PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

Another Republican Orator on the Stump.

Speech of the Hon. Abraham Lincoln. of Illinois. ð:o., ào.

The announcements that the Hon. Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, would "speak" at the Cooper Institute, drew together a large assemblage at that building last night. The tax of twenty-five cents per capita did not-as it very frequently does-act as a preventative on the visiters, but they continued, on the contrary to pour in in considerable numbers until the large hall was about threequarters filled. Among the audience there were, as is usual in these republican assemblages, a goodly number

At about a quarter to eight o'clock, ex-Governor King made his appearance on the platform, and was greeted with loud applause, which he seemed to enjoy mightily, as with a smile of benevolent gravity he settled himself

The arrival of D. Dudley Field, accompanied by William Cullen Bryant and the speaker of the evening, was the signal for the most tumultuous applause.

Mr. Figgs said-Fellow republicans, I beg leave to nominate as chairman of this meeting a republican whom you all know well-William Cullen Bryant. (Applause.) Those of you who are in favor of Mr. Bryant will be pleased to say "Aye." (Loud cries of "Aye.") Those who are opposed will say " No." (No response.) There is no "No." (Laughter.)

Mr. WILLIAM CULIEN BRYANT then came forward amid loud applause. He said—My friends, it is a grateful office that I perform in introducing to you at this time an eminent citizen of the West, whom you know-whom you have known hitherto only by fame, but who has consented to address a New York assembly this evening. The great West, my friends, is a potent auxiliary in the battle we are fighting for freedom against slavery, in becivilization against barbariem, for the occupation of some of the fairest region of our continent, on which settlers are now build. ing their cabins. I see a higher and wiser agency than that of man in the causes that have filled with a bardy population the vast and fextile region which forms the Lorthern part of the valle; of the Mississippi-a race of men who are not askanded to till their acres with their own hands, and who would be ashamed to subsist by the labor of slaves. (Loud applaces).) These children of the West to the Labor to the advances of slavery, and from them is recruited the Vanguard of the armies of liberty. (Applause.) One of them will appear before you this evening. I present to you a gallant soldier of the political campaign of 1856, who then rendered good service to the republican cause. and who was since the great champion of that cause in the strucele which took place two years later for the supremany of the republicans in the Legislature of Illinoiswho took the field there against Dougles, and would have won the victory but for the unjust apportionment law of the State, which allowed a minority of the people to elect a majority of the Legislature. (Applause.) I have only my triends, to pronounce the name of Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois-(loud cheers)-to receive the profoundest attention. (Renewed cheers.)

Mr. Lincoln is a tall, thin man, dark complexioned, and apparently quick in his perceptions. He is rather unsteady in his gait, and there is an involuntary comical awkwardness which marks his movements while speaking. His voice, though sharp and powerful at times, has a frequent tendency to dwindle into a shrill and unpleasant sound. His enunciation is slow and emphatic. and a peculiar characteristic of his delivery was a remarkable mobility of his features, the frequent contortions of which excited the merriment which his wordsalone could not well have produced

ADDRESS BY HON. ABRAHAM LINCOLN. When the applause which greeted Mr. Lincoln had subsided, he said:--

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF NEW York-The facts with which I shall deal this evening are mainly old and familiar; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them If there shall be any movelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations following that presentation. In his speech last autumn, at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in the New York Times, Senator Douglas

we live, understood this question just as well, and even better,

course. (Applause) I so adopt it because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting point for a discussion between republicans and that wing of the democracy headed by Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry, What was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned? What is the frame of government under which we live? The answer must be, The constitution of the United States. That constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787 (and under which the present government first went into operation), and twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789. Who were our fathers that framed the constitution? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is altogether true to say they fairly represented the opinion and sentiment of the whole nation at that time. Their names, being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all, need not now be repeated. I take these "thirty nine, for the present, as being "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." What is the question which, according to the text, those fathers uncerstood just as well, and even better than we do now? It is this:-Does the proper division of local from federal authority, or anything in the constitution, forbid our federagovernment to control as to slavery in our federal Territories? Upon this Douglas holds the affirmative, and republicans the negative. This affirmative and denial form an issue; and this issue, this question, is precisely what the text declares our fathers understood better than we. (Cheers.) Let us now inquire whether the "thirtynine," or any of them, ever acted upon this question; and if they did, how they acted upon it-how they express. ed that better understanding. In 1784, three years be fore the constitution, the United States then owning the Northwestern territory, and no other, the Congress of the confederation had before them the question of prohibiting slavery in that Territory; and four of the "thirtynine" who afterwards framed the constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these Roger Sherman, Thomas Millin and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition, thus snowing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory. The other of the four, James McHenry, voted against the probibition, showing that for some cause he thought it improper to vote for it. In 1787, still before the constitution, but while the Convention was in session framing it, and while the Northwestern territory still was the only turritory owned by the United States-the same question of prohibiting slavery in the territory again came perore the Congress of the confederation; and three more of the "thirty nine" who afterwards signed the constitution were in that Congress and voted on the question. They were William Bionnt, William Few and Abraham Buldwin, and they all voted for the probibition, thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory. This time the prohibition becarse a law, being a part of what is now well known as the Ordinance of 1787. The question of federal control of slavery in the Territories seems not to have been directly before the Convention which framed the original constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine," or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question. In 1789, by the first Coogress which eat under the constitution, an act was passed to enforce the Ordinance of 1787, including the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nice," Tuomas Fitzsimmons, then a member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its stages

