

Veto of the Electoral College Bill—Its Return to the Senate—The President's Objections to It.

WASHINGTON, July 20.—The President this afternoon sent the following message to the Senate:

To the Senate of the United States:

I have given to the joint resolution entitled a "resolution excluding from the Electoral College the votes of States lately in rebellion, which shall not have been recognized," as careful examination as I have been able to bestow on the subject during the few days that have intervened since the measure was submitted for my approval. Feeling constrained to withhold my assent, I herewith return the resolution to the Senate, in which House it originated, with a brief statement of the reasons which have induced my action. This joint resolution is based upon the assumption that some of the States whose inhabitants were lately in rebellion, are not now entitled to representation in Congress and to participate in the election of a President and Vice President of the United States. I have heretofore had occasion to give in detail my reasons for dissenting from this view. It is not necessary at this time to repeat them. It is sufficient to state, that I continue strong in my conviction, that the acts of secession by which a number of the Southern States sought to dissolve their connection with the Northern States, and to subvert the Union, being unauthorized by the Constitution, and in direct violation thereof, were from the beginning absolutely null and void. It follows necessarily that when the rebellion terminated, the several States which had attempted to secede, continued to be States in the Union, and all that was required to enable them to resume their relations to the Union, was that they should adopt the measures necessary to their practical restoration as States. Such measures were adopted, and the legitimate result was, those States having conformed to all the requirements of the Constitution, resumed their former relations because they were entitled to the exercise of all the rights guaranteed to them by its provisions. This joint resolution under consideration, however, seems to assume that by the insurrectionary acts of their respective inhabitants those States forfeited their rights as such, and can never again exercise them, except upon their readmission into the Union, on the terms prescribed by Congress. If this position be correct, it follows that they were taken out of the Union by virtue of their acts of secession, and hence that the war waged on them was illegal and unconstitutional. We would be thus placed in this inconsistent attitude: that while it was commenced and carried on the instance, the ground that the Southern States stand being component parts of the Union were in rebellion against the lawful authority of the United States. Upon its termination we resort to a policy of reconstruction which assumes that it was not in fact a rebellion, but the war was waged for the conquest of Territories assumed to be the outside of Union. The mode and manner of receiving and counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States are in plain and simple terms prescribed by the Constitution. That instrument imperatively requires that the President of the Senate and House of Representatives open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Congress has therefore no power under the Constitution to receive the electoral votes or reject them. The whole power is exhausted; when in presence of the two Houses the votes are counted and the result declared. In this respect the power and duty of the Senate as under the Constitution; are purely ministerial. When, therefore, the joint resolution declared that no electoral votes shall be received or counted from the States that since the 4th of March, 1867, have not adopted a constitution of the State Government under which a State Government shall have been organized, a power is assumed which is nowhere delegated to Congress, unless upon the assumption that the State Governments organized prior to the 4th of March, 1867, were illegal and void, the joint resolution by implication at least concedes that these States were States by virtue of their organization prior to the 4th of March, 1867, but denies to them the right to vote in the election of the President and Vice President of the United States. It follows either this assumption of power is wholly destroyed by the Constitution, or that the States excluded from voting were out of the Union by reason of the rebellion, and have never been legitimately restored. Being fully satisfied that they were never out of the Union, and their relations thereto have been legally and constitutionally restored, I am forced to the conclusion that the joint resolution which deprives them of the right to have their votes for President and Vice President received and counted, is in conflict with the Constitution, and that Congress has no more power to reject their votes than those of the States which have been uniformly loyal to the Federal Union. It is worthy of remark that if the States whose inhabitants were recently in rebellion, were legally and constitutionally organized and restored to their rights prior to the 4th of March, 1867, I am satisfied they were, the only legitimate authority under which the election for President and Vice President can be held therein, must be derived from the Governments instituted before that period. It clearly follows that all the State governments organized in those States, and the acts of Congress for that purpose, and under military control are illegitimate and of no validity, whatever, and in that view the votes cast in those States for President and Vice President in pursuance of the acts passed since the 4th of March, 1867, and in obedience to the so-called reconstruction acts of Congress cannot be legally received and counted, while the only votes in those States that can be legally cast and counted, will be those cast in pursuance of the laws in force in the several States prior to the legislation of Congress on the subject of reconstruction.

