

# Democratic Watchman.

"STATE RIGHTS AND FEDERAL UNION."

VOL. 13 BELLEFONTE, PA., FRIDAY JAN. 3, 1868. NO. 1.

## OVER THE RIVER.

The following beautiful lines, full of beauty, tenderness, and poetical imagery, were written by Miss Nancy Priest, a "Factory Girl," in Massachusetts. They were originally published in the Springfield Republican, a few years since:

Over the river they beckon to me,  
Loved ones who've gone to the further side,  
The gleam of their snowy robes I see,  
But their voices are drowned in the rushing tide.

There's one with ringlets of sunny gold,  
And eyes the reflection of Heaven's own bow,  
He crosses in the twilight, gray and cold,  
And the pale mist hid him from mortal view.

We saw not the angels who met him there,  
The gate of the city we could not see!  
Over the river—over the river,  
My brother stands waiting to welcome me.

## II.

Over the river the boatman pale  
Carried another—the household pet—  
Her brown curls waved in the gentle gale—  
"Darling Minnie! I see her yet."  
She crossed on her bosom her dimpled  
kisses,  
And peacefully entered the phantom bark  
We watched it glide from the river sands,  
And all our sunshine grew strangely dark.  
We know she is safe on the further side,  
Where all the ransomed angels be;  
Over the river, the mystic river,  
My childhood's idol is waiting for me.

## III.

For none return from those quiet shores,  
Who cross with the boatman cold and pale,  
We hear the dip of the golden oars,  
And catch a glimpse of the snowy sail—  
And lo! they have passed from our yearning  
hearts,  
They cross the stream, and are gone for  
ever.

We may not under the veil apart,  
That hides from our vision the gates of day,  
We only know that their bark no more  
May sail with us o'er life's stormy sea.  
Yet, somewhere, I know, on the unseen  
shore,  
They watch, and beckon, and wait for  
me.

## IV.

And I sit and think, when the sunset's gold  
Is flushing river and hill and shore,  
I shall one day stand by the water cold,  
And list for the sound of the boatman's  
oar.  
I shall watch for a gleam of the flapping  
sail,  
I shall hear the boat as it gains the  
strand,  
I shall pass from sight with the boatman  
pale  
To the better shore of the Spirit Land.  
I shall know the loved one gone before,  
And joyfully sweet will the meeting be,  
When over the river, the peaceful river,  
The Angel of Death shall carry me!

## SOUND DOCTRINE

The following, the closing portion of the message of His Excellency, J. W. STEVENSON, present Governor of Kentucky, should be read and pondered over by all. It is the old-fashioned Democratic doctrine—such as was taught in the days of JEFFERSON, and will benefit anyone who takes time to read it. [E. W. WATCHMAN.]

## FEDERAL RELATIONS.

I am oppressed with solemnity when I turn from the reference to State affairs, over which I have thus rapidly glanced, to invite your attention to those of our Federal relations. I regret to say they present a dark and sad picture. The hope so fondly cherished by every patriot, that a restored Union upon the basis of the Constitution was the rich fruition destined to crown the triumph of Federal arms over the forces of the Confederate States in our late unhappy conflict, has proved so far utterly illusive.

No error has become of late more popular than the one that the States which adopted the Federal Constitution were never sovereign. Another fraught with greater mischief, is, that the United States was not the representative and organ of the several sovereign States, to the extent of the power delegated to it, but was the government of the people of the thirty-six States united and consolidated.

To those erroneous and mischievous dogmas, the more dangerous and startling one is for the first time put forth by the party having present control of the Federal Government, that the States have no rights, but bear to the Federal Government the same dependent relation of counties to the States of their location.

To whatever extent this false theory exhibits a tendency menacing to the stability of the Constitution, the integrity of the Union, or the indestructible character of any sovereign or co-equal State in our Federal system, it demands and should receive our deliberate consideration.

Before the thirteen colonies became a confederation of independent States, they were associated only by community of transatlantic origin, by geographical position, and by the mutual tie of common dependence on Great Britain.