were sixteen of the "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original constitution They were: --John Langdon, Thos. Fitzsimmons, Richard Bassett, Nicholas Gilman, William Few. George Real, Wm. S. Johnson, Abraham Baldwin, Pierce Butier, Rufus King, Roger Sherman, Daniel Carcoli, Robert Morris,

George Clymer. This shows that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the constitution, properly forbade Congress to probiost slavery in the federal territory; cleo both their fidelity to correct principie and their oath to support the constitution would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition. Again, George Washington, another of the "thirtynine," was then President of the United States, and. as such, approved and signed the bill, thus completing its validity as a law, and tone showing that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the constitution, forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory. (Loud applause) No great while after the adoption of the original constitution, North Carolina ceded to the federal government the country now constituting the State of Tennessee: and a few years later Georgia ceded that which now constitutes the States of Mississippi and Alabams. In both deeds of cession it was mute a condition by the ceding States that the federal government should not prohibit slavery in the coded country. Beside this, slavery was then actually in the ceded country. Under these circumstances Congress, on taking charge of these countries, did not absolutely prohibit slavery within them. But they did interfere with it-take control of iteven there, to a certain extent. In 1793 Congress organized the Territory of Mississippi. In the act of organization they prohibited the bringing of slaves into the Territory, from any place without the United States, by fice, and giving freedom to slaves so prought. This act passed both bracches of Cougress reas and mays. In that Congress were three of the "thirty nine," who framed the original constitution. They were John Langdon, George Rewl and Abrabam Baldwie. They all, probably, voted for it. Certaincord if, in their understanding, any line dividing local from federal authority, or anything in the constitution they spoke, and act as they acces upon it. This is all republicans desire—in relation to

federal government purchased the Louisiana country. Our former territorial acquisitions came from certain of war own States, but this Louisians country was acquired from a foreign nation. In 1804 Congress gave a Territorial arganization to that part of it which now constitutes the State of Louisiana. New Orleans, lying within that part. was an old and comparatively large city. There were other considerable towns and settlements, and slavery was extensively and thoroughly interminaled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial act, probibit slavery; but they did interfere with it-take control of it—in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The substance of the provision therein made in relation to slaves was:-

First, That no slave should be imported into the Territory from foreign parts. Second, That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of

Third, That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in

all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law and freedom to the slave. (Prolonged cheers.) This act also was passed without yeas and nays. In the Congress which passed it, there were two of the "thirtynine." They were Abraham Baldwin and Jonathan Dayton. As stated in the case of Mississippi, it is probable they both voted for it. They would not have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it, if, in their understanding, it violated either the line properly dividing local from federal notherity or any provision of the constitution. In 1819 and 1820 came and passed the Missouri question. Many votes were taken, by yeas and nays, in both branches of Congress, upon the various phases of the general question. Two of the "thirty-nine"-Rufus King and Charles Pinckney-were members of that Congress, Mr. King steadily voted for slavery probibltion and sgainst all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as steadily voted against slavery prohibition, and against all compromises. (Cheers.) By this Mr. King saswed that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the constitution, was violated by Congress prohibiting slavery in federal territory; while Mr. Pinckney, by his votes, showed toat, in his understanding, there was some sufficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case. The cases I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover. To enumerate the persons who thus asted, as being four in 1784, three in 1787, seventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1804, and two in 1819 20there would be thirty one of them. But this would be counting John Langeon, Roger Sherman, William Few, Ruft's King and George Read, each twice, and Abraham Saldwin four times. (Applause.) He was a Georgian, too. (Renewed applause and laughter.) The true number of those of the "thirty-nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question, which, by the text, they understood better than we, is twenty three, leaving sixteen not show a to have acted upro it in any way. Here, then, we have twenty-three of our "thirty nine" fathers who framed the government under which we live, who have, upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "underetood just as well, and even better than we do now." and twenty one of them-a clear majority of the whole "thirty nine"-so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross political impropriety and wilful perjury, if, in their understanding, any proper division between local and federal authority, or anything in the constitution they had made themselves and sworn to support, forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in the federal Territories. (Cheers.) Thus the twenty one acted; and as actions speak lowder than words, so actions under such responsibility speak still londer. Two of the twentythirth oled against Congress onal prohibition of slavery in the foulded a ritories, in the instances in which they acted upon the question. But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper disjsion of local from federal authority, or some provision or principle of the constitution, stood in the way; or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition, od what a peared to the:n to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the constitution can conscient one vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he dooms constitutional, if, at the same time, he deems it luexpedient. It, therefore, would be uneafe to got do no even the two who voted against the prohibition, as having done so because, in their understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or anything in the constitution, forbado the federal government to centrol as to si very in federal territory. (Laughter and prolonged applause). The remaining sixteen of the "thirty nine," so far as I have discovered, have left no record of their