I cannot refrain from directing your special attention to the declaration contained in the joint resolution "that none of the States whose inhabitants were lately in rebellion, shall be entitled to representation in the Electoral College, &c." If it meant that no State is to be allowed to vote for President or Vice President, all of whose inhabitants were engaged in the late rebellion, it is apparent that no one of the States will be excluded from voting, since it is well known that in every Southern State there were many inhabitants who did not participate in the Southern rebellion, but who actually took part in its suppression or refrained from giving it any aid or countenance. I therefore conclude that the true meaning of the resolution is that no State, a portion of whose inhabitants were engaged in the rebellion, shall be permitted to participate in the Presidential election except upon the terms and conditions therein prescribed. Assuming this to be the true construction of the resolution, the inquiry becomes pertinent, may those Northern States, a portion of whose inhabitants were actually in the rebellion, be prevented at the discretion of Congress from having their electoral votes counted? It is well known that a portion of the inhabitants of New York and Virginia were alike engaged in the rebellion, and it is equally well known, that Virginia, as well as New York was at all times during the war recognized by the Federal Government as a State in the Union so clearly, that upon the termination of hostilities it was not even deemed necessary for her restoration that a provisional government should be appointed. Yet according to this joint resolution the people of Virginia, unless they comply with the terms it prescribes, are denied the right of voting for President and Vice President, while the people of New York, a portion of the inhabitants of which State were also in rebellion, are permitted to have their electoral votes counted without undergoing the process of reconstruction prescribed for Virginia. New York is no more a State than Virginia. The one is as much entitled to be represented in the Electoral College as the other. If Congress has the power to deprive Virginia of this right, it can exercise the same authority with respect to New York or any of the States. Thus the result of the Presidential election may be controlled and determined by Congress. The people would be deprived of their rights under the Constitution to choose a President and Vice President of the United States. If Congress were to provide by law that the votes of none of the States should be received and counted if cast for a candidate who differed in political sentiment with a majority of the two Houses, such legislation would at once be condemned by the country as unconstitutional and a revolutionary usurpation of power. It would, however, be exceedingly difficult to put into the Constitution any more authority for the joint resolution under consideration than for an enactment looking directly to the rejection of all votes not in accordance with the political preference of a majority of Congress. No power exists in the Constitution authorizing the joint resolution or the proposed law; the only difference being that one would be more palpably unconstitutional and revolutionary than the other; one would rest upon the Radical error that Congress has power to prescribe the terms and conditions to the right of the people of the States to cast their votes for President and Vice President. For the reasons thus indicated I am constrained to return the joint resolution to the Senate for such further action thereon as Congress may deem necessary.

[Signed] ANDREW JOHNSON  
WASHINGTON, July 20, 1868.

The Negro of the South.—His New Masters and his Present Form of Bondage.

The sale and enslavement of the human race, whenever the crimes of man-stealing and slave-trading could be made profitable, pecuniarily or politically, have from the first year of their arrival in this country to the present moment, been most unscrupulously engaged in and vigorously prosecuted by the carpet-bagger and his Puritan ancestors. The re-enslavement of the lately emancipated blacks of the Southern States is now engaging the attention of the carpet-bagger because there is almost as much profit in reducing the negro to political slavery as there once was in buying him with New England rum, and then selling him to the colonists of Virginia. And the great object of New England in destroying the old and patriarchal form of negro slavery was to substitute for it that most selfish and unfeeling form of human bondage which secures the vote of the negro, and neither clothes, nor feeds, nor gives him useful and honest employment. The form of slavery which the carpet-bagger has introduced into Virginia is as hideously selfish as that which it has superseded was liberal and humane. Through the aid of secret societies, by constantly working upon his fears and by appealing to his most brutal passions, the carpet-bagger has bound the poor negro in the fetters of a species of slavery which can only end in his utter demoralization and ruin. So terrible has been the demoralization resulting from the form of slavery introduced into the South since 1865, that it has already swept away (it has been estimated) one sixth of the negro population. That system of slavery which prevailed at the South until the North abolished it sought to make the negro a source of profit as a tiller of the soil. The negro was better fed, clothed and cared for than any agricultural laborer of modern times, and the vital statistics of the census prove that he was the healthiest and most long-lived laborer in the world. No where in Christendom was the day laborer as exempt from the diseases and infirmities which are occasioned by neglect, vicious indulgences, inadequate food and unhealthy dwellings as was the black laborer of the South until the horrible scourge of New England enslavement fell upon him in 1865. But this form of bondage did not put money in sufficient quantities in the pockets of the unscrupulous political adventurers of the North, and it was abolished. If the form of negro slavery which is likely to prove of most immediate profit to the North is that which, while it does not impose upon the master the