When that tie was sundered, they severally assumed the powers and rights of absolute self-government. The municipal and social institutions of each—its laws of property and of personal relation—even its political organization—were such only as each one chose to establish, wholly without interference from any other. In the language of the Declaration of Independence, "each State had full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." The several colonies differed in climate, in soil, in natural production, in religion, in systems of education, in legislation, and in forms of political ad-

ministration; and they continued to differ in these respects when they voluntarily allied themselves as States to carry on the war of their independence. The object of that war was to disenthrall the united colonies from the oppressive rule of their mother country. That country had turned a deaf ear to their growing complaints against a long series of oppressions, which at last culminated in a claim of a right to tax, without its correlative one of representation.

The success of the war led to a permanent separation between them. The political result was the foundation of a Federal Republic of free white men of the colonies, constituted, as they were, in distinct and reciprocally independent State governments.

The first union of these thirteen independent State governments, under articles of confederation, proved inefficient to achieve the objects proposed and intended. That union had been the act of thirteen State governments, and was a union of governments.

These States found it convenient to modify the condition of their association by resorting to a more effective system of governmental union. They adopted a duplex system of government, compounded of the separate government of the several States composing the union and one common government of all its members, called the Government of the United States. Each was framed by written Constitutions; those of the several States by the people of each acting separately and in their sovereign character, and that of the United States by the same agency acting jointly instead of separately. Both State and Federal Constitutions are marked by the divisions of political power into Legislative, Executive and Judicial.

Each rest on the same great American foundation: that the people are the source of all power, and that rulers are directly responsible to the ruled.

The entire powers of the Government are divided between the two. To the Federal Government was delegated all power necessary for the execution of certain well-defined functions of a general nature, looking to the common defence and security of all the States—leaving all power not delegated expressly to the States and people thereof.

Both Federal and State, within their prescribed sphere, possess all the attributes and perform all the functions of government. Neither is complete without the other. The sovereignty and equality of the States underlaid, and was the fundamental condition of the Constitution.

The States went into the Union on the agreed premises of exerting their common strength for the defence of the whole, and of all its parts, but of utterly excluding all capability of reciprocal aggression. Each solemnly bound itself to all the others neither to undertake nor permit any encroachment upon, or intermeddling with another's reserved rights.

The independent sovereignty of the States assured to each by the constitutional provision for co-equal representation in the Senate of the United States, was the fundamental condition of the American Union.

Such is the brief outline of the constitutional theory of that noble structure of free representative government erected by our fathers as an intrenchment of and religious liberty against the encroachment of civil power.

It has stood the shock of nearly eighty years. It has blessed us as few nations have ever been blessed. Under its protection we have enjoyed liberty, security, prosperity and happiness.

A distinguished living English statesman in 1823 in prefacing a defence of the Government and Constitution against the liberals, who, in support of their views, pointed to the American success in free institutions, said:

"Nor can the United States of America be fairly quoted as an example against me. Whether she be more or less happy than England, her standing in the world is not yet such as to enable her to draw any triumph from the comparison of her institutions with those of other nations. Since she first conquered her independence she has been as little exposed to the internal dangers arising from war as the Republic of San Marino. She has had a continent to spread in, and a huge wilderness to receive the quiet and fermenting spirits among her people. Each State has governed itself with as little difficulty as the Quarter Sessions in England regulate the county expenses; her Congress has

carried on war and negotiations without the smallest apprehension of conquest. It is when the Republic weary of peace and prosperity shall measure her new forces, and sigh for her greatness and glory; when a national debt and a national army shall be created by the will of national opinion; when Mexico shall be a bordering and rival empire; when generals shall arise with more brilliant talents and a less virtuous character than Washington—it is then, it will be decided whether the institutions of America are wiser than those of England."

"It must be confessed, however, that should America stand this test, or even should she continue to flourish for the next century, it will no longer be just to withhold from her the pre-eminence among the governments of the globe."

Some of the perils thus foreshadowed and proposed by England's enlightened and living statesman as a practical test of the stability of American Constitution al Government now surround and encompass us. Shall his doubt be realized, or shall we win his meed of approbation?