understanding upon the direct question of federal control of slavery in the federal Territories. But there is much reason to believe that their understanding upon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty-three compacts, had it been manifes ed at all. For the purpose of adhering rigidly to the text, I bave purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested, by any person, however distinguished, other than the thirty nine fathers who framed the original constitution; and, for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any of the" thirty-nipe" even, on any

phases, as the foreign slave trade, and the morality and colicy of slavery generally, it would appear to us that on the direct question of federal control of slavery in federal Territories, the sixteen, if they had acted at all, would probably bave acted just as the twenty three did. Among that sixteen were several of the most noted anti-slavery men of those times-as Dr. Franklin (Cueers), Alexander Hamilton, and Gouverneur Morris-while there was not one new known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John Rutledge of South Carolina. (Applause) The sum of the whole is, that of our "tairty-nine" fathers

other phase of the general question of slavery. If we should look into their acts and declarations on those other Our fathers, when they framed the government under which I fully endorse this, and I adopt it as a text for this diswho framed the original constitution, twenty onea clear majority of the whole-cortainly understeed that no proper division of local from federal authority, nor any part of the constitution, forbade the federal government to control slavery in the federal Forritories, while all the rest probably had the same undertanding. Such, unquestionably, was the understanding f our fathers who framed the original constitution; and he text affirms that they understood the question better han we. (Laughter and cheers.) But, so far I have been considering the understanding of the question manifested by the framers of the original constitution. In and by the original instrument a mode was provided for amending it; and, as I have already stated, the present frame of government under which we live consists of that original, and twelve amendatory articles framed and adopted since. Those who now insist that federal control of slavery in federal Territori's violates the constitution, point us to the provisions which they suppose it thus violates; and, as I uncerstand, they all fix upon provisions in these amendatory articles, and not in the original instrument. The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case plant themselves upon the fifth amendment, which provides that "no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law;" while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the tenth amondment, providing that "the powers not granted by the constitution, are reserved to the States respectively, and to the people." Now, it so happents that these amendments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the constitution-the identical Congress which passed the act already mentioned, enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. (Applause.) Not only was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same indistant men who, at the same session, at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward maturity, these constitutional amendments and this act prohibiting slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The constitutional amendments were introduced before and passed after the act of enforcing the ordinance of '87; so that during the whole pandency of the act to enforce the ordinance the constitutional amendments were also pen iing. That Congress, consisting in all of seventy-six members, including sixteen of the framers of the origipal constitution, as before stated, were ore eminently our fatbers who framed that part of the government under which we live which is now claimed as forbidding toe federal government to control stavery in the federal Territories. Is it not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that Congress deliberately framed, and carried to maturity at the same time, are absolutely inconsistent with each other? Auch does not such affirmation become impudently absurd when coupled with the other affirmation, from the 84ms mouth, that those who did the two things alleged to be inconsistent uncerstood whether they really were inconsistent better than we-better than he who affirms that they are inconsistent? (Applause and great merrim-at.) It is surely sa'e to assume that the "thirty oine" framers of the original constitution, and the seventy-six members of the Congress which tramed the amondments thereto, taken altogether, do certainly include those who may be tairly called "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." And 80 assuming, I defy any man to show that any one of them ever in his whole life declared that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the constitution, forbade the tederal government to control as to stavery in the federal Territories. (Lond applause.) I go a step further. I dely any one to show that any living man in the whole world ever did, prior to the beginning of the present century, (and I might almost say prior to the beginning of the last half of the present century,) declare that, in without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without yeas and pays, whice is equivalent to a unanimous passage. (Cheers.) In this Congress there

his understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the constitution, forbade the tederal government to control as to slavery in the federal Territories. To those who now so deciare I give, not only "our fathers who framed the government under which we live," but with them all other living mea within the century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them. Now and here, lot me guar i a William Patterson, James Madison, little against being misunderstood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so would be to discard all the lights of current experience-to reject all progress-ail improvement. What I do say is, that if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers, in any case, we should do so

upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed. cannot stand; and most surely not in a case whereof we ourselves occlare they understood the question better than we. (Laughter) If any man, at this day, sincerely beleves that a proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the constitution, forbids the federal government to control as to slavery in the federal ferritories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which he can. But he has no right to mislead others, wno have less access to history and less lessure to study it, into the false belief to at "our lathers, who framed the government under which we live," were of the same opinion-thus substituting falsehood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument. (Applause.) If any man at the day sincerely believes "our fathers, who framed the government under which we live," used and applied principles, in other cases, which ought to have led them to understand that a proper division of local from federal authority, or some part of the constitution, forbids the federal government to control as to slavery in the federal Territories, he is right to say so. But he should, at the same time, brave the responsibility of declaring that, in his opinion, he understands their principles natter than they did themselves-(great laughter)-and espeally should be not shirk that responsibility by asserting that they "understood the question just as well, and oven better, than we do now." (Applaties) But chough. Lat all who believe, that our "lathers, who framed the government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better thad we co now," sheak as

