from the returning reason and sense of justice of the great mass of the people in the Southern States, now misguided and led astray by the falsehoods and machinations of political leaders, who have fomented this rebellion to subserve their own selfish and ambitious ends.

Let the Administration of Mr. Lincoln once come fairly into power; let it have an opportunity to develop its policy as every other Administration has done; let it maintain a wise, but firm and decided course in the enforcement of the revenue laws, and the protection of the public property, and it will not be long before the eyes of the people of the seceding States will be opened, not merely as to the real aims and position of the Republican party, but also to the ruinous policy which they have been made to pursue. Then will come the time when the conservative, patriotic men of those States, who are now submerged by this revolutionary tide, can and will be heard. And, then, when the olive branch shall be tendered by the people of the North; when the mutual misunderstandings are done away, the people of the South will return to their allegiance to the Government that has protected them so long and so well; peace and harmony will once more be restored; and the glorious old stars and stripes will still float in the breezes of heaven, the banner of a common country.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
PRINTED AT THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN OFFICE.
1861.