Will our matchless form of representative government, with its well-arranged system of checks and balances, prove still a barrier against all the antagonizing forces now threatening integrity? Is the stability of the Constitution of the United States, which in the past achieved so many triumphs over sectional prejudice, now to become subverted by the fanaticism or errors of our own people? Shall the vital interest of thirty-four millions of free American white citizens be surrendered to the domination of the relatively few negroes in the United States? Or, rather will not the American masses conspire to subordinate their will to those limitations placed by themselves as checks and barriers against the popular necessity and frenzied passions of the hour? Shall not self-control and ready obedience to law, in the future, as in the past, continue to be the crowning characteristic of our American institutions?

Will the people of the sovereign and independent States constituting the American Union permit any change in their fundamental system of government save in that express mode and manner prescribed in the Constitution? Will they tolerate the overthrow of a solitary barrier in that instrument erected to protect the equality and preserve the reserved rights of each of the States?

These are vital questions. Their issue unquestionably involves the continuance of self-government. Upon their determination rests the life of the Republic. They must be met. We cannot avoid it.

They must be considered calmly but fearlessly—fully—but with wisdom. Consider them as thoughtful friends of self-government—as true lovers of Constitutional liberty—and as free but fearless Representatives of Kentucky. I have already shown the inviolability of the reserved rights of each State as a fundamental condition of the Union.

The party now in power, in their platform of principles at Chicago on the 16th of May, 1860, in their fourth resolution, say "That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential in that balance of power on which the perfect union and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."

I rejoice to find myself sustained in my opinion of the inviolability of the reserved rights of the States by this emphatic indorsement of the entire Republican party. That platform was put forth by their representative men. They declare, as a canon of their political faith, that the interference by the Federal Government with the domestic institutions of any State is a usurpation wholly unauthorized by the Constitution of the United States.

If we turn our eyes to ten States of the Union, we shall behold them, at this time, stripped by Federal legislation of their equality; their sovereignty, their right of suffrage, and all right of representation in either house of Congress. All the bulwarks of personal freedom—*habeas corpus*, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, trial by jury—have been ruthlessly taken away. It were an apt question to inquire where the

to subvert the governments of these ten States.

The government of the United States is one of limitations. It possesses no power not delegated, and no express power to subvert can be shown. How, then, does the instrumentality of the States become the engine of their destruction? It cannot be derived from the war power. The maintenance of the Union brings with it the support of the State governments in all their rights. It was denied that the States could secede. If this right be denied, the supremacy of the Federal arms restored the vigor of the Union and all the States composing it, with their constitutional rights. It has been judicially held that no State in a confederated government can ever become the subject of conquest. Besides all this, the solemn faith of the nation was pledged through the executive and Congress that the war was waged alone for the restoration of the Union without any intention on the part of the Government to interfere with the reserved rights of the States.

Among the rights of a State none can be more vital than that of representation. It lies at the root of free government. It is the vital breath of free institutions. The people are the only source of power. They can not act in mass. The right to choose a representative is every man's portion of sovereign power. Yet it becomes my duty to inform you that Kentucky in at this moment deprived of her rightful representation in the more popular branch of our National Legislature.

Hon. John D. Young, James B. Beck, Thomas L. Jones, Asa P. Grover, J. P. Knott, John Young Brown, Lawrence S. Trimble, Elijah Hise, and George M. Adams were elected on the 4th day of May, 1867, from their respective districts, at a free and fair election Representatives from this Commonwealth to the Fortieth Congress of the United States. Elijah Hise died but a few days after his election, and did not reach Washington. They were all constitutionally eligible at the period of their election. They repaired to Washington and demanded to be sworn and admitted to their rights as Representatives from Kentucky. All were at first refused admission. Subsequently, George M. Adams was admitted. The other gentlemen, including Hon. J. S. Golladay, who was elected as the successor of Hon. E. Hise, are still refused their seats. Kentucky, entitled under the Constitution to nine Representatives, has at this moment but one.

This wrong is rendered still more apparent by the fact that L. S. Trimble had been a member of the last Congress. Congress has the constitutional right to inquire into the regularity of the returns of the election of its members. It may demand to know that the Representative is of the requisite age, and has resided the requisite period fixed by the Constitution as a period of his eligibility. If the member is willing to take the oath, Congress can neither add to or subtract one iota from that constitutional provision, which prescribes his qualification. If Congress, upon party suggestion of private individuals, can deprive a State of its representation, then Congress is supreme, and the State powerless.

