

tutional features which make it a free government, but a government made by men with swords imbued in the blood of their brothers just before they made it. I must confess I have no sympathy with this extreme shuddering about civil war. God knows it is a natural feeling, and the war is disagreeable enough to me. In its actual progress it has come near enough to me on several occasions to make me feel the torturing anxieties and the deep distresses which inevitably attend it. But I ask, Mr. President, whether a people that was anything but imbecile, slovenly, effeminate, and fit only to be kicked out of the civilized world, ever existed without civil war.

Gentlemen talk about civil war consolidating the government. There is no government in the world that is worth anything, that has not got consolidation enough to preserve its own existence. The gentleman says that the Government of the United States protects us abroad, and nobody goes abroad. The Government of the United States protects us by its great and immediate powers abroad; but I ask under whose protection and by whose power do the Governments of the States exercise their beneficent jurisdiction at home. By their combination among themselves they have lifted among the banners of the earth a banner which is everywhere respected and feared; and it is because the Declaration of Independence declared certain general principles represented in our form of government, emblemized by that flag, and supported by the United States people, making this country so strong at home and so feared abroad, that the State Governments have been able, peaceably and quietly to discharge their all-important and valuable functions. Take a government scattered and separate, like any small principality that stands shuddering every day lest its powerful enemies tear it to pieces; and I ask you whether in a government in that condition the liberty of the citizen is safe and the property of the citizen is protected.

Gentlemen say that the history of the world is written all over with evidence that consolidation has destroyed liberty and ruined nations. I am not in favor of that consolidation which absolutely blends together these people; but I am in favor of that consolidation which is necessary to keep them united, and to preserve their power among the nations of the earth. With all deference to the learning and opinion of gentlemen who have pronounced this theory, I say you cannot point me to an instance in the history of the world, where the consolidation of a nation has either destroyed the liberty or destroyed a people. Gentlemen talk about the despotisms of Europe. Why are they despotisms? Not because they are consolidated, but because the institutions of the people, and the partial development they have made, and the

customs they have lived under, make them despotic; and if they were not consolidated they would be just as despotic. Go back to feudal times, and trace up the French nation, with their kings, and ultimately with their empire; and, I ask whether they would have been under the dominion of Louis Napoleon today, as despotic as it is, if the rights of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, had not suffered under the Duke of Guise or Henry of Navarre, or any of the half kings who exercised authority over the portions of France. I say that Louis XI, as bad a man as he was, as corrupt and despotic a man as he was, conferred liberty upon the people of France as far as it could be conferred, for the people were not fit for liberty, when the people of France, who had been pillaged and despoiled by the separate princes of France, were consolidated under one grand government. And what ruined the republics of Greece? Was it consolidation? The most glorious page in their country's history, was under the empire of Philip and Alexander. It is that history which has spread their renown over the civilized world, and which carried Greek civilization over every portion of the then known world. It was despotic, of course. In the growth of civilization the rights of man had never got above that standard, and any government they could have had would have been despotic; and a united despotism is better than a divided despotism.

What follows when a nation is divided into small fragments? The very fact that the people are weak, makes them willing to trust their government with power. The very fact that the nation is small and weak, makes it more necessary for them to concentrate every energy in one executive head. It is only when a people becomes strong; it is only when a people becomes as the United States have become, vast in numbers, and wealth, intelligence, and power, that they are able to organize a free government with divided powers; because then and only then people know that they are strong enough not to make it necessary to keep up a demonstration of power.

Gentlemen talk about the blessed progress of the government under the States' rights idea. I deny that the government ever advanced upon the States' rights idea. You had sometimes States' rights men in different offices of the government; but whether that is so or not, I ask with what consistency it can be said that this government has advanced under the States' rights theories, rather than under the consolidation theory under the Constitution. I am not disposed to go into the argument about the outrages said to have been committed upon any State. But I ask you, if it is true that President Lincoln controls more power than he ought to control, and if it is true that Jefferson Davis con-