

At the following terms, to wit: \$1.75 per annum, if paid strictly in advance. \$2.00 if paid within 6 months; \$2.50 if not paid within 6 months.

Professional Cards.

JOSEPH W. TATE,

ATTORNEY AT LAW, BEDFORD, PA. Will promptly attend to collections and all business entrusted to his care, in Bedford and adjoining counties.

J. R. DURBORROW,

ATTORNEY AT LAW, BEDFORD, PA. Office one door South of the "Mengel House." Will attend promptly to all business entrusted to his care in Bedford and adjoining counties.

ESPY M. ALSIP,

ATTORNEY AT LAW, BEDFORD, PA. Will faithfully and promptly attend to all business entrusted to his care in Bedford and adjoining counties.

U. H. AKERS,

ATTORNEY AT LAW, Bedford, Pa. Will promptly attend to all business entrusted to his care. Military claims speedily collected.

F. M. KIMMELL. J. W. LINGENFELTER. KIMMELL & LINGENFELTER, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, BEDFORD, PA.

JOHN P. REED, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BEDFORD, PA. Respectfully tenders his services to the public.

JOHN PALMER, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BEDFORD, PA. Will promptly attend to all business entrusted to his care.

A. M. COFFROTH, ATTORNEY AT LAW, Somerset, Pa. Will hereafter practice regularly in the several Courts of Bedford county.

J. ALSIP & SON, Auctioneers & Commission Merchants, BEDFORD, PA.

J. L. MARBOURG, M. D. Having permanently located, respectfully tenders his professional services to the citizens of Bedford and vicinity.

SAMUEL KETTERMAN, BEDFORD, PA.

JACOB REED, J. J. SCHRELL, REED AND SCHRELL, BANKERS & DEALERS IN EXCHANGE, BEDFORD, PENN A.

ST. CHARLES HOTEL, CORNER OF WOOD AND THIRD STREETS, BEDFORD, PA.

WARTHAN & ENGELMANN, (SUCCESSORS TO MICHAEL WARTHAN & CO.)

Tobacco Snuff and Cigar MANUFACTORY, No. 313 NORTH THIRD STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

ADMINISTRATORS' NOTICE. Letters of administration upon the estate of John Metzger, late of Juniata town, who deceased, having been granted to the undersigned by the Register of Bedford county, all persons indebted to said estate are requested to make immediate payment, and those having claims will make known the same without delay.

Bedford Gazette

VOLUME 59. Freedom of Thought and Opinion. WHOLE NUMBER, 1046.

NEW SERIES. BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 6, 1864. VOL. 7, NO 40.

Table with 3 columns: Rate (One Square, Two Squares, Three Squares), Duration (Three months, Six months, One year), and Price (\$1.50, \$2.00, \$3.00).

SPEECH OF HON. ALEXANDER LONG OF OHIO, DELIVERED In the House of Representatives, APRIL 8, 1864.

Wm. H. Seward in his letter of April 11, 1861, to Mr. Adams, our Minister to England, said: "For these reasons, the President would not be disposed to reject a cardinal doctrine of theirs (the Rebels) namely: that the Federal Government could not reduce the seceding States to obedience by conquest, even though he were disposed to question that proposition. But in fact the president willingly accepts it as true. On the one hand an imperial or despotic government could subjugate thoroughly disaffected and insurrectionary members of the State.— This Federal Republicanism of ours is of all forms of governments the very one which is most unfitted for such labor."