Again: The equality of the States was secured, as we have shown, by that provision in the Constitution, guaranteeing to each State equal representation in the Senate. Yet in the face of this plain exaction of the Constitution a Senator from Maryland, duly elected and constitutionally eligible, is refused admission, and no reason assigned for his exclusion.

Palpable and flagrant as these violations of the rights of the State are, I am pained to say we are confronted with more fearful usurpations. The recent scheme of Congressional reconstruction of ten States of the Union, and the practical operations now occurring under it, must in their effects if successful, sweep away every vestige of our Federal system of free government.

The wrong now perpetrated under that plan vitally affects every free white citizen of every State in our Confederacy. It rests on the monstrous outrage of enfranchising the blacks and disfranchising the whites. It is not negro equality; but the results of the late pretended elections exhibit the startling fact that it is negro supremacy. Eight millions of white people, through Congressional instrumentalities of registration, and military commanders, are under the absolute rule of negroes! Every

power is derived under the Constitution which confers upon Congress the right to govern the people there, and that is sectional. It goes to Washington, and then it becomes national. The States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana and Texas, are entitled to thirty-two members of Congress; New York has thirty-one members of Congress; New York is outnumbered by these States. The New York Representatives represent four millions of people and seven hundred and fifty thousand voters. The thirty-two Representatives from the South, with an aggregate majority of over one hundred thousand, have the privilege of outvoting them.

Again: The ten States now under military rule are entitled to fifty Representatives in Congress. Under a full representation—five-fifths instead of three-fifths—they will have sixty. The aggregate negro majority in these States is over 86,000. New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey have fifty-nine Representatives. They have eight million, and will be outvoted by 86,680 of the Africanized portion of the South.

In the Senate of the United States the contrast is still more startling. Florida, with a population of 150,000 but with a registered vote of 5,000 whites and 40,000 negroes, balances New York. South Carolina, with a population of 700,000, a registered vote of 21,000 whites and 46,000 negroes, balances Pennsylvania. Louisiana, with a population of registered white voters of 44,000, and negro of 82,000, balances Ohio.

Its effect must be still more general and disastrous in the Electoral College. Do the present Representatives of the Congress of the United States represent faithfully a free white constituency in these open ribald, direct usurpations of power?

Are the people of the States tired of the Government of their fathers? Do they desire to see the Constitution under which our great Republic has become the first power in Christendom, supplanted by an unwritten constitution, representing the National will as embodied in the act of Congress? Do they wish to transfer the legislative control to the ignorant negro; their great commercial and industrial interests from the superior to the inferior race? It cannot be.

Will the people of the States permit the usurpations of Congress upon reserved rights, which the party in power have denounced as crimes? The question involves the self-preservation of every State. Another of greater solicitude presses itself upon the serious deliberation of every friend of Constitutional government. What means do the government of a State possess to prevent the Government of the United States from encroaching on its reserved powers?

Clearly not by any State vote of any Federal enactment. It could not be productive of good. Besides, no such power, in my judgment, is possessed by any State to nullify at will a Federal enactment. The remedy most certainly is not secession. Its madness has too recently been illustrated in blood to find any advocates. We have several remedies which we have in the past proved efficient. We have the right of remonstrance—of manly protest against any and all encroachments upon our rights. We have the right of adopting resolutions against any violation of the Constitution.

But that which I recommend is an appeal to the people of our sister States. I suggest that you shall put forth a calm, temperate address, setting forth the startling encroachments of Congress—its utter overthrow of self-government by usurpations unauthorized by the letter or spirit of the Constitution, addressing it to our sister States, calling upon them to unite and co-operate with us in opposition to the despotic usurpations of the reserved rights of the States.

Dispel the prejudice, which for design-

ing purposes, is attempted to be created against us. Counteract the falsehood that we desire to re-establish slavery. Expose the trick that we have unfriendly legislation against those lately our slaves, and discriminate against them in favor of the whites. Throw back the stigma so basely cast upon our humanity and benevolence by these disloyal enemies of Constitutional Government, who would slander Kentucky, hoping thereby to irritate our Northern brethren by creating the false impression that the negroes were not fully protected in the enjoyment of their rights of persons and property.

