

The Democratic Watchman.

VOL. 8.

BELLEFONTE, FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 17, 1863.

NO. 20

The Muse.

For the Watchman.
STRANGEMENT.
BY JOHN P. MITCHELL.

Tens not thy human heart spoke
Thou work that echoes my brain;
Oh, call thy fearful import back,
And smile on me again.

Thou dost not mean to crush the heart
Whose every throb is thine;
Then give us back the love which thou
Hast said was ever mine.

Forget thee? Oh, as easily
I could forget the world's pain,
All those who battle in the stream
Must die of their own strain.

Forgetfulness can only come
When every quivering string,
Upon the world our human harp
Tullies has ceased to ring.

The pine as easily may cease
To grow when breezes sigh,
As I to still my beating heart,
Or let its music die.

Love's harp has often wail'd the dirge
Of victims to the gallows,
Its harp strings are the chords of life,
Which thrill the notes of pain.

But never, never, can the heart
Forget the halcyon shrine
Where it in humble rapture fell
As this one did at thine.

Still turned thou thy face away,
And all thy love is cold,
The hand once in my raptur'd press'd
I can no longer hold.

Oh, can a woman's heart so soon
Forget the love it gave,
To leave so soon as we trust
This side the gloomy grave?

Does Heaven breathe this dirge forth,
This wailing dirge to thee,
Is this the time, as we are told,
Of joys that are no more?

Such love like the meteor's dash,
That glances upon the night,
And fills the soul with holy thoughts,
Then sinks in oblivion's night.

Oh, had I never, never loved
A thing of human clay,
This gloomy night would never come
To bear my love away.

Forget thee? No, I'll not forget
Each throb of life I gave,
The recollections of my life
Will never pass away.

The day will come when thou wilt miss
This hour when thou wert here,
When thou wilt feel the bitter ache
Of those who love in vain.

Then thou wilt learn that mortals,
Though dark, fade not away;
Thy heart will throbb with all the pain
That gives us life today.

And for the honest, loving heart
Thy earthly love, heart,
While playing for but one kind word,
As a signal of change.

In vain when future years have taught
Thine own proud soul to sigh,
With that which reacheth to the heart,
Which now is left to die.

But I can never forget thee, no,
My soul will never yield,
And till we meet, when I breathe thy name,
Thou art remembered still.

The form will never be forgot;
When 'er the past I sigh,
Thy eyes, thy form will ever tell—
"Ours love can never die."
HOSWART, Pa., July 15, 1863.

Miscellaneous.

The Detector Answered.
REPLY TO THE ALBANY DEMOCRAT TO LINCOLN'S LETTER OF JUNE 12TH.

STATEMENT.

At a meeting held in the Capitol, in the city of Albany, on the 10th day of May, 1863, to consider the arbitrary arrest of Mr. Vallandigham, certain resolutions were adopted, copies of which were, by the direction of the meeting, transmitted by its officers to President Lincoln, who, in a communication dated the 12th of June, 1863, addressed to the gentlemen referred to, which has appeared very generally in the public prints, discussed the resolutions and controverted certain positions which they maintained in regard to personal rights and constitutional obligations.

On the receipt of this communication the Hon. Dr. Brantley, chairman of the meeting, referred to, addressed the President intimating him in substance that the special duty assigned to the officers of the meeting had been fulfilled by sending the resolutions to his excellency, but adding that in view of the importance of the principles involved, and the public interest which the matter has assumed, he had deemed it proper to submit the President's letter to the committee, who reported the resolutions for such action as in their judgment it might demand.

The committee have considered the subject, and viewing the questions at issue as of the gravest importance, replies to the President's communication, which reply is now laid before the public. At the request of the committee it was sent to the President by the officers of the meeting, in a letter under their signatures, to which the following is a copy:

This Excellency, the President of the United States:

Sir: The undersigned, officers of the public meeting held in this city on the 10th day of May last, to whom your communi-

tion of the 12th of this month, commenting on the resolutions adopted at that meeting, was addressed, have the honor to send to your Excellency a reply to that communication by the committee who reported the resolutions. The great importance to the people of this country of the questions discussed must be our apology, if any be needed, for saying that we fully concur in this reply, and believe it to be in entire harmony with the views and sentiments of the meeting referred to.

