Doc.	Original Text	Simplified Text
1	Event number: e739137 https://www.quillproject.net/m2/session/5679#739137  Excerpt from a speech given by Charles Sumner on Feb. 6, 1866 in the Senate Committee of the Whole  "The freedman must be protected But this cannot be done so long as you deny him the shield of impartial laws. Let him be heard in court and let him vote. Let these rights be guarded sacredly. Beyond even the shield of impartial laws, he will then have that protection which comes from the consciousness of manhood At present he is only a recent chattel, awaiting your justice to be transmuted into manhood. If you would have him respected in his rights, you must begin by respecting him in your laws.  And now the national safety is staked on this act of justice. You cannot sacrifice the freedman without endangering the peace of the country, and the stability of our institutions. Everything will be kept in jeopardy. The national credit will suffer. Business of all kinds will feel the insecurity The house will continue divided against itself."	The newly-freed slaves must be protected, but we cannot protect them as long as our laws do not protect them. The newly-freed slaves should be able to sue in court when their rights have been violated, and they should be able to vote. These rights are sacred and should be protected for all people.  The safety of the country depends on us protecting the newly-freed slaves and giving them equal protection under the law. We cannot keep treating them as slaves without jeopardizing the peace of the country and stability of our government. If we do not protect the newly-freed slaves in their civil rights, the country will suffer economically. We will continue to fight against ourselves.

https://www.quillproject.net/m2/session/5584#843654

Excerpt from a speech given by Mr. Eldridge on March 2, 1866 in the House of Representatives

... "[The Civil Rights Act of 1866] is another of the measures designed to take away the essential rights of the States. I know that when I speak of States and State rights, I enter upon unpopular subjects. But, sir, whatever other gentlemen may think, I hold that the rights of the States are the rights of the Union, that the rights of the States and the liberty of the States are essential to the liberty of the individual citizen. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Thayer] inquires what right of the States this bill proposes to take away. I reply, it seeks to lay prostrate at the feet of the Federal Government the judiciary of the States. It not only proposes to enter the States to regulate their police and municipal affairs, but it attempts to destroy the independence of the State judiciary."

The Civil Rights Act of 1866 is meant to take away the rights and powers of the States. I know that the subject of states' rights is unpopular, but I believe that states' rights are necessary for protecting the liberty of individuals and of the country. This bills takes away states' rights by making the Federal Government more powerful than the state governments. The bill not only takes away states' rights, it also allows the federal government to interfere with the rulings of state courts.

https://www.quillproject.net/m2/session/5687#739245

Excerpt from a speech given by Mr. Yates on Feb. 19. 1866, in the Senate Committee of the Whole

... "What was this war about? "State rights." It was a question whether the Constitution and laws of the United States were to be the supreme law of the land, or whether State sovereignty, as it was termed, was to be the supreme law. It was whether a State, at its mere pleasure and volition, had a right to secede from the Union and to establish a separate and independent government.

... But if we leave [the protection of civil rights] to the States, then we have no security for the citizen; we cannot have uniformity of legislation; if we give up to the States the power to decide the fundamental question of citizenship upon which the life of the Government depends, then we must expect wrangling and distinctions of classes, which may result in a war quite as bloody and as fatal as that which recently has shrouded our land in the weeds of sorrow."

What was the Civil War about? States' rights. The war was over whether the Constitution and the laws of the United States were the supreme law of the land, or whether state constitutions and state laws were the supreme laws of the land. The war was over whether the States could leave the United States and establish their own government at any time, for any reason.

If we leave the protection of civil rights to the States, then we cannot guarantee that all States will protect the rights of all citizens. If we leave it to the States, each State could deal with it very differently and some States might continue to discriminate and treat citizens differently. If we leave it to the States, we could find ourselves back in another bloody civil war.

