

CIVIL BELLUM.

In this fearful struggle between North and South, there are hundreds of cases in which fathers are opposed against sons, and brothers against brothers.

AN IMPORTANT PAPER.
Protest of leading Republicans against Dictatorial Usurpations.—A caustic Rebuke.

Senator Wade of Ohio, and Representative Davis of Maryland, laid up Lincoln's Usurpation of Power to the Reprobation and scorn of the Freemen of the United States.

TO THE SUPPORTERS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

WE HAVE read without surprise, but not without indignation, the proclamation of the President of the 8th of July, 1864.

The supporters of the Administration are responsible to the country for its conduct; and it is their right and duty to check the encroachments of the Executive on the authority of Congress and to require it to conform itself to its proper sphere.

It is impossible to pass in silence this proclamation without neglecting that duty; and having taken as much responsibility as any others in supporting the Administration, we are not disposed to fall in the other duty of asserting the rights of Congress.

The President did not sign the bill to guarantee to certain States whose Governments have been usurped a republican form of Government, passed by the supporters of the Administration in both Houses of Congress after mature deliberation.

The bill did not, therefore, become a law, and it is, therefore, nothing.

The proclamation is neither an approval nor a veto of the bill; it is, therefore a document unknown to the laws and Constitution of the United States.

So far as it contains an apology for not signing the bill, it is a political manifesto against the friends of the Government.

So far as it proposes to execute the bill which it is not a law, it is a grave Executive usurpation.

It is fitting that the facts necessary to enable the friends of the Administration to appreciate the apology and the usurpation before them.

The proclamation says: And whereas the said bill was presented to the President of the United States for his approval less than one hour before the sine die adjournment of said session and was not signed by him.

If that be accurate, still this bill was presented with other bills which were signed.

Within that hour, the time for the sine die adjournment was three times postponed by the vote of both Houses; and the least intimation of a desire for more time by the President to consider the bill would have secured a further postponement.

Yet the Committee sent to ascertain if the President had any further communication for the House of Representatives reported that he had none; and the friends of the bill, who had anxiously watched him, to ascertain if he had already been informed that the President had resolved not to sign it.

The time of presentation, therefore, had nothing to do with his failure to approve it.

The bill had been discussed and considered for more than a month in the House of Representatives, which it passed on the 4th of May; it was reported to the Senate on the 27th of May without material amendment, and passed the Senate absolutely as it came from the House on the 2nd of July.

Ignorance of its contents is out of the question. Indeed, at his request, a draft of a bill substantially the same in all material points and identical in the points objected to by the proclamation, had been laid before him for his consideration in the winter of 1862-1863.

There is, therefore no reason to suppose the provisions of the bill took the President by surprise.

On the contrary, we have reason to believe that he has been well known that this method of preventing the bill from becoming a law without the constitutional responsibility of a veto, had been resolved on long before the bill had passed the Senate.

We are informed by a gentleman entitled to entire confidence, that before the 22nd of June in New Orleans it was stated by a member of Gen. Banks' staff, in the presence of other gentlemen in official position, that Senator Doolittle had written a letter to the department that the House reconstruction bill would be stayed in the Senate to a period too late in the session to require the President to veto it in order to defeat it, and that Mr. Lincoln would retain the bill if necessary, and thereby defeat it.

The Democratic Watchman.

"STATE RIGHTS AND FEDERAL UNION."

Vol. 9. BELLEFONTE, PA., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1864. No. 35.

It is to be a law by the approval of the people without the approval of Congress at the will of the President, on his opinion of the popular approval, execute it as law?

Or is this merely a device to avoid the serious responsibility of defeating a law on which so many hearts reposed for security?

The President proceeds: "The President proceeds: I have therefore, I Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do hereby declare and make known, that, while I am in the discharge of my duty, I have signed and caused to be published a proclamation, unapproved, by a formal approval of this bill, to be inflexibly executed."

And, while I am so prepared to declare that the free State Constitutions and Governments already adopted and installed in Arkansas, and Louisiana shall be set aside and held for naught, thereby annulling and annulling the rights of the people who have set up the same as to their effect.

That is to say the President persists in recognizing those shadows of Governments in ARKANSAS AND LOUISIANA, which Congress formally declared to be null and void, and which were repelled by formal votes of both Houses of Congress—which it was declared formally should have no electoral vote for President and Vice President.