We are, with great respect, very truly yours,
DR. BRANTLEY, Chairman of the Meeting.

Ed. Perry, John Taylor Cooper, Peter Montebell, Peter Gansvoort, Wm. S. Padgett, James H. Sanders, H. W. McCallan, L. M. Rogers, Alanson Sumner, John N. Block, John I. Burton, James D. Wasson, Stephen Clark, Bernard Reynolds, John P. Nessel, John Kennedy, David Orr, John Stewart, W. A. Rice, R. L. Banks, I. M. B. Davidson, Philip O'Brien, Jeremiah Osborn, D. V. N. Bachelier, Moses Patton, Francis Kearney, Samuel W. Gibbs, Timothy Seymour, L. D. Holstein, J. Spoorburg, Richard Parr, John McElroy, E. Mulcahy, Sigmond Alder, Wm. Seymour James Quinn, Jos. T. Rice, John Morgan, Joseph Kresser, Vice Presidents.

Hale Kingsley, James McQuade, J. M. Dallock, R. W. Peckham, Jr., M. A. Nolan, Secretaries.

Albany, June 30, 1863.

To his Excellency, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States.

Sir: Your answer, which has appeared in the public prints, to the resolutions adopted at a recent meeting in Albany affirming the personal rights and liberties of the citizens of this country, has been referred to the undersigned, the committee who prepared and reported these resolutions. The subject will now receive from us some further attention, which your answer seems to justify, if not to invite. We hope not to appear wanting in the respect due to your high position if we reply with a freedom and earnestness suggested by the infinite gravity and importance of the questions upon which you have thought proper to take issue at the bar of public opinion.

You seem to be aware that the Constitution of the United States, which you have sworn to protect and defend, contains the following guarantees, to which we again ask your attention: [1] Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. [2] The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, shall not be violated, and no search warrant shall issue, but upon probable cause supported by oath. [3] No person, except soldiers and marines in the service of the Government, shall be held to answer for a capital or infamous crime, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury, nor shall any person be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. [4] In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall have the right of a speedy trial by a jury of his peers, and the right of being tried by a jury of his peers in the State or district in which the crime shall have been committed, and to be confronted with the witnesses against him.

You are also no doubt aware that on the adoption of the Constitution, these invaluable provisions were proposed by the jealous enemies of the States, and were inserted as amendments for the perpetual assurance of liberty against the encroachments of power. From your earliest reading of history, you also know that the great principles of liberty and law which underlie these provisions were derived by us from the British Constitution. In that country they were secured by *magna carta* more than six hundred years ago, and they have been confirmed by many and repeated statutes of the realm. A single palpable violation of them in England would not only outrage the public indignation, but would endanger the throne itself. For a persistent disregard of them, Charles the First was deposed and beheaded by his rebellious subjects.

The fact has already passed into history that the sacred rights and immunities which were designed to be protected by these constitutional guarantees have not been preserved to the people during your administration. In violation of the first of them the freedom of the press has been denied. In repeated instances, newspapers have been suppressed in the loyal States because they criticized as unconstitutional the might, those fatal errors of policy which have characterized the conduct of affairs since your advent to power. In violation of the second of them, hundreds, and we believe thousands of men have been seized and immured in prisons and bastilles, not only without warrant upon probable cause, but without any warrant, and for no other cause than a constitutional exercise of the freedom of speech. In violation of all these guarantees, a disincorporated citizen of a peaceful and loyal State has been torn from his home at midnight by a band of soldiers, acting under the order of one of your generals, tried before a military commission, without judge or jury, convicted, and sentenced without even the suggestions of any offence known to the Constitution and laws of this country. For all these acts you avow yourself ultimately responsible. In the special case of Mr. Vallandigham, the injustice committed by your subordinates was consummated by a sentence of exile from his home pronounced by you. That great wrong, more than any other which preceded it, asserts the principles of a supreme despotism.