Fovery in federal territory. (egricuse.) In 1863 the clavery, as these fathers marked it, so let it be again

learned, as an ordital to be extended, has lobe tolerated, and protected only because of an I so far as its action presence among us makes that teleration and protection a ecressity. (Local applaces.) Let all the guarantees those fathers gare it be, not gradgburly, but fully and fairly maintained. For this republisare copiend, and with this, so far as I know or believe, they well be content. (Appeared.) And now, if they world lesten-as I suppose they will not-1 would address a test words to the Southern people. (languter.) I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people, and I consider that in the general quathice of reason and justice you are not infector to any other occopet still, when you speak of us recublicans. you do so only to der minus he as reptiles, or, at the best. at to better than ontinue. You will great a bearing to parates or murderers, but nothing like it to " black rerubbecans. (Laughter.) in all your contactions with one neether each of you deeme an encomplifical condemonation es " back republicanism" as the first thing to be ettended to. (Laughter.) Indeed, such cendemnation of us seems to be an indispensable prerequisite-license, so to steak-know you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all. Now, can you or not be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves? Bring forward your charges and specifications, and then be realism long enough to hear us deny or justify. You say we are sectional. We deny it. (Lond applease.) That makes an issue, and the burden of proof is upon you. (Laughter and applause.) You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section-gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then, in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, wa thould thereby crase to be sectional. (Great merriment.) You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet, are you will ing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably seen find that we have ceased to be rectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. (Loud cheers.) You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue. The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making and not of ours. And if there b fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do repelyeu by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is cure; but this brings you to where you ought to have startes-to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. (Loud applause.) If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any other object, then our principle, and we with it, are rectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so meet it as if it were possible that something may be said on enr side. (Laughter.) Do you accept the challenge? No. Then you really believe that the principle which our samers who framed the government under which we live shought so clearly right as to adopt it, and endorse it again and again, upon their official oaths, is, in fact, so wherey wrong so to demand your condemnation without a moment's consideration (Applause.) Some of you selight to thaunt in our faces the warning against rectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning, he had, as President of the United States, approved and signed an act of Concress, enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory, which act embodied the policy of the government upon that subject, up to and at the very moment he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned it he wrote Lufayette that he considered that prohibition a wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we should some time have a confederacy of free States. (Applause.) Bearing this to mind, and seing that sectionalism has since arisen upon this same subject, is that warning a weapon in your hands against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washington himself speak, would be cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy, or upon you who repudiate it? (Applause.) We respect that vearning of Washington, and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it. (Applause.) But you say you are conservativeeminently conservative-while we are revolutionary, derienctive, or something of the sort. What is conservatism? te it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, the identical and policy on the point in controversy which was adopted by our fathers who framed the government under which we live; while you with one accord reject, and scout, and rpit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disagree among yourselves as to what that substitute shall be. You have considerable variety of new propositions and plans, but you are wavelength in rejecting and denouncing the old policy of the tathers. Some of you are for reviving the foreign slave trade; some for a Congressional slave core for the Territories; some for Congress forbidding the Territories to prohibit slavery within their limits; some for maintaining slavery in the Territories through the Judiciary; some for the "gur reat par-rinciple" -- (laughter) -- that "if one man would coalave another, no third man should object," fartastically called "popular sovereignty"-(renewed laughter and applause) -but never a man among you in favor of federal prohibition of slavery in federal Territories, according to the practice of our fathers who framed the government under which we live. Not one of all your various plans can show a precedent or an advocate in the century within which our covernment originated. Consider, then, whether your claim of conservatism for yourselves, and your charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations. Again, you say we have made the slavery question more prominent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent, but we deny that we made it so. It was not we, but you, who discarded the old policy of the fathers We registed. and still regist, your innovation-your want of conservatism; and thence comes the greater prominence of the question. Whould you have that question reduced to its former proportions? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. If you would have the peace of the old times, re-adopt the precepts and policy of the old times. (Applause.) You harge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper's Ferry (Great laughter.) John Brown! (Renowed laughter.) John Brown was no republican, and you have railed to implicate a single republican in his Har per's Ferry enterprise. (Loud applause.) If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable to not designate the man and prove the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcugable to assert it, and especially to persist in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. (Great applause.) You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander. (Applause.) Some of you generously admit that no re publican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's ferry affair; but sill insist that our dectrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold to no doctrines, and make no declarations which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the government under which we live. (Applance) You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this shair. When it occurred, some important State elections were pear at hand, and you were in evident gleewith the belief that, by charging the blame upon us you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. (Laughter.) You did not sweep New York, and New Jersey, and Wisconsin, and Mionesota, precisely like fire sweeps over the prairie in high wind. (Laughter) You are still dramming at this idea. Go on with it. If you think you can, by glandering a woman, make her love you, or by villiying a man make him vote with you, go on and try it. (Boisterous laughter and prolonged applause.) Every republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual pretest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Sarely this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with our fathers who framed the govern ment ander which we live, declare our belief that slavery is wrong-(applause)-but the slaves do not hear us declare even this, for anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your micropresentations of us, in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charged the other with sympathy with black republicanism; and then, to give point to the charge, defines black republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood and thunder among the slaves. (Boisterous laughter and applause.) Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the republican party was organized. What induced the Southampton insurrection, tweaty-eight years ago, in which at least three times as many lives were lost as at Harper's Ferry? You can scarcely stretch your very elastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was got up by black republicanism. (Laughter.) In the present state of things in the United States I do not think a general, or even a very extensive slave insurrection, is possible. The indispensable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendary free men, black or white, supply it. The explosive materials are everywhere in parcels, but there neither are, nor can be supplied, the indispensable connecting trains. Much is said by Southern people about the affection of slaves for their masters and mistresses; and a part of It, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised and communicated to twenty individuals before some one of thom, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divulge it. This is the rule; and the slave revolution in Hayti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar circumstances. The gunpowder plot of British history, though not connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case, only about twenty were admitted to the secret; and yet one of them, in his auxiety to cave a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by concequence, awarted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen, and open or stealthy assassinations in the field, and local revolts extending to a score or so, will continue to occur as the natural results of slavery; but no general desurrection of slaves, as I think, can tappen in this country for a long time. Wheever much fears, or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed. In the language of Mr. Jefferson, attered many years ago, "It is still in our power so direct the process of emancipation, and deportation. perceably, and in such slew degrees, as that evil will wear off incensive; and their places be, part passu, filled up by free white laborers. (Lond applause.) if, on the contrary, it it: left to force itself.on, human nature must shudder at the grosped hold up." Mr. Jefferson did not mean to gay, nog do I, that the power of amancipation is in the federal g overnment. He spoke of Virginia; and, as to the Power of amancigation, I speak of the slaveholding States only. The federal government, however, as we insist, has the power of mestraming the extension of the institution-the cower to insure that a clave incurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from Slavery. (Applause.) John Brown's effort was peculiar. it was not a slave insurrection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves, in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact, it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their ignorance, saw plainly enough it could not encored. That affair, in its philosophy, corresponds with the many attempts, related in history, at the accessination of kings and emperors. An ecthusiast breads over the oppression of a people till he fancies himself commissioned by Heaven to liberate them. He ven-