Such was the language of the Secretary of State in April, 1861, three days before the Sunday on which the President whirled his proclamation calling out seventy-five thousand troops, but after seven States had seceded. The Secretary shared in the fears of the President, that the attempt to subjugate the South would destroy the Government. Three years of civil war in a vain and fruitless effort at subjugation attest and prove to day the correctness of the opinion then held by the President: "Only an imperial or despotic government, could subjugate thoroughly disaffected and insurrectionary members of the State." This Federal republicanism of ours is of all forms of Government the most unfitted for such labor. Who does not believe it? If there is truth in the declaration of Independence, and the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will certainly not dispute it, since they incorporated it in the Chicago platform which became a law unto the President; who, I ask, can deny the conclusion of the Secretary of State, having in view always, as he and the President undoubtedly had, the great cardinal truth underlying all republican governments "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." If the President and his Secretary of State gave utterance to truth in 1861, is it any less a truth to-day? Has not rather the experience of three years of war confirmed it? I believed it then; I believe it now. But, sir, I propose to call another witness to testify against this coercive policy, who also spoke in advance of the war. Edward Everett, in his letter of May 29, 1860, to Washington Hunt, accepting the nomination as Vice President of the Union Party of which, I believe, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Henry Winter Davis) was a member, and for whom a number of gentlemen upon this floor voted then said: "The suggestion that the Union can be maintained by numerical preponderance and military prowess of one section exercised to coerce the other into submission is, in my judgment, as self-contradictory as it is dangerous. It comes loaded with the death-smell from fields wet with brothers blood. If the vital principles of all republican governments 'is the consent of the governed,' much more does the basis of equal sovereignty States require, as its basis, the harmony of its members and their voluntary co-operation in its organic functions."

It will no doubt be said Mr. Everett has changed his views upon the subject.—That may be so, but I have not. I believed it a sound doctrine in 1860, before secession occurred or coercion began. Three years experience in attempting "by numerical preponderance and military prowess of one section exerted to coerce the other into submission" has convinced me more thoroughly that it is "as self-contradictory as it is dangerous"—contradictory because it violates the great principles of free government, which "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and dangerous because, by its exercise, especially when wielded by a weak, vacillating and unscrupulous man, it destroys, instead of maintaining, the Union, Constitution and organic law; civil liberty and personal security are forced to yield to what is claimed to be a military necessity and the government itself, in the brief period of three short years, is to-day verging on the very brink of ruin.

I am well aware, Sir, that the cry of disloyalty, want of patriotism and lack of devotion to the government, which is in every place and at all times raised against those who have the independence to disapprove of any of the acts of Mr. Lincoln, as well as an ordinate desire for Government patronage from the building of a steam ship and a shoddy contractor down to the insignificant position of taking charge of a mutilated and depreciated greenback in the Treasury building, has changed the opinion of many men, but the fixed principles of free government as well as the rules of right, reason, justice and truth are unchangeable; and although it may be unpopular and even at the risk of personal liberty in times like the present to advocate them, they are nevertheless eternal and immutable. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Stevens) who stands upon this floor and before the country as an acknowledged leader of the Administration party, has had the honesty and independence, in a speech delivered at early a part of the session to announce what he holds to be the true position of the Confederate States. He says: "Some think that these States are still in the Union and entitled to the protection of the Constitution and the laws of the United States." This idea he at once repudiates and then boldly affirms that which he holds to be the true doctrine. "Others hold that having committed treason, renounced their allegiance to the Union, discarded the constitution and laws organized a distinct and hostile government, and by force of arms have risen from the condition of insurgents to the position of an independent power, de facto and having been acknowledged as a belligerent both by foreign nations and our own Government, the Constitution, and the Union are abandoned, so far as they are concerned, and that as between the two belligerents they are under the laws of war and the laws of nations alone and that whichever power conquers may treat the vanquished as conquered provinces, and may impose upon them such conditions and laws as it may deem best."

In answer to any objections that may be raised to this position, he says: "But it is said that this must be considered a contest with Rebel individuals only as States in the Union cannot make war; that is true so long as they remain in the Union; but they claim to be out of the Union, and the very fact that we have admitted them to be in a state of war, to be belligerents, shows that they are no longer in the Union, and that they are waging war in their corporate capacity, under the corporate name of the Confederate States and that such major corporation is composed of minor corporations called states, acting in their associated character."

"When an insurrection becomes sufficiently formidable to entitle the party to belligerent right it places the contending Powers on precisely the same footing as foreign nations at war with each other." "No one acquainted with the magnitude of this contest can deny to it the character of a civil war. For nearly three years the Confederate States have maintained their declaration of independence by force of arms." "What, then, is the effect of the war between these belligerents, these foreign nations? Before this war the parties were bound together by a compact, by a treaty called a "Constitution." They acknowledge the arbitrary or municipal laws mutually binding on each. This war has cut asunder all these ligaments, abrogated all the obligations."