These repeated and continued invasions of constitutional liberty and private right have occasioned profound anxiety in the public mind. The apprehension and alarm which they are calculated to produce have been greatly enhanced by your attempt to justify them, because in that attempt you assume to yourself a rightful authority possessed by no constitutional monarch on earth. We accept the declaration that you prefer to exercise this authority with a moderation not hitherto exhibited. But believing as we do, that your forbearance is not the temper which liberty is enjoyed in this country, we propose to challenge the ground on which your claims of supreme power is based. While yielding to you as a constitutional magistrate the deference to which you are entitled, we cannot assent to your despotic power you claim, however indulgent and gracious you may promise to be in wielding it.

We have carefully considered the grounds on which your pretensions to more than regal authority are claimed to rest; and if we do not misinterpret the misty and clouded forms of expression in which these pretensions are set forth, your meaning is, that while the rights of the citizens are protected by the Constitution in time of peace, they are suspended or lost in time of war, when invasion or rebellion exists. You do not, like many others in whose minds reason and the love of regulated liberty seem to be overthrown by the excitements of the hour, attempt to base this conclusion upon a supposed military necessity existing outside of and transcending the Constitution, a military necessity which disappears in a total eclipse. We do not find this gigantic and monstrous heresy put forth in your plea for absolute power, but we do find another equally subversive of liberty and law, and quite as certainly tending to the establishment of despotism. Your claim to have found, not outside but within the Constitution, a principle of germ or arbitrary power, which in time of war expands at once into an absolute sovereignty, wielded by one man, so that liberty ceases, or is dependent upon his will, his discretion or his caprice. This extraordinary doctrine you claim to derive wholly from that clause of the Constitution which, in case of invasion or rebellion, permit the writ of *habeas corpus* to be suspended. Upon this ground the whole argument is based.

You must permit us to say to you with all due respect, but with the sternness demanded by occasion, that the American people can never acquiesce in this doctrine. In their opinion the guarantees of the Constitution which secure to them freedom of speech and of the press, immunity from arrest for offences unknown to the laws of the land, and the right of trial by jury before the tribunals provided by those laws, instead of military commissions and drum-head courts, are living and vital principles in peace or in war, at all times and under all circumstances. No sophistry or argument can shake this conviction, nor will the people require its confirmation by logical sequence and deductions. A *facta* conviction deeply interwoven with the instincts, the habits, and the education of our countrymen. The right to form opinions upon public measures and men, and to declare those opinions by speech or writing, with all due respect, but with the sternness demanded by occasion, that the right of personal liberty, unless forfeited according to established laws, and for offences previously defined by law, the right which secured of crimes to be tried where law is administered, and punishment is pronounced only when the crime is legally ascertained; all these are rights instantly perceived without argument or proof. No refinement of logic can unsettle them in the minds of freemen; no power can annihilate them, and no force can compel the magistrate to compel their surrender.

So far as it is possible for us to understand from your language, the mental process which has led you to the alarming conclusions indicated by your communication, it is this: The *habeas corpus* is a remedial writ, issued by courts and magistrates to inquire into the cause of any imprisonment or restraint of liberty, on the return of which, and upon due examination, the person imprisoned is discharged, if the restraint is unlawful, or admitted to bail if he appears to have been lawfully arrested, and is held to answer a criminal accusation. Inasmuch as this process may be suspended in time of war, you seem to think that every remedy for a false and unlawful imprisonment is abrogated; and from this postulate you reach, as a single bond, the conclusion that there is no liberty under the Constitution which does not depend on the gracious indulgence of the Executive only. This belief once established, and by this mode of induction there springs at once into existence a brood of crimes or offences undecided by any rule, and hitherto unknown to the laws of this country; and this is followed by indiscriminate arrests, midnight seizures, unheard of modes of trial and punishment, and all the machinery of terror and despotism. Your language does not permit us to doubt as to your essential meaning; for you tell us that "arrests are made not so much for what has been done as for what probably would be done. And again: "The man who stands by and says nothing when the peril of his Government is discussed cannot be misun-