Above all, let our brethren throughout the Union know that the people of Kentucky are united, and that they present for the conjoint action of the people of all the States a platform of principles which every true man who loves his country can warmly and thoroughly indorse.

These fundamental truths are: The supremacy of the Constitution and laws of the United States within their allotted sphere; The inviolability and perpetuity of the Union under the Constitution;

The incompetency of a State, or States or of the General Government, to impair the integrity of the Union by secession on the one hand or exclusion on the other; The perfect equality among all the States under the Constitution;

The exclusive right of each State to regulate its domestic and internal affairs, subject only to such special exceptions as the Constitution itself has established; The right of each State to regulate its own suffrage.

Let the issue be made to the people of every State. I cannot persuade myself that such an appeal will be made in vain. We have no hostility to the black race, but are for the self-preservation of our own.

The interest, the honor, the peace, the safety, the prosperity of the people of all sections, are involved and imperilled in the maintenance of these guarantees. I am not, dark as the hour is, without hope. I see beams of light across our political horizon. They indicate, though dimly, coming day. I have faith in the people. I persuade myself that recent popular expressions of the masses indicate that the storm of fanaticism and error, which has almost shipwrecked us in the wild chimerical schemes of social change, will yet dash itself against the rock of the Constitution, and expend its fury without danger.

But, above all, my trust is in a higher Power. I look to Him "who stilleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of the waves, and the madness of the people." His strength has always upheld me. "In every hour of our acknowledged peril, when the dark clouds have shut down around us, He has interposed as if to baffle human wisdom, astonish human foresight, and bring out of darkness the rainbow of promise." To His providence I commend you, with an assurance of my hearty co-operation in all measures tending to the glory, peace, and prosperity of our beloved Commonwealth.

J. W. STEVENSON.  
December 2, 1867.

"Protection"—its Workings.

It has become painfully manifest, during the past few weeks, that a crisis in financial affairs is approaching; not from a scarcity of money, nor from the usual causes that bring about such disasters, but from the unhappy and blighting effects of the legislation of Congress upon the industry of the country. "Protection" was one of the hobbies of the old Whig party; and when the "Republican" party obtained the control of the government, it mounted the old nag, and assuring the people of the good times in store for them through his "good points," set off on a brisk canter. Well, the race is run, and you see where it ended—by "running into the ground;" on the principle of the old Spanish proverb, we presume: "Set a beggar on horseback, and he will ride to the devil." In this case, unfortunately, it is the people who have been ridden to death, so far as their material interests are concerned.

"Protection" is a very nice thing—in theory; but it works bad in practice.—It is very nice to say to foreign manufacturers, "You shall sell none of your goods in this country without paying so high a duty as to prevent your competing with American manufacturers. But, unfortunately, the protectionists overreached themselves, as people generally do when blinded by selfishness. The manufacturers, finding they had things their own way, raised their prices so high that few would buy, while the prohibitory tariff cut off the supply from abroad, and so, after a brief season of prosperity, we find the manufacturers flat on their backs, justly appealing for—"protection!" We cannot say that we pity them.

"Protection" does not furnish a market for the products of our country, nor does it put money in the pockets of the people. It has simply enriched a few, at the expense of the many. That it will fail to do even this, in future, seems evident.

The workings of the "protection" policy of the Jacobins may be seen in the unsettled condition of the country to-day, and the still darker prospects in store for us, in the not distant future. Many of the factories, iron mills, etc., throughout the country are closed for want of business, and thousands of people who depended on their labor in them for a living, are thrown out of employment, and will soon be asking for bread.

Of whom? Will the Congress that enacted the "protection" laws, protect the workmen in their hour of need? We doubt it. How can it be expected, when it has means to clothe and feed, a military despotism over ten States of the Union to maintain, and a vast horde of hungry cormorants to fatten at the public crib? Workingmen of America—behold the workings, and enjoy the blessings of the "protective" policy of the Jacobin party, and say whether you are ready to give them a new lease of power.—Jacksonian, (Pontiac Mich.)