Now, Sir for once at least I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the Confederate States are out of the Union, occupying the position of an independent Power de facto, have been acknowledged as a belligerent, both by foreign nations and our own Government; "maintained their declaration of independence for three years by force of arms and that the war has cut asunder all the ligaments and abrogated all the obligations that bound them under the Constitution. So far I agree with him and however unwilling we may be to accept such position as the actual condition of the Confederate States, the history of the past three years, the law of nations, the genius of our government and a regard for truth compel me at least to accept it, and my judgment to approve it and if the charge of disloyalty is brought against me for this opinion, I have only to shield myself under the broad mantle of the distinguished leader of the Republican party.— At the commencement of the war England and France both declared the Confederate States to be belligerents: the United States has treated with them as such in the exchange of prisoners, and the Administration is to-day without honesty or independence of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania to avow it, doing precisely what he proposes to do under his war of conquest, waged against the Confederate States as a foreign nation. It is not now even pretended, that the war is carried on having for its object the restoration of the Union; "reconstruction"—"consolidation"—"centralization with an entire change of the Constitution," are the terms employed in speaking of the government that is to exist hereafter. To speak of the Constitution as it is, and the Union as it was, is an offence, subjecting an officer in the army to punishment by dismissal from the service, and conclusive evidence, of disloyalty in the citizen. If the time ever was, when the Union could have been restored by war, which I do not believe, it has long since been dispelled by emancipation, confiscation, amnesty and the like proclamations; military orders annulling State constitutions, setting aside State laws, obliterating State lines and attempting to organize and set up a form of State government in their stead in which one man out of ten who shall turn Abolitionist, take and subscribe an oath to execute and obey, the will of Abraham Lincoln, whatever it may be, shall govern and rule over the remaining nine who refuse to become Abolitionists. These follies of the Administration and others of the like character, have, instead of crushing the rebellion," crushed out whatever Union sentiment may have remained among the Southern people. It is possible, that in districts of country occupied by the army occasionally a man may be found who seeing nothing before him but ignominy and death, his wife and innocent children appealing to him for protection with all the ties of filial affection his property to be confiscated, and his family to become outcast and beggars in the world, that such a man, in order for the time being to save himself, save his family and save his property, may take the oath but the effect of it will be, as it ought to be, like that of Galileo who invented the telescope, and who first taught the rotary motion of the earth.— That noble old Italian, after many years of labor in the study of science, and when he had advanced to the extreme age of 70, was summoned before an inquisition, tried and condemned and imprisoned in a dungeon for teaching a heresy subsequently he was brought out and offered liberty on condition of renouncing his heretical doctrine. The effect of beholding the glorious light of the sun and breathing again the pure air of Heaven as contrasted with the lousy home dungeon in which he had been cast, and to which he must return or renounce his belief in the earth's motion so far overcame his humanity that he consented to comply, and upon his bended knees, with his hands upon the gospel, he affirmed his belief in the Copernican doctrine. Part of his obituary ran in these terms: "With a sincere heart and unfeigned faith, I objure, curse and detest the said errors heresies, (viz. that the earth moves, &c.) I swear that I will never in future say or assert anything verbally or in writing, which may give rise to a similar suspicion against me." Rising from his knees with his eyes fixed on the earth, he whispered to a friend, *E par a mare,* "It moves for all that." So it will be with the man who is forced to take the oath to save himself, his family and his property. He may take it, but in his heart he will detest and despise the authority that requires it. Will such a man be devoted to or make a good citizen of the government in which he lives? The history of Poland, of Hungary of Ireland and of Italy furnishes an answer to the question. If imperial governments are not able to hold in submissive obedience small portions of a vast empire once in revolt, how much less a government having for its basis the consent of the governed. But subjugation" is the watchword. Liberty and freedom for the slaves and subjugation and extermination for the master is the popular cry. Meet them, fight them, crush them says the gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. Green Clay Smith.) Sir, that is easily said upon this floor and is popular with those who from day to day fill the gallery of this House, but even the gentleman from Kentucky as well as a number of other military gentlemen, were quite willing to forego the pleasure of the performance and exchange their commissions as general in the field for a certificate entitling them to a seat upon this floor; and were I to judge by the willingness with which it was done and the tenacity with which they held on to it and the efforts some of them are making to return here again instead of the war spirit they breathe within these walls I should strongly suspect them of being in sympathy with the peace party.