They are the mere creatures of his will—they can live a day without his support. They were oligarchies, imposed on the people by military orders under the forms of election, at which generals, provincial-marshal, soldiers and camp followers were the chief actors, assisted by a handful of resident citizens and urged on to premature action by private letters from the President.

In neither Louisiana nor Arkansas, before Bank's defeat, did the United States control half the territory or half the population. In Louisiana, General Banks' proclamation of the 12th of July, 1862, declared "The fundamental law of the State is martial law."

On that foundation of freedom, he erected what the President calls "the free Constitution and government of Louisiana."

But of this State, whose fundamental law was martial law, only sixteen parishes were held by the United States; and in five of the sixteen we held only our camps.

The eleven parishes were substantially held at 238,165 inhabitants; the residue of the State not held by us 575,917.

At the farce called an election, the officers of Gen. Banks returned that 11,346 ballots were cast; but whether any or by whom the people of the United States have no legal assurance; but it is probable that 4,000 were cast by soldiers or employees of the United States, military or municipal.

Such is the free Constitution and Government of Louisiana; and like it that of Arkansas.

And whereas the said bill was presented to the President of the United States for his approval less than one hour before the sine die adjournment of said session and was not signed by him.

recognition is a nullity if it be not conclusive on Congress. The Constitution, the right to Senators and Representatives inseparable from a State Government.

If there be a State Government the right is absolute. If there is no State Government, there can be no Senators or Representatives chosen.

The two Houses of Congress are expressly declared to be the sole judges of their own members.

When, therefore, Senators and Representatives are admitted, the State Government, under whose authority they were chosen is conclusively established, when they are rejected, its existence is as conclusively rejected and denied; and to this judgment the President is bound to submit.

The President proceeds to express his unwillingness "to declare a constitutional competency in Congress to abolish slavery in States," as another reason for not signing the bill.

But the bill nowhere proposes to abolish slavery in the States.

He further declares that "the bill would provide that all slaves in the rebel States should be manumitted."

But as the President had already signed three bills manumitting several classes of slaves in States, it is not conceived possible that he entertained any scruples touching the provision of the bill respecting which he is silent.

He had already himself assumed a right by proclamation to free much the larger number of slaves in the rebel States, under the authority given him by Congress to use military power to suppress the rebellion; and it is quite inconceivable that the President should think Congress should vest in him a discretion to not exercise itself.

It is the more intelligible from the fact that, except in respect to a small part of Virginia and Louisiana, the bill covered only what the President declared "the rebel States," and it is quite inconceivable that the President should think Congress should vest in him a discretion to not exercise itself.

Slavery as an institution can be abolished by a change of the Constitution of the United States, or of the law of the State; and this is the principle of the bill.

It required the new Constitution of the State to provide for that prohibition, and the President in the face of his own proclamation, does not venture to object to its being put into effect.

It is silent respecting the rebel debt and the political exclusion of rebel leaders; leaving slavery exactly where it was by law at the outbreak of the rebellion, and adds no guarantee even of the freedom of the slaves he undertook to manumit.

good votes; it will be the force of Louisiana and Arkansas voted over again, under the forms of this bill, but not by authority of law.

But when we come to the guarantee of future peace which Congress meant to enact, the forms, as well as the substance of the bill, must yield to the President's will that now should be imposed.

It was the solemn resolve of Congress to protect the loyal men of the nation against three great dangers, (1) the return to power of the guilty leaders of the rebellion, (2) the continuance of slavery, and (3) the burden of the rebel debt.

Congress required assent to those provisions by the Convention of the State; and if refused, it was to be dissolved.

The President "holds for naught" that resolve of Congress, because he is unwilling "to be inflexibly compelled to any one plan of restoration," and the people of the United States are not to be allowed to protect themselves unless their enemies agree to it.

The order to proceed according to the bill is therefore merely at the will of the rebel States; and they have the option to reject it, to accept the proclamation of the 8th of December, and demand the President's recognition.

Mark the contrast! The bill required a majority, the proclamation is satisfied with one-tenth; the bill requires one oath, the proclamation requires another; the bill requires voters by registration, the proclamation by guess, the bill exacts adherence to existing territorial limits, the proclamation admits of others; the bill governs the rebel States by law, equalizing all before it, the proclamation commits them to the lawless discretion of military governors and post-masters.