Event number: **e849070**<a href="https://www.quillproject.net/m2/session/5673#849070">https://www.quillproject.net/m2/session/5673#849070</a>

Excerpt from a speech given by Mr. Saulsbury on Jan. 29, 1866, in the Senate Committee of the Whole

... "If the power to pass [the Civil Rights Act of 1866] exists anywhere, it must exist in the Constitution as originally framed. Sir, was it ever pretended by any statesman before that that Constitution conferred such a power as this? Look at the powers enumerated in the Constitution and see whether it is possible for the ingenuity of man to arrive at the conclusion that any such power exists; ... and all the powers which Congress possesses are found in the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution.

... That is the sole, almost the entire, authority given under the Constitution to this Federal Government.

... I propose now to examine this bill to see that its provisions are such that it cannot come within the power of Congress, either under the Constitution before it was amended, or under the Constitution as recently amended abolishing slavery in the United States."

The power to pass the Civil Rights Act must be found in the Constitution. Is there anywhere in the Constitution that gives the Federal Government power to protect the civil rights of individuals? The Constitution lists all the powers of Congress in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

The powers listed in that section are the only powers given to the Federal Government in the Constitution.

We should look at the Civil Rights bill and see if anything in the bill falls under the powers given to Congress in the Constitution.

https://www.quillproject.net/m2/session/5495#738983

Excerpt from a speech given by Mr. Donnelly on Jan. 23, 1866 in the House of Representatives

"I shall vote for [the constitutional amendment] cheerfully as a step in the right direction, as tending to bring the representation in this House to a more exact basis of equality[.] ...

It follows as a logical conclusion that if men have no voice in the national Government, other men should not sit in this Hall pretending to represent them. And it is equally clear that an oppressed race should not lend power to their oppressors, to be used in their name and for their destruction. It is a mockery to say that a man's agent shall be his enemy and shall be appointed without his consent and against his desire, and by other enemies.

... For one I shall not rest satisfied until every security is given for the safety, the prosperity, and the development of all the people of the South, without distinction of race or color, feeling assured that in that only can we find the safety of the South and the well-being of the nation.

I will happily vote for the constitutional amendment because it makes representation in Congress more equal.

If a group of people do not have a voice in the Federal Government, others should not pretend to represent them. The newly-freed slaves should not be represented in Congress by the people who held them in slavery. If the newly-freed slaves are represented in Congress, they should be able to vote for the people representing them.

I will not be happy until we have done all we can to make the South safe and happy for all people, and keep the country peaceful.

https://www.quillproject.net/m2/session/5480#738961

Excerpt from a speech given by Mr. Rogers on Jan. 22, 1866 in the House of Representatives

"When the Constitution of the United States was made, our fathers, ... embodied in it the doctrine that representation should not be based upon the voting population of the country, but that it should be solely and wholly based upon the numbers of the people, without regard to sex or color, adding to those who were persons and citizens within the meaning of the organic law a representation for three-fifths of the slave population of this country.

This [constitutional amendment] now under consideration contains a proviso which saps the very foundation and principles upon which the genius and institutions of this country have rested from the commencement of its political existence.

... Yet, because there are in certain States negroes, men of an inferior race, men who by the laws of God are stamped with an inferiority so indelible that nothing can wipe it out, it is proposed that such States shall only enjoy their full right to representation here on the condition that they will allow to these negroes the unqualified right of suffrage on a perfect equality with the white citizen.

The Founding Fathers wrote in the Constitution that representation in Congress is based on the number of people in a State, and not on the amount of people who could vote. The number of people in a state included everyone, men, women, and children, and in the states that had slaves, each slave counted as 3/5th of a person.

The constitutional amendment we are talking about would change the Constitution in a major way. These changes would go against the Founding Fathers' ideas about government.

With this constitutional amendment, representation in Congress would be based on the number of people who can vote. States with Black people would be forced to give Blacks the right to vote in order to get more representation in Congress. I think Blacks are inferior and should not be allowed to vote.