"Mr. Chairman: I am no military man, and therefore incompetent to give advice or advance an opinion in military affairs, but I have been often, forcibly struck by a remark of Marshal Ney, in reply to Napoleon, as related by Headly in his "Napoleon and his Marshals." "One day, at Madrid, Napoleon entered the room where Ney and several officers were standing, and said in great glee, every thing goes on well; Romana will be reduced in a fortnight; the English are defeated and will be unable to advance; in three months the war will be finished." The officers to whom this was addressed, made no reply, but Ney, shaking his head, said with his characteristic bluntness, "Sir, this war has lasted long already, and our affairs are not improved. The people are obstinate; even their women and children fight; the massacre our men to-morrow we have to oppose another twice as numerous. It is not an army we have to fight, it is a whole nation. I see no end to this business." Bonaparte followed his own inclination, and was eventually defeated."

Mr. Chairman: Is there not instruction in the blunt yet forcible reply of the old French Marshal to his superior officer for us? Have we not had, from time to time, the predictions of Napoleon during the past three years, but without a Marshal Ney to say "I see no end to this business."

But, Mr. Chairman, how do we stand in the eyes of the civilized world to-day, in waging a war of subjugation and conquest against the Confederate States, which have seceded from us and set up a government of their own? Are we not inconsistent with all our former acts? Have we not been early to admit this property with regard to others? There never was a people on the face of the earth that demanded an independent government that did not leave the sympathy of the American people, and ought we now to shrink from the doctrine we have been willing to apply to others? My earliest recollection is the appeal made by Clay and Webster in behalf of Greece, in 1824, when they so eloquently declaimed in that behalf on this floor and in the other branch of Congress. Whether it was Greece or the States of South America, or Poland or Hungary, or Italy or Ireland, the fact that a large country, for any cause, demanded a distinct and separate Government, always received the warmest sympathy and support of the American people, irrespective of party.— Even as late as December, 1850, after Mr. Lincoln was elected, and after the preliminary steps for secession had been taken, the paper having the largest circulation of any in the Republican party, and having more influence than any other in the formation of Republican opinion, declared that it could see no reason why, if three millions of colonists could separate from the British Crown in 1776, that five millions of Southern whites could separate from us in 1861. I remember could not separate from us in 1861. I have been as much puzzled as the distinguished Republican editor, Mr. Greeley, to find, looking at it as a revolutionary right, the difference in position. Ought we to shrink from the application of a doctrine to ourselves which we have been so willing to apply to other nations, such as Austria, Russia and Spain, if we do what will be the judgment of impartial history? How much better it would have been for us and for the cause of Democracy throughout the globe. What a splendid tribute it would have been to a republican government if we had parted in peace with our dissatisfied sister States, as Mr. Everett recommended as late as February 1861, sustained by such leading Republican journals as the Cincinnati Commercial, N. York Tribune, Indianapolis Journal, Chicago Tribune, New Haven (Connecticut) Palladium, Columbus Journal, and Salmon P. Chase, now Secretary of the Treasury, and many others of that school. What in monarchical countries had required a long and bloody war, would have been accomplished by Democratic principles and republican sense of justice. What a splendid proof it would have afforded of the capacity of the people of self-government.— What a valuable lesson it would have conveyed to the whole civilized world. The fact that we could rise superior to all prejudices and passions and have conquered ourselves would have been the highest triumph that we had ever achieved. I regret as much, Mr. Chairman, as any gentleman upon this floor that any of our sister States should have desired to cut asunder the ligaments that bound them to us. None would be more willing than myself to make any reasonable sac-