derstood. If not hindered (of course by arrest,) he is sure to help the enemy, and much more if he talks ambiguously—talks for his country with 'whats' and 'ifs' and 'ands.' You also tell us that the arrests complained of have not been made "for the treason defined in the Constitution," nor "for any capital or otherwise infamous crime, nor were the proceedings following in any constitutional or legal sense criminal prosecutions." The very ground, then, of your justification is, that the victims of arbitrary arrest were obedient to every law, were guiltless of any known and defined offence, and therefore were without the protection of the Constitution. The suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* instead of being intended to prevent the enlargement of arrested criminals until a legal trial and conviction can be had, is designed, according to your doctrine, to subject innocent men to your supreme will and pleasure. Silence itself is punishable, according to this extraordinary theory, and still more so the expression of opinions, however loyal, if attended with criticism upon the policy of the Government. We must respectfully refuse our assent to this theory of the constitutional law. We think that men may be rightfully silent if they choose, while clamorous and zealous patriots proclaim the praises of those who wield power; and as to the "whats," the "ifs" and the "ands," these are *facta* words and belong to the vocabulary of freemen.

We have already said that the intuition of a free people instantly rejects these dangerous and unbecoming doctrines. It is not our purpose to enter upon an elaborate and extended refutation of them. We submit to you, however, one or two considerations in the hope that you will review the subject with the earnest attention which its supreme importance demands. We say then, we are not aware that the writ of *habeas corpus* is now suspended in any of the peaceful and loyal States of the Union. An act of Congress approved by you on the 3d of March, 1863, authorized the President to suspend it during the present rebellion. That the suspension is a legislative, and not an executive act, has been held in every judicial decision ever made in this country, and we think it cannot be delegated to any other branch of the Government. But passing over that consideration, you have not exercised the power which Congress attempted to confer upon you, and the writ is not suspended in any part of the country where the civil laws are in force. Now, inasmuch as your doctrine of the arbitrary arrest and imprisonment of innocent men, in admitted violation of express Constitutional guarantees, is wholly derived from a suspension of the *habeas corpus*, the first step to be taken in the ascent to absolute power, ought to be to make it known to the people that the writ is in fact suspended. It is one of the provisions of the Constitution, and of the very highest value, that no *ex post facto* law shall be passed, the meaning of which is, that no act which is not against the law when committed can be made criminal by subsequent legislation. But your claim is that when the writ of *habeas corpus* is suspended you may lawfully imprison and punish for the crimes of silence, of speech, and opinion. But as these are not offences against the known and established law of the land, the constitutional principles to which we now refer requires that you should, before taking cognizance of such offences, make known the rule of action, in order that the people may be advised, so as not to become liable to its penalties. Let us turn your attention to the most glaring of all the assaults upon constitutional liberty, which have marked the history of your administration. No one has ever pretended that the writ of *habeas corpus* was suspended in the State of Ohio, where the arrest of a citizen at midnight, was made, and he placed before a court martial for trial and sentence, upon charges and specifications which admitted his innocence according to the existing laws of this country. Upon your own doctrine, then, you can hesitate to redress this monstrous wrong.

But sir, we cannot acquiesce in your dogma that arrests and imprisonment, with or without criminal accusation, in their nature lawless and arbitrary, opposed to the very letter of constitutional guarantees, can become in any sense rightful, by reason of a suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*. We deny that the suspension of a single and peculiar remedy for such wrongs brings into existence new and unknown classes of offences or new causes for depriving men of their liberty. It is one of the most material purposes of that writ to enlarge upon bail persons, who, upon probable cause, are duly and illegally charged with some known crime, and a suspension of the writ was never asked for in England or this country, except to prevent such enlargement, when the supposed offence was against the safety of the Government. In the year 1807, at the time of Burr's alleged conspiracy, a bill was passed in the Senate of the United States, suspending the writ of *habeas corpus* for a limited time in all cases where persons were charged on oath with treason or other high crime or misdemeanor. Your doctrine denies the freedom of speech and of the press. It invades the sacred domain of opinion and discussion. It denounces the "ifs" and the "whats" of the English language, and even the refuge of silence is in-