burden of supporting the slave, gives him all the spoils of office, and the right to beggar the Southern property holders by taxation. The object in view was attained by the empty bauble of freedom and by making the negro a voter, and then controlling his vote through the agency of secret societies. Here was a sort of enslavement after the carpet-bagger's own heart. It was artfully disguised by a proclamation of emancipation, which concealed the barbed point of the deadly hook which was to catch the black Leviathan. It was just such a swindle as that which the New Englander has invariably employed when plotting to turn the weakness of an inferior race to their own advantage. It was re-using the old game which the early colonists of Massachusetts resorted to when the Indian was to be cheated of his land, and the negro to be torn from his native land by Puritan greed. "Liberty and suffrage" are the "red cloth and rum" with which the ancestors of these carpet-baggers commenced their crusade against the black and red man. A gallon of rum was the old New England price for a freshly caught African, and a yard of red cloth was the price paid to the Indian for a thousand acres of land. The policy of that section has always been in dealing with inferior races to cheat them. Honesty in dealing with inferior races has always been derided by the "elect of the Lord." III. In their treatment of emancipated negroes, the carpet-baggers are re-enacting the deliberate villainies which their ancestors practiced towards the native African and the Indian. They demand from the negro the most unbecoming obedience to their political decrees. They hold over him the terrors of those diabolical secret societies which they have established in every magisterial and constable's district. If he dares to disobey his New England masters, he is hunted with a ferocity with which no slave follower ever chased a fugitive through the swamps of Louisiana. Mobs threaten to tear him to pieces, assassins shoot him at the door of his humble cabin, and the church denounces and excommunicates him. Bayne ventures to run for Congress against a carpet-bagger, and the carpet-bagger at once incite the poor ignorant blacks to assail one of their own race in the most brutal manner. IV. The bondage which New England has substituted for the patriarchal form of slavery to the most hideous which ever scourged any portion of the human race. It enslaves but gives nothing in return; their mass of potage is all which the carpet-bagger gives to his political slave. The price of "suffrage" is "soup" and nothing more. The present rulers of the blacks assume none of the duties of their old Virginia masters. They value them for their votes as the trapper of the plains values buffaloes for their hides and skins. A black voter who is ragged and half starved is worth fully as much to a carpet-bagger as a fat and well fed suffragan. "Waste good clothing and generous 'gint upon the nigger," says the carpet-bagger, "when he is such an infernal fool as to permit us to lead him by the nose without demanding from our hands what his old master gave him." And hence the scoundrels who have re-enslaved the negroes of the South neither feed, clothe, house nor pay them wages. He gets no care from his present master either in infancy, sickness or old age. Except as a voter, whose mission it is to put his carpet-bag master in office, the present masters of the poor negroes have no use for them. The present "slave-drivers" do not march at the head of a legion, well fed and comfortably clothed laborers to the corn and cotton fields. They drive their ragged and demoralized serfs to the polls, where, after they have deposited a mysterious piece of paper in a box of which a carpet-bagger holds the key, they are dismissed to starve, steal or earn a support from their former masters.—Richmond Enquirer.

The Louisville Journal announces George H. Pendleton as the Warlock of the next Presidency.

The Democratic Nominations.—Why Conservative Republicans Should Support Them.—Letter of Senator Doolittle of Wisconsin.