ifice to induce them to return to their partnership with us, but still recognizing the truth of the doctrine taught by the fathers of the Republic and so fairly expressed by John Quincy Adams, that our Government was, after all, in the heart, it would be better, severe as would be the pang of regret to part in friendship, rather than to hold sovereign States pinned to us by the bayonet, as Mr. Greeley expressed it, in 1861. What advance have we made in the science and principles of government, Mr. Chairman, if we cannot rise above the Austro-Russian principle of holding subject provinces by the power of force and coercion? What becomes of the Declaration of Independence and of all our teachings for eighty years? After all, Mr. Chairman, it is not the extent of territory which should be the object of our desires.— Better sacrifice over nine-tenths of the territory than destroy our republican form of government. What our people desired in 1861, and which I honored though I regarded as mistaken, was the preservation of the government and the retention of our jurisdiction over the whole territory. They were rightly willing to sacrifice every material consideration for that purpose. Land is nothing, Mr. Chairman, compared to liberty. We existed as a Republic when the mouth of the Mississippi was held by a foreign power, when we had nothing west of that river, when Florida was held against us; and we could exist again if by the chastisement of heaven we should be curtailed to our old territorial dimensions. For fifteen millions of dollars we purchased the whole of that immense territory, and were it a hundred thousand times as valuable, its preservation would not be worth our admirable form of government. Pride of territorial ambition is a vulgar and low ambition of national greatness. Russia, and even China can vie with us in that, but who would rather reside in one of the Cantons of Switzerland, or in Great Britain, than in those countries. It is not the extent of territory that we possess, but in the manner in which we govern it that renders us respectable. Many gentlemen seem rather to look to the quantity than the quality. All Republics have been destroyed by the thirst of territorial aggrandizement and the lust of conquest. The great object of our Government should be to develop and cultivate the internal resources of those friendly to its jurisdiction rather than to extend it over hostile and foreign people. It is in that character that true patriotism is to be cultivated and true national glory found. Especially should all republics cultivate the art of peace, since it is by the war power that free Governments are commonly overturned. The charge has been made that Democracy is turbulent, warlike and aggressive, but it is a terrible misconception of its true interests, for upon the people fall the awful calamities of armed collisions. An eminent poet has said—Lord Byron—that war was a game which if the people were wise, kings and princes would never play at. The venerable Dr. Franklin, at the close of his illustrious career, remarked: "That there was never a good war and a bad peace."

We have made, Mr. Chairman, by this war eight millions of bitter enemies upon the American continent. While time shall last the recollections of this bloody strife will never fade from the memories of the people North and South, but will be handed down to the latest generation. The words Shiloh, Antietam, Gettysburg, Manassas, Bull Run, Richmond, Vicksburg and Fort Donelson, are words of division and disunion, and will serve to bring up emotions of eternal hate. If it were true, as was alleged by a distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Wade), in a speech in Portland in 1855, "that he believed that no two nations on the earth hated each other as much as the North and South," how much more true is the remark now after they have been arrayed in such bloody contests. It is the object of the sword to cut and cleave asunder, but never to unite. What union is there between Russia and Poland, between Austria and Hungary, between England and Catholic Ireland, where the sword and the bayonet for centuries have been employed? Instead of conferring national strength, they are sources of weakness to countries that hold them in subjection, and which would this day be stronger without them than with them.

Mr. Chairman, these lessons of history are full of warning and example. Much better would it have been for us in the beginning—much better would it be for us now—to consent to a division of our magnificent empire and cultivate amicable relations with our estranged brethren than to seek to hold them to us by the power of the sword. Here let me advert to the common, yet perfectly glaring and apparent error, that to part with one jurisdiction over eleven States involves the destruction of our government. The statement of the proposition demonstrates its absurdity. As well might one say, who had a farm of two hundred acres of land that he had lost his title deed to all of it because, by some misfortune, he had parted with fifty. In losing the South, not one function of our government over us is surrendered. It remains over us as completely sovereign as it ever did. Here let me say, as the experience of my individual belief, that if it had been understood in the North, as in the South, that by the terms of the Federal compact a State had a right to secede from the Union, this disruption would never have occurred. Had the North so understood the matter there would have been upon its part a forbearance from the exercise of extreme measures, and a desire not to press its Southern sisters to the wall that would have maintained the Confederacy unbroken. It was the prevalence of the idea of the Consolidation in the North that the Southern States had no right to and would not secede, that tempted them and that fatal policy that has surrendered the Confederacy.

It is said that no confederacy can exist by a recognition of this principle, but such was not the view of the fathers of our Government, it was not the view of Jefferson and Madison in

their immortal resolutions of 1798 and 1799. It has been said, Mr. Chairman, that it would make a confederacy a rope of sand but if so it is strange that the Southern Confederacy, where it is recognized should hold together through such a bloody pressure as we have applied to it for the last three years; it is a strange rope of sand that endures all that.