terrupted. We repeat, a suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* merely dispenses with a single and peculiar remedy against an unlawful imprisonment; but if that remedy had never existed, the right to liberty would be the same, and every invasion of that right would be condemned not only by the Constitution, but by principles of far greater authority, than the writ itself. Our complaint is not at all limited to this writ, for its action of false imprisonment, and the action would remain to the citizen, if the writ were abolished forever. Again, every man, when his life or liberty is threatened without the warrant of law, may lawfully resist and if necessary in self-defence, may take the life of the aggressor. Moreover, the people of this country may demand the impeachment of the President himself for the exercise of arbitrary power. And when all these remedies shall prove inadequate for the protection of free institutions, their remains in the last resort the supreme right of revolution. You once announced this right with a latitude of expression which may well be considered dangerous in the present crisis of our national history. You said: "Any people, anywhere being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing Government, and form a new one that suits them better. Nor is this right confined to cases where the people of an existing Government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that can, may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a government, and forming a new one, without their interference with the movements of the Government." (Vol. 10, *Constitutional Guide*, p. 94.) Such were your opinions, and you had a constitutional right to declare them. If a citizen now should utter sentiments far less dangerous to his tendency, your nearest military commander would consign him to a dungeon or to the tender mercies of a court-martial, and you would approve the proceeding.

In our deliberate judgement, the constitution is not open to new interpretation suggested by your communication, nor by the instrument is harmonious and consistent. The possible suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* is consistent with freedom of speech and of the press. The suspension of that remedial process may prevent the enlargement of the accused traitor or convict until he shall be legally tried, but no justifiable arrest and imprisonment without warrant, without cause, without the accusation or suspicion of crime. It seems to us, moreover, too plain for argument that the sacred right of trial by jury, and in courts where the law of the land is the rule of decision, is a right which is never denied, never suspended, in peaceful and loyal communities and States. Will you, Mr. President, maintain, that because the writ of *habeas corpus* may be in suspension, you may substitute soldiers and bayonets for the peaceful operation of the laws, military commissions and inquisitorial modes of trial for the courts and juries prescribed by the Constitution itself? And if you cannot maintain this, then let us ask where is the justification for the monstrous proceeding in the case of a citizen of Ohio to which we have called your attention? We know that a recreant judge, whose name has already become a byword of contempt, found the apology on the outside of the supreme and fundamental law of the Constitution. But this is not the foundation on which your superstructure of power is built. We have mentioned the act of the last Congress professing to authorize a suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*. This act now demands your special attention. Because we are not greatly interested in the *facta* and arguments are directly opposed to all plain arguments and conclusions of your communication. That act, besides providing that the *habeas corpus* may be suspended, expressly commands that the names of all persons therefore or thereafter arrested by authority of the President, or his Cabinet ministers, being citizens of States in which the Administration of the laws has continued unimpacted, shall be returned to the courts of the United States for the district in which such persons reside, or in which their supposed offences were committed, and such return being made, if the next grand jury attending the courts does not indict the alleged offenders, then the judges are commanded to issue an order for their immediate discharge from imprisonment. Now, we must help asking whether you have overlooked this law, which most surely you are bound to observe, or whether you have intention to disregard it? Its meaning certainly cannot be mistaken. By the National Legislature has said that the President may suspend the accustomed writ of *habeas corpus*, but at the same time it has commanded that all arrests under his authority shall be promptly made known to the courts of justice, and that the accused parties shall be liberated, unless prosecuted by a Grand Jury according to the Constitution, and tried by a jury in the ancient and accustomed mode. The President may possibly, so far as Congress can give the right, arrest without legal cause or warrant. We certainly deny that Congress confer this right, because it is forbidden by the higher law of the Constitution. But

waiving that consideration this statute, by its very terms, promptly removes the proceeding in every case into the courts where the persons detained are to be discharged, unless indicted for criminal offenses against the established, and ascertained laws of the country.