It is silent respecting the rebel debt and the political exclusion of rebel leaders; leaving slavery exactly where it was by law at the outbreak of the rebellion, and adds no guarantee even of the freedom of the slaves he undertook to manumit.

It is silent respecting the rebel debt and the political exclusion of rebel leaders; leaving slavery exactly where it was by law at the outbreak of the rebellion, and adds no guarantee even of the freedom of the slaves he undertook to manumit.

Every Constitution of the rebel States at the outbreak of the rebellion may be adopted without the change of a letter; for none of them contravene that proclamation; none of them establish slavery.

It adds no security to the freedom of the slaves.

For their title is the proclamation of freedom. If it be unconstitutional, an oath to support it is void. Whether Constitutional or not, the oath is without authority of law, and therefore void.

It is if it be valid and observed, it exacts no enforcement by the State, either in law or Constitution, to add a State guaranty to the proclamation title; and the right of a slave to freedom is an open question before the State courts on the relative authority of the State law and the proclamation.

THE CONFEDERATE PRISONERS AT ELMIRA.

WILLIAMSPORT, August 30th, 1864.

DEAR WATCHMAN:—On the morning of the 27th I got on board the train for Elmira, at which place I arrived half past one o'clock, P. M., the same day.

It was the solemn resolve of Congress to protect the loyal men of the nation against three great dangers, (1) the return to power of the guilty leaders of the rebellion, (2) the continuance of slavery, and (3) the burden of the rebel debt.

Congress required assent to those provisions by the Convention of the State; and if refused, it was to be dissolved.

The President "holds for naught" that resolve of Congress, because he is unwilling "to be inflexibly compelled to any one plan of restoration," and the people of the United States are not to be allowed to protect themselves unless their enemies agree to it.

The order to proceed according to the bill is therefore merely at the will of the rebel States; and they have the option to reject it, to accept the proclamation of the 8th of December, and demand the President's recognition.

Mark the contrast! The bill required a majority, the proclamation is satisfied with one-tenth; the bill requires one oath, the proclamation requires another; the bill requires voters by registration, the proclamation by guess, the bill exacts adherence to existing territorial limits, the proclamation admits of others; the bill governs the rebel States by law, equalizing all before it, the proclamation commits them to the lawless discretion of military governors and post-masters.

It is silent respecting the rebel debt and the political exclusion of rebel leaders; leaving slavery exactly where it was by law at the outbreak of the rebellion, and adds no guarantee even of the freedom of the slaves he undertook to manumit.

Every Constitution of the rebel States at the outbreak of the rebellion may be adopted without the change of a letter; for none of them contravene that proclamation; none of them establish slavery.

It adds no security to the freedom of the slaves.

For their title is the proclamation of freedom. If it be unconstitutional, an oath to support it is void. Whether Constitutional or not, the oath is without authority of law, and therefore void.

It is if it be valid and observed, it exacts no enforcement by the State, either in law or Constitution, to add a State guaranty to the proclamation title; and the right of a slave to freedom is an open question before the State courts on the relative authority of the State law and the proclamation.

Every Constitution of the rebel States at the outbreak of the rebellion may be adopted without the change of a letter; for none of them contravene that proclamation; none of them establish slavery.

It adds no security to the freedom of the slaves.

REBELS.

BY MISS CAROL WOODLEY.

Rebels! 'tis a holy name! The name our fathers bore, When battling in the cause of right, Against the tyrant in his night.

Rebels! 'tis our family name! Our father, Washington, Was the spot-rebel in the fight, And gave the name to us a right: Of father unto son.

Rebels! 'tis our given name! Our mother, Liberty, Received the title with her fame, To days of glory of her name, —When at her breast were we.

Rebels! 'tis our sealed name! A baptism of blood— The war—'tis, and the din of strife— The fearful contest, life for life, The mingled crimson flood.

Rebels! 'tis our fighting name! For peace rules 'er the land, Until they speak of heaven won— Until our rights receive a blow From foe or brother's hand.

Rebels! 'tis our dying name! For a' though life is dear, To days of grief of her name, We'd rather live as freemen dead, Than live in slavish fear.