But to return, Mr. Chairman. As will be judged perhaps, by the tenor of these remarks, I am reluctantly and despondingly forced to the conclusion that the Union is lost, never to be restored. I regard all dreams of the restoration of the Union, which was the pride of my life and to restore which even now, I would pour out my heart's blood, as worse than idle. I see neither North or South any sentiment on which it is possible to build a Union—those elements of Union which Mr. Adams described have by the process of time been destroyed. Worse, yet worse than that, Mr. Chairman, I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that in attempting to preserve our jurisdiction over the Southern States, we have lost our constitutional form of government over the northern. What has been predicted by our wisest and most eminent statesmen has come to pass; in grasping at the shadow we have lost the substance; in striving to remain the casket of liberty in which our jewels were confined, we have lost those precious monuments of freedom. Our Government as all know, is not anything resembling what it was three years ago; there is not one single vestige of the Constitution remaining; every clause and every letter of it has been violated, and I have no idea myself that it will ever again be respected. Revolutions never go backward to the point at which they started. There has always been a large party in this country favorable to a strong or monarchical government, and they have now all the elements upon which to establish one. They have a vast army, an immense public debt, and an irresponsible Executive. Ambitions to retain power, he is a candidate for re-election, and as Commander-in-Chief, it is charged (whether true or false, I shall not undertake to decide), that he has already used the army in the Florida expedition to advance his chances of success. One of the Generals he has decapitated (Gen. Fremont), has entered the field to oppose his claim to a continuance in power, and if The Chronicle of this city, the President's organ, is correct in its construction of the suggestions of The New York Herald, speaking of Lieutenant Gen. Grant, the question is already mooted whether he, in certain contingencies, at the head of the army would not be justified in assuming the reins of government.

The very idea upon which this war is founded—coercion of States, leads to despotism; to preserve a republican form of Government under any Constitution; under the prevalence of the doctrines now in vogue, is clearly impossible. These convictions of the complete overthrow of our Governments are as unwelcome and unpleasant to me as they are to any member of the House. Would to God the facts were such I could cherish other convictions. I may be denounced as disloyal and unpatriotic for entertaining them, but it will only be by shallow fools and arid knaves who do not know or will not admit the difference between recognizing a fact and creating its existence. A man may not desire to die, but nevertheless his belief will not alter the fact of his mortality. I shall not in these remarks revive the unpleasant and acrimonious controversy of who is responsible for the death and destruction of our Republic. I do not see that any such discussion now would be productive of good. I entertain clear and strong convictions upon that point, convictions that I have no doubt will be shared by the impartial historian of the future. For the present I am willing to let the past with all its recollections rest, provided we can snatch from the common ruin some of our old relics of freedom. I do not share in the belief entertained by many of my political friends on this floor and elsewhere that any peace is attainable upon the basis of Union and reconstruction. If the Democratic party were in power to-day I have no idea, and honesty compels me to declare it, that they could restore the Union over thirty-four States. My mind has undergone an entire change upon that subject. I believe that there are two alternatives, and these are; either an acknowledgment of the independence of the South as an independent nation, or their complete subjugation and extermination as a people; and of these alternatives I prefer the former.

Mr. Chairman, I take little or no interest in the discussion of the question which many of my political friends would make an issue as to how this war shall be prosecuted, its manner and object. I regard that as worse than trifling with the great question. I do not believe there can be any prosecution of the war against a sovereign State under the Constitution, and I do not believe that a war so carried on can be prosecuted so as to render it proper, justifiable or expedient. An unconstitutional war can only be carried on in an unconstitutional manner, and to prosecute it further under the idea of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Stevens), as a war waged against the Confederate States as an independent nation, for the purpose of conquest and subjugation, as he proposes, as the Administration is in truth and in fact doing, I am equally opposed.

I will say further, Mr. Chairman, that if this war is to be still further prosecuted, I prefer that it shall be done under the auspices of those who now conduct its management, as I do not wish the party with which I am connected to be in any degree responsible for its results, which cannot be otherwise than disastrous and suicidal—let the responsibility remain where it is until we can have a change of policy instead of men, if such a thing is possible. Nothing could be more fatal for the Democratic party than to seek to come into power pledged to a continuance of a war policy—such a policy would be a libel on its creed in the past and the ideas of lie at the basis of all free governments, and