tures the attempt, which ends in little olse than in bix own

execution. Offini's attempt on Louis Napoleon, and John

hko bycsk up the republican organization? Bittian in on the control of the contro cannot be charged. Toere is a judy ment and a feeling against slavery in this nation, which oust at least a million and a half of votes. You can ot destroy that judgment and feeling-that sentiment-by breaking up the political organization when railies around it. You can scarcely scatter and deperse an army which has been formed into order in the face of your beaviest fire, but if you could, how much would you gain by forcing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful chanel of the ballet box, into some other channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Brun n's be lessened or enlarged by the operation? But you will break up he Upion, rather than subsait to a denial of your coost totional rights. That has a somewhat reckless sound; but it would be pulliated, if not fully justified, were we proposing, by the mere force of numbers, to deprive you of some right, plainly written down in the constitution. But we are proposing no such thing. When you make these declarations, you have a specific and well understood allusion to an assumed constitutional right of yours, to take slaves into the federal Territorics, and to hold them there as property. But no such right is specifically written in this constitution. That instrument is literally ellent about any such right. We, on the contrary, deny that such a right has any existence in the constitution, even by implication. (Applause.) Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is, that you will destroy the government, unless you be allowed to construe and enforce the constitution as you please, on all points in dispute between you and us. You will ruin or rule in all events. This, plainly stated, is your language to us. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the dis puted constitutional question in your favor. Not quite so But, waving the lawyers' distinction between dictum and decision, the Court have decided the question for you in a sort of way. The Court have substentially said, it is your constitutional right to take slaves into the icderal Territories, and to hold them there as property. When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was made in a divided Court by a bare majority of the judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it; that it is so made as that its arowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning; and that it was mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact—the statement in the opinion that " the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution " An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not distinctly and expressly affirmed in it. (Applanse.) Bear in mind the judges do not pledge their judicial opinion that such right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution; but they pledge their veracity that it is distinctly and expressly affirmed there-"distinctly"-that is, not mingled with anything elseexpressly, that is in words meaning just that, without the aid of any inference, and susceptible of no other meaning. If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the word "slave" nor "slavery" is to be found in the constitution, nor the word "property" even, in any connection with language alluding to the things slave or slavery-(applause)-and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a "person;" and wherever his master's legal right in relation to him is alluded to, it is spoken of as "zervice or labor due," as a "debt" payable in service or labor. Also, it would be open to show, by cotemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and slavery; instead of speaking of there, was employed on purpose to exclude from the constitution the idea that there could be property in man. To show all this is easy and certain. When this obvious mistage of the Judges shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and reconsider the conclusion based upon it? And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers who framed the government under which we live"--the men who made the constitution-decided this same constitutional question in our favor long ago-decided it without a division among themselves, when making the decision; without division among themrelves about the meaning of it after it was made, and so far as any evidence is left without basing it upon any migtaken statement of facts. Under all these circumstances do you really feel yourselves justified to break up this government, unless such a court decision as yours is shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political action? But you will not abide the election of a republican President. In that supposed event you say you will destroy the Union, and then, you say, the great crime of baving destroyed it will be upon us! (Laughter.) That is cool. (Great hughter.) A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!" (Continued hughler.) To be sure, what the robber demanded of me-my money-was my own, and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was no more my own than my vote is my own; - ("That's go," and applause.) - and the threat of death to me, to extert my money, and the threat of destruction to the Union, to extort my vote, can scarcely be distinguished in principle. A few words now to republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great confederacy shall be at peace and in harmony one with another. Let us republicans do our part to have it so. ("We will," and applause.") Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the Southern people will notice much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands and yield to them, if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them. Will they be satisfied if the Territories be unconditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us the Territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation. The question recurs, what will satisfy them? Simply this: We must not only let them alone, but we must, somehow, convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been trying to so convince them, from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them. These natural, and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only: cease to call slavery wrong, and join them in calling it right And this must be done thoroughly-done in acts as well as in words. Silence will not be tolerated-we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Douglas' new sedition law must be enacted and enforced, suppressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, whether made in politics, in presses, in pulpits or in private. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure; we must pull down our free State constitutions; the whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us. I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone, do nothing to us, and say what you please about slavery." But we do let them alone-have never disturbed them-so that, after all, it is what we say which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accuse us of doing, until we cease saying. I am also aware they have not, as yet, in terms, demanded the overthrow of our free State constitutions. Yet those constitutions declare the wrong of slavery with more solemn emphasis than do all other payings against it; and, when all these other sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these constitutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the demand. It is nothing to the contrary that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for the reason they do, they can voluntarily stop nowhere short of this consummation. Holding, as they do, that slavery is morally right and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it as a legal right and a social blessing. (Applause.) Nor can we justifiably withhold this on any ground save our conviction that slavery is wrong. If slavery is right, all words, acts, laws and constitutions against it are themselves wrong, and should be silenced and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality-its universality;

full recognition, as being right; but thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast our yoles with their view, and against our own? In view of our moral, social and political responsibilities, can we do this? ("No, no," and applause.) Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation: but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national Territories and to overrun us here in these free States? ("No, nover," and applause. A voice-"Guess not." Laughter.) If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our cuty, fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored-contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man-such as a policy of "don't care" on a question about which all true men do care—such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to disunionists, reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the rightcous to repentance-(prolonged cheers and laughter)-such as invocations of Washington, imploring men to ucsay what Washington said, and undo what

if it is wrong, they cannot justly insist upon its extension

-its enlargement. All they ask we could readily grant,

readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking

it right, and our thinking it wrong, is the precise fact

upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it

right, as they do, they are not to blame, for desiring its

dungeons to ourselves. (Applause.) Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty, as we understand it. Mr. Lipcoln then bowed, and retired amid the loud and uprearious applause of his hearers-nearly every man rising spontaneously, and cheering with the full power of their lungs.

duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from

it by menaces of destruction to the government nor of

Seward. The audience now began to clamor for more speeches, and loud cries arose for Greeley, who was espied among

Three cheers were then proposed and given for Wm. H.

the crowd on the platform. HORACE GREELEY, on coming forward, said: -Mr. Chairman and gentlemen-My elequent Western friend, who has just addressed you, is but a specimen of the men which free institutions make. (Applause.) Born in a slave State and reared mainly in a free State, he is a proper example of what labor may be; how effort and honest aspirations may bring a man from the humblest ranks of society and place him at last in connection with the highest. (Cheers.) Let us. never doubt that the contest in which we are engaged, and in which on our side we present such spectacles as are termed by the gentle-man opposite the mud sills of our society, can never be lost. It may be that we may be beaten one year, perhaps another and another, but in the great tide of time we are sure that the last wave will be higher than the first; and thus we shall go on from victory to victory, even through reverses, learning how victories at last shall be won. (Applause.) When I heard our friend gay what he said so well about