WASHINGTON, July 18, 1868.  
O. H. Ostrander, Esq., Danville, Va.:  
DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, in which, speaking for yourself and forty-eight other Conservative Republicans of your town, you express a "sense of disappointment and regret that no better names had been offered by the Democratic party to lead the Conservative and patriotic masses of the people to victory, and the Radical Republican party to merited defeat. As a gentleman and a statesman Mr. Seymour holds our respect, but as a Peace Democrat we are indisposed to vote for him," and you are pleased to say, that if my name, among others, had been placed at the head of the ticket, "all would have gone well, and victory would have been certain." You desire my opinion upon the situation and "the prospects of a third party." I thank you for the confidence thus reposed in me, and shall not shrink from the responsibility of stating frankly my opinion. I do not think the organization of a third party is wise, or can work any practical good to the great cause in which we are engaged. In the very nature of things, when great principles are at stake, there are, and there can be, but two effective political parties. "He that is not for me is against me," in politics as well as in religion, is a truth upon which every wise man is compelled to act. What, then, is the great and paramount issue? What is that great and unpardonable wrong for which the Radical party is now arraigned and should be overthrown? It is substantially this: In violation of the Constitution—in violation of pledges made and often repeated, from the first battle of Bull Run to the end of the war; pledges to the North to get men and money; pledges especially made to the Democracy to get their support in the field and in the elections; pledges made to the South to induce them to lay down their arms and to renew their allegiance; and pledges to foreign powers to prevent intervention—in violation of all these solemn pledges, upon which we invoked the blessings of Almighty God upon our cause, and by which alone we gained strength to master the rebellion—in violation of the natural and inalienable right of the civilized men of every State to govern themselves, and in violation of the clear provisions of the Constitution, which leaves to each State for itself the right to regulate its own affairs, without interference, by *ex post facto* laws, disfranchising hundreds of thousands of the most intelligent of its citizens and baser forced upon ten States and six millions of our own Anglo Saxon race the universal and unqualified suffrage of seven hundred thousand ignorant, and, in the main, half civilized negroes. This is the great wrong for which that party is arraigned at the bar of public judgment, and for which it should be overthrown. To consummate that great wrong, they have abolished all civil government, and civil liberty even, in these ten States. They have established an absolute military despotism, wherein all rights to life, liberty and property are subject to the will of one man. They have kept the Union divided. They have prevented the restoration of industry. They kept down the credit of the government, during the three years of peace to a point so low that, to the shame of every American, the six per cent. bonds of the United States sell for only 73 in gold, while the bonds of Brazil, bearing only four per cent. interest, bring over 90 in gold. They have encroached upon the just rights of the Executive; They have threatened the independence of the Supreme Court; They have unjustly and without cause, impeached and put upon trial the President himself, and by every species of denunciation, and even by threats of assassination, have endeavored to force the Senate to convict him, in order to place in the Executive chair one who will use all its power to consummate that gigantic wrong against the Constitution, against our plighted faith, against civilization, and against our own race and kindred. The Convention in New York met for the purpose of organizing to overthrow the party in power for this great wrong and restore the Union and the Constitution, and the rights of the States, and of all the States under it. Now, I do not say the nominations made at New York are the very best that could have been made for that purpose. The elements to be organized into a victorious army are four fold. To use a military figure, there were four army corps to be organized into one grand army. First. The great Democratic corps. Second. The War Democratic corps. Third. The Conservative Republican corps. Fourth. The Civilized Southern corps. The first, or Democratic corps, was fully organized, with ranks well filled, but not in sufficient numbers to secure the victory. There was the War Democratic corps, which supported Lincoln in 1864; but which, in consequence, of the great wrong above mentioned, was ready to sever itself from the Radical army under General Grant; and there was the Conservative Republican corps, of which you are pleased to speak of as a leader, who, for the same reasons, were ready to join the great army, and do all in their power to bring success to our cause. The two last are the recruiting corps. They hold the balance of power. As matter of policy, had the first corps been given to either of the one or the other, it would have made our victory more easy, if not more certain. Everybody knows that the result of this contest is to depend upon the important question, whether we shall be able to recruit these two corps in sufficient numbers, and carry them to the hearty support of Mr. Seymour. If we can, victory is with us. If we cannot, victory is against us. In my judgment, it is our duty: to do so. The very life of the Constitution is involved, and with it, the rights of the States and the liberties of the people. I cannot hesitate for one moment. My judgment is for it; my whole heart is