Upon what foundation, then, permit us to ask, do you rest the pretension that men who are not accused of crime may be seized and imprisoned or banished at the will and pleasure of the President or any of his subordinates in civil and military positions? Where is the warrant for invading the freedom of speech and of the press? Where is the justification for placing the citizen on trial without the presentment of a grand jury and before military commissions? There is no power in this country which can suspend with its laws. The President is as much bound to them as the humblest individual. We pray you to bear in mind, in order that you may duly estimate the feeling of the people on this subject, that for the crime of suspending with the laws and statutes of Great Britain, our ancestors brought one monarch to the scaffold, and expelled another from his throne.

This power which you have erected in theory is of vast and limited proportions. If we may trust you to exercise it mercifully and leniently, your successor, whether immediate or more remote, may wield it with the energy of a Caesar or Napoleon, and with the will of a despot and a tyrant. It is a power without boundary or limit because it proceeds upon a total suspension of all the constitutional and legal safeguards which protect the rights of the citizen. It is a power not inappreciably described in the language of one of your secretaries. Said Mr. Seward to the British minister in Washington, I can touch a bell on my right hand and order the arrest of a citizen of Ohio. I can touch the bell again and order the imprisonment of a citizen of New York, and no power on earth but that of the President, can release them. Can the Queen of England in her dominions do as much? This is the very language of a profane despotism, and we learn from you, with profound emotion, that this is no idle boast. It is a despotism limited in principle, because the same arbitrary and unrestrained will or discretion which can place men under illegal restraint or banish them, can put to torture or to death, the thousands who are not so fortunate. Nor have the people of this country thus abandoned their consciences. No agreement can command their judgment, such interpretations of the great character of their liberties. Quick as the lightning flash the intuitive sense of freemen perceives the sophistry and rejects the conclusion.

Some other matters which your Excellency has presented demand our notice. In justification of your course as to Mr. Vallandigham, you have referred to the arrest of Judge Hill at New Orleans by order of General Jackson, but that case differs widely from the case of Mr. Vallandigham. New Orleans was then, as you truly state, under "martial or military law." This was not so in Ohio when Mr. Vallandigham was arrested. The administration of the civil law had not been disturbed in that Commonwealth. The courts were open, and justice was dispensed with its accustomed promptitude. In the case of Judge Hill, General Jackson in a few days sent him outside of the line of his encampments and set him at liberty, but you have undertaken to banish Mr. Vallandigham from his home. You seem also to have forgotten that the judgment of the court which imposed the fine upon him, that he promptly paid it, that he enjoined his friends to assist "as he most freely did to the decision which had just been pronounced against him."

More than this, you overlook the fact that the then Administration (in the language of a well known author) militarily decidedly rebuked the proceedings of General Jackson, and that the President viewed the subject with surprise and solicitude. Unlike President Madison, you in a case much more unwarranted, approve the proceedings of your subordinate officer and, in addition, justify your course by a carefully considered argument in its support.

It is true that after some thirty years, Congress, in consideration of the devoted and patriotic services of General Jackson, refunded the amount of the fine he had paid. But the long delay in doing this proved how reluctant the American people were to do any thing which could be considered in any way approving the disregard shown to the majesty of the law, even by one who so eminently enjoyed their confidence and regard.

One subject more, and we shall conclude. You express your regret that our meeting spoke "as Democrats," and you say that in this time of national peril you would have preferred to meet us on a level, one step higher than any party platform. You thus compel us to allude to matters which we should have preferred to pass by. But we cannot omit to pass your criticism, as it casts at least an applied reproach upon our motives and our proceedings. We beg to remind you that when the tour of our country's peril had come, when it was evident that a most gigantic effort was to be made to subvert our institutions and to overthrow our Government, when it was vitally impor-

tant that party feelings should be laid aside, and that all should be called upon to unite most cordially and vigorously to maintain the Union, at the time you were sworn into office as President of the United States, when you should have urged your fellow-citizens in the most emphatic manner to erebroke all past differences and to rally in defence of their country and its institutions, when you should have enjoined respect for the laws and the Constitution, to the well and pleasure of the President or any of his subordinates in civil and military positions?—Where is the warrant for invading the freedom of speech and of the press? Where is the justification for placing the citizen on trial without the presentment of a grand jury and before military commissions? There is no power in this country which can suspend with its laws. The President is as much bound to them as the humblest individual. We pray you to bear in mind, in order that you may duly estimate the feeling of the people on this subject, that for the crime of suspending with the laws and statutes of Great Britain, our ancestors brought one monarch to the scaffold, and expelled another from his throne.