(Applause). Let us not be no insurrection. then, count as lost the struggle of 1854 and 1858, which liberated Kansas-that vast regionand liberated her from even the danger of any future ingurrection. True, a few men sacrificed their lives thereand noble men they were, too-but it was in a struggle which the thousands of years of peace that are to follow shall richly repay. (Applause.) We reaped an advan-tage from that brief struggle and those pre-cious sacrifices. Let us, then rejoice in the belief that if the people of the country should be brought face to face with such champions, and such arguments as we have heard to-night our cause must be invincible. (Cheers.) General Nye was then called upon and said :- Fellow-

citizens. I cannot consent to mar the beauty of the speeches you have listened to to-night. On another occasion, when you cannot do better, I may give you some soft words on this queston (laughter); but at present I only claim to be the equal of any republican in feeling as deeply, and working as strenuously in proportion to what has been given me, as any man to secure the advantages of a republican triumph. (Applause.) I am waiting to see that curious gathering at Charleston which is shortly to take place, where those Union loving men of the North-(laughter)-will shake hands with the disunton preaching men of the South for the glorious and patriotic purpose of preserving unmarred to all future time, this beautiful fabric of our republican institutions. (Laughter and applause.) I want to see John Cochrane and Senator Hammond strike hands together at the Convention. I want to see the present Mayor of this city and Senator Davis of Mississippi strike bands and pledge each other, one to dissolve the Union and the other to uphold it. (Laughter.) I want to see the beauty of that doctrine exemplified that was put forth by Mr. Charles O'Conor. I want to see the time come when the doctrines of Washington shall be eulogized, and when a nation of fifteen Stateshalf of the Union-denounces the doctrine which he esponsed. I want to see this group of consistency mingled together. (Laughter.) I understand that one of the delegations from this State are going down in a big ship by themselves. (Renewed laughter and cheers.) I think that is Wise. (A voice-No, its Wood-loud laughter and cheers.). But I advise them to keep their steam up, with their anchor ready to slip at a moment's warning, for that they will have an invitation to "leave" is as cortain as that they go. (Boisterous laughter.) I want to see that ship safely moored again at our wharf, without accident, because I desire to share in the glory of beating them combined. ("Good, Good," and cheers, and a voice-"I think we shall.") I am going to leave Illinois to our friend Lincoln, and there is no doubt that he will take care of that individual upon whom gravitation seems at present to have so direct a hold. (Prolonged laughter.) When that Convention shall have met and parted-when the most magnificent row has taken place which this nation has ever seen—(laughter)—then I think it will be time, by your permission, for me, after these other gentlemen shall have have exhausted themselves, to utter what little I have to say on the republican prospects of success. Until then I shall reserve myself, and save you the penalty of my

James A. Brices, of Ohio, was then loudly called for, and responded:-Republicans of New York-I cannot talk to you at this late hour, after the feast of fat things which you have enjoyed to night. You are greedy for republicanism, as wolves upon the prairie are greedy for food, but, unlike them, greedy to save-not to destroy. It is too late to talk to you further upon this topic. You desire to go home and rest, to get strength for the coming contest, and to decide whether the gallant son of Kentucky, who was reared in Illinois, and whom you have beard to night (applause), shall be the standard bearer in the fight, or whether your glorious son of New York (tremenduous applause, and three cheers for Wm. H. Seward), or the noble, stalworth Chase, of Ohio-a banner which, when November comes, shall float in triumph, and under its folds we shall be able to shout, "Victory for the Union and the constitution," and liberty shall be sate. (Loud applause.)

further speech to-night.

Judge Craver then took the floor, and made inspiriting remarks as to the prespects of the party in general; and appealing particularly to the young men of New York, he said, "bring out your long Tom, fill it with grape and cannister, and when you hear the bugle give the note, go up in unbroken columns, scale the fortress of this slaveholding Gibraltar, take possession of the citadel, and Rome will again be free." The meeting then dispersed.

City Politics.

THE YOUNG MEN'S NATIONAL UNION CLUB. The Young Men's National Union Club held its second regular meeting at Clinton Hall last evening. Quite a number of respectable gentlemen were present. Mr. E. P.

Norton, President of the Club, occupied the chair, and Mr. John Thomas Phillips, acted as Secretary. Mr. Smith Hambleton was elected a member of the Executive Committee from the First, Mr. Jared A. Timpson from the Second, Mr. Benj. F. Buck from the Fourth, Mr. John R. Livermore from the Eleventh, Mr. A. R. Peck from the Twentieth and Mr. Wm. F. Jackson from the Twenty-first wards. The committee were not prepared to report the names of members of the Finance Committee. After a long and excited debate, and several devisions, the President refused to recognise a motion to elect delegates to the General Executive Committee of the Union party, on the ground that the Club has no connection with that or any other body. Several new members were elected. Copies of the report of the mass Union meeting at the Academy of Music were extensively distributed. Mr. E. J. Brown, of the Executive Committee, reported that Union Clubs were forming all over the country. In Massachusetts, Mr. Lawrence was expending his time and money for this movement. In Illinois a club of 600 had been formed and a newspaper started within three days. From al parts of New York the same things were reported. Men, high in office in the country, were thinking seriously of coming over on masse. It only requires ten minutes to couvert any reasoning man to the great National Union party. After Clay had given Van Buren that tremendous thrashing in the Senate, they both walked out arm in arm. Do Schators walk out arm in arm now? Do the Hunters and the Sumpers take sweet counsel together for the good of the country? No. All fraternal feeling has vanished. and the representatives in Congress share in the sectional feeling. He had thus been informed by eminent Congressmen. Nothing but the conservative national feeling of the country could rebuke and put down this see tional fanaticism Mr. Ramsay has spent the winter travelling through

Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, and he found everywhere, among all classes, the sentiment that their brethren of the North were estranged from them; that the great republican party was an abolition party, which had sent and would send emissaries to cut the throats of the people of the South. As for the negroes, they were better off than most colored and many white men here. The only way to proceed was to give time, talent and money to put down the black republican party, which is now covering the country as with a dark cloud. The members of that party might be honest, and doubtless were, but the leaders were conducting them towards disunion, civil The meeting then adjourned to the second Tuesday in

Police Intelligence.

APREST FOR CIRCULATING ORSCENE CIRCULARS.-A man named Harris was acrested about six o'clock last evening by detectives Klug and Slowey, on complaint of a number of citizens residing in the upper part of the city, who allege that the accused has caused to have circulated obscene circulars, which have been left at their houses after they have proceeded to business, in order that they may fall into the hands of the females. Harris was arrested at the Post Office station D, Eighth street, just as he was about leaving with a number of letters addressed to him. He was taken to the Police Headquarters and committed for examination. A large number of letters were found at his place of business in Broadway, signed by young ladies and gentlemen, all in answer to the circular. They were taken possession of by Capt. Walling, who will hand them over to the magistrate before whom Harris will be taken. Parties having been annoyed by these circulars would do well to call at the Police Headquarters and enif we thought slavery right; all we ask, they could as ter their complaint.

Charge of Highway Robbery .- Charles Gehen, a young man, twenty four years of age, a native of Germany, and residing at 151 Attorney street, was arrested on Sunday evening charged with attacking Charles Williams, of 171 Luclow street, at about eleven o'clock on Saturday night. while the latter was walking in Honston street, near Attorney. It is alleged that he first struck Williams over the mouth with a slung shot, knocking out his teeth, and then extracted from his coat pocket a memorandum book containing a five dollar bill on the Broadway Bank. Ac-

cused was committed in default of \$2,000 to stand his trial. CHARGE OF PERJURY AGAINST A JERSEYMAN .- Officer Barron, of the Lower Police Court, on Monday arrested a provision dealer, named Amos Hoagland, a resident of Newark, New Jersey, on a charge of perjury, preferred against him by George Cone, of Scranton, Pennsylvania, who alleges that the accused, on the 21st of July last, swore falsely in a certain law suit then pending in the First District Court of this city. Justice Connolly held him

in \$1,000 bail to answer the charge. FAST DRIVING ON CENTRAL PARK .- Michael Reynolds and P. Leonard were arrested by the Park keepers, on Sunday, for driving at a faster rate than seven miles an hour. They were confined at the Twenty-third ward station house over night, and yesterday, being brought

Washington did. Neither let us be slandered from our before Justice Brownell, were fined two dollars each. Counterferts.-Last evening new counterfelt ones on the Chemung Bank, Chemung, N. Y., made their appearance. The storekeepers were soon put on their guard by the means of the telegraph and police force. No arrests

Brooklyn City News.

were made.

THE ALEANY LOBBY COMMITTEE -At a meeting of the Common Council last night a communication was received from the Mayor, vetoing the resolution adopted on the 20th inst., authorizing the appointment of a committee of five to proceed to Albany, with power to expend \$500 to defray expenses. His Honor deems such an appropriation a wasteful expenditure of the public money, and adds that the city and county are represented in the Senate and Assembly by gentlemen of character and ability, who fully understand the wants of the community, and who are anxious to perform all the duties required of them in their legislative capacity, and there cannot be a doubt that all wise and proper measures will be attended to by them. Furthermore, the Mayor does not think that a delegation of Aldermen will have more weight at Albany than any other five gentlemen of like standing and reputation in the community. The communication was order-

A New Post Office Building.-A resolution was adopted by the Common Council last night to the effect that the time has arrived when an application should be made to the United States government for an appropriation for a

Ecown's afternet at Harper's Ferry were, in their philoso insurrections, I rejoiced to think that where the same. The cagerness to the blame on our policy prevails, though there may be strikes, or temporary alienations of the two things. The caperness of the two things:

Post office in the city of Recoktyn.

Post office in the city of Recoktyn.

Specie from Mexico—The achoener Virginia Antoinette arrived at New Orleans on the 18th inst. from Yera Cruz, and the same of the two things:

The caperness of the two things of the two things of the two things of the two things of the t (Applance.) And how much would it evalt you, if you applance.) A free and concated laboring class is the car. | with \$24,250 in specie. The schooner Star arrived same could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's book, and the I tain imbork of society, and where they exist there can I day with \$12,951 in specie.