Then call us rebels if you will— We glory in the name; For bending under unjust laws, And wearing faith to an unjust cause, We'll rather die as freemen dead, Than live in slavish fear.

THIS, THAT AND THE OTHER.

Negro soldiers are now paid the same as white—bounty, clothing, allowances equal.

The Weldon railroad has already cost us upwards of seven thousand lives.

The amount of fractional currency in circulation is now \$24,000,000.

Our internal revenue now amounts to a million per day; our expenses are about three millions.

There is another pressure on "Old Abe" to reform his cabinet. Too late—nothing will save him.

A Most Brutal Outrage—Gen. Hunter Downfalls a Wounded Soldier.
Messrs. Editors, I have seen some reference in a Cincinnati paper to some disgraceful and brutal outrage committed by Gen. Hunter on the retreat which terminated his late disastrous and irreparable raid towards Lynchburg; but the matter deserves more public notice than it has yet received, and since I am induced to relate it for your columns, as it was told me by a very respectable gentleman, a soldier whose misfortune it is to belong to the command of Gen. Hunter. The particular instance of brutality is what I refer to, and it is the case of a wounded soldier by the name of...

Such is the instance of shocking inhuman barbarity, as related to me. I have exaggerated it, in the telling, not the least. By what I have heard of the late Gen. Canby, or Austrian Haynau, been inspired by the demons of American Abolition fanaticism, it had been a deed worthy of them. As it is, it is the deed worthy only of "Butler, the Beast," the butcher, McNeal, or Hunter.—Examiner.

ARRESTED FOR DANNING LINCOLN.—Mr. McLean, of Chicago, while walking by Camp Douglas, in that city, on Friday last, in company with two republicans, when in a conversation with one of them, he was charged that he was more for abolition than the Union, I denied it. Now I can say one word. I am for no man who insists upon abolition as a condition even to the opening of negotiations for the hearing of propositions. For one I am ready to have the old Union again, without conditions—with slavery in the South, or not, just as the South themselves choose to decide, for it concerns them most. Whatever else I do, you may be sure will never vote for Abraham Lincoln again. He has put me in a bad humor, and I will not be a Union man. His disgraceful manners and obscene jokes I could put with, mortifying as the fact is, rather than vote with a party who I have believed I belong to think perhaps unjustly were not for Union, but I cannot give my sanction to a President who makes abolition an absolute condition even to the hearing of propositions from the rebels.—Hartford Times.

WHAT WOULD YOU DO?—The Republicanism asks us "what would you do, if you were restored to power?" We answer in a few words: we would put a stop to this infernal war, and thus arrest the nation in its downward career to destruction and woe. Within thirty days after a Democratic inauguration, President Lincoln will still ask: What then would follow, and how the troubles would be settled, no one can now tell; but that they would be settled, all know and that the Union would be restored under the Constitution of our fathers, all Democrats believe and hope.—N. Y. Patriot.

HOW THEY SAY IT.—It is amusing to see the radical papers squirm and twist under the lash given the Widow-Maker by Messrs. Wade and Davis, in their protest against Lincoln for his rotten and unprincipled position in the Reconstruction Bill, which passed both Houses of Congress. It is a sad condition as you will, there the matter stands, a solemn protest made by two leading republicans, men who have been quoted time and again by the republican press, as great spirits in their party. Murder will out. Old Scurry has got his foot in it at last.

THE DERRISBROOK.—In Nashville, on the 28th of July last, a white soldier, was fined twenty dollars for kicking the rear part of a negro soldier at one of the camps of instruction. The same party, who were present at the Major, was fined dollars for breaking a bottle over the head of a white soldier who was tending hospital. The army scale of prices runs queer if a negro rump is eighteen dollars more worth than a white soldier's head.

MR. FORTNA'S DECLARATION.—Mr. Lincoln has declared in Congress, that Mr. Lincoln is a traitor, and that his party cannot continue the war, and that his power and the restoration of the Union are incompatible.

OF COURSE upon the question of a peace proposition, the same party, who were present at the Major, was fined dollars for breaking a bottle over the head of a white soldier who was tending hospital.

Col. William McComb, of Philadelphia, in a letter to the Adjutant-General, has expressed the opinion of a general, and the latter has written to the Adjutant-General, that he will not accept of a peace proposition, unless it is accompanied by a guarantee that the rebels will be restored to their former positions.