Your Administration has been true to the principles you then laid down. Notwithstanding the fact that several hundred thousand Democrats in the loyal States cheerfully responded to the call of their country, filled the ranks of its armies, and by their strong hands and willing arms aided to maintain your excellency and the officers of the Government in the possession of our national Capital, notwithstanding the fact that the great body of the Democrats of the country have in the most patriotic spirit given their best efforts, their treasures, their brothers and their sons, to sustain the Government and to put down the rebellion, you choosing to erebroke all this, have made your appointments to civil office, from your Cabinet officers and foreign ministers down to the persons of lowest official grade among the tens of thousands engaged in collecting the revenues of the country, exclusively from your political associates.

In closing this communication, we desire to reaffirm our determination and, we doubt not, that of every one who attend the meeting which adopted the resolutions we have discussed, expressed in one of those resolutions, to devote all our energies to sustain the cause of the Union.

Permit us then in this spirit, to ask your Excellency to re-examine the grave subjects we have considered, to the end that on your retirement from the high position you occupy, you may leave behind you no doctrines and no further precedents of despotism to prevent you and your posterity from enjoying that consolation which has been made history of us all, and to the end also that history may speak of your Administration with indulgence, if it cannot with approval.

We are, sir, with great respect, yours very truly,

John V. L. Pruyn, Chairman of Committee.
James Kell, Gilbert C. Davidson, J. V. P. Quackenbush, Wm. A. Fassett, O. M. Hubbard, John Hagen, Henry Lansing, S. Hand, M. K. Cohen, John C. Miller, C. Van Buren, George H. Traylor, C. W. Armstrong, Wm. Doyle, Franklin Townsend, Wm. Appleton, B. R. Spilman, James McKewen, A. H. Treman, Daniel Shaw, W. Simon, A. E. Simson, Isaac Lederer.

Albany, June 30, 1863.

Abolition Vandalism in the Southwest.

The St. Louis Democrat, an abolition paper, gives an admirable account of the doings of a cavalry brigade, under command of Colonel Cornyn, in which it says that this mounted brigade left Corinth, Miss., on the 1st of May, for the purpose of making a raid on disunion through a section of country not heretofore traveled by our forces. It was the intention (to quote more of the select language of the narrator) "to play the devil generally," and to leave on the minds of the non-combatant people "a vivid impression as to what the war really is." The brigade was five nights in the saddle, and in the brief space their abolition ecologist claims that among other signal victories, they burnt seven cotton factories, all private property, costing an average of \$200,000 each; the largest of these containing three hundred looms, being valued at \$100,000,000, and employing hundreds of men, women and children. The stock of manufactured goods on hand is described to have been more valuable than the buildings and machinery.

Seven flouring mills, steam saw mills, private dwellings, yellow waving fields, fields just ready for the scythe, were alike destroyed in the wantonness of vengeance. Speaking of the immense amount of forage committed to the flames, the jubilant narrator says: "Immense is not the word—language cannot describe the scene—the smoke arising from burning corn-cris in every direction and for many miles on each side of our path." Great numbers of slaves were brought away, but this was a matter of course.—E.

The Commercial Bulletin says that Mr. Chase contemplates coloring his own views by assuming the Presidency, after his retirement from office, of a bank, under the national law of \$2,000,000 capital, to be located at Washington.

A little over two years ago Mr. Chase left this city unable to pay his debts. Those who make this war pay at the rate of a million a year will denounce Democrats as "traitors," for their patriotism "amounts to considerable." Chase clears about four dollars on every American citizen batched.—C.