in it. So far from relaxing, we should redouble our efforts. Bear in mind that the war was ended three years ago, when a new era was opened in political affairs. That Mr. Seymour is a man of high character, of unquestioned patriotism, of great ability and experience, wholly with us upon the living and paramount issue; and that, if elected he will make a most able and dignified President, and certainly no Pennsylvanian will forget that, but for his promptness and energy in forwarding the forces of New York to Gettysburg, that great battle might have been lost and Pennsylvania overrun. While, in General Blair, we have a civilian and a soldier whose promptness and indomitable resolution seized Camp Jackson; and saved Missouri from secession; who always stood among the foremost of the war Republicans, in council and in the field, while the war lasted; and when it was over, was among the first to demand that for which the war was prosecuted—the Union of the States under the Constitution, with their rights, equality, and dignity unimpaired. Let us unite for a victory! Let us have peace—a peace which comes not from a violated Constitution and the despotism of the sword, but a peace which comes from a restored Union and the supremacy of constitutional law, by which alone liberty is secured. Respectfully, Yours,  
J. R. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. Pendleton, by his mealy, dignified and honorable course during the canvass for the Presidential nomination, won for himself thousands of new friends and admirers. The time will be when the country will gladly honor him with my position at her bedside.—Dayton (Ohio) Ledger.

The Late Democratic Convention.

The protracted sessions and frequent ballottings of the late Democratic National Convention resulted from two causes, both of which were calculated to inspire the party with the most sanguine expectations of the success of their ticket in November. The Convention commenced with the resolute purpose of mercifully enforcing the "two-thirds rule" until it should secure the strongest possible candidate, and adhered to that purpose to the end of its labors. The partisans of the various distinguished gentlemen who were placed in nomination, regarding the nomination as almost equivalent to an election, fought for their favorites with terrible earnestness. Hence there was much balloting, great excitement, five days of hot and uncomfortable labor but no fatal dissensions, no irreconcilable feuds, no differences upon principle. The platform of principles—a masterpiece of work—met with the enthusiastic support of every delegate, and when "Seymour and Blair" emerged from the dust and smoke of the warmly contested struggle, fairly and honestly, they were hailed with the enthusiastic cheers of the friends of all the disappointed candidates. In 1844 and 1852, when the exigencies of the party rendered it necessary for all its oldest and most distinguished statesmen to be set aside, the feeling of discontent was infinitely greater than it was during the late Convention, but it subsided in a few weeks, and Polk and Pierce defeated with ease the foremost statesman and the greatest military hero of the Whig party. It was only when there was open mutiny and rebellion against the action of the Convention in 1848 and 1860—that the Democracy sustained a crushing defeat. At no moment was the late Convention ever threatened with rupture and discord. Never was there the slightest risk that the friends of Pendleton, or of any other candidate, would oppose their personal preferences to the nomination of any consistent Conservative or Democrat. The shameless disregard of principle which the nomination of a discarded Radical candidate for the Presidency, like Judge Chase, would have involved, might have resulted in a "split" like that at Charleston in 1860, but the fraction of a single vote from the distant shores of the Pacific seems to have expressed the full strength of this pioneer of negro suffrage in the Convention. No one who reflects for a single instant can doubt that it was part of eminent wisdom to antagonize Radicalism and Democracy by the nomination of two of the most determined enemies of the revolutionary party at Washington which could be found within the limits of the Democratic party. There is not an instance in the history of parties of a reckless, unscrupulous, desperate, revolutionary party having been defeated by a line of timid policy, or by compromising time serving leaders. Such parties must be hunted down like outlaws and beasts of prey. There is no other way of dealing with them. No men in the United States have assailed the infamous act of the Radical party with the persistent energy of Seymour and Blair. From the first aggressive and unconstitutional acts of Congress these gentlemen have pointed their batteries of well directed artillery into the majority of that unscrupulous party. Following the lead of such standard bearers the Democracy will conduct an aggressive campaign. The Democratic platform is a powerfully drawn indictment, which will be vigorously prosecuted to a certain conviction of the offenders. The war will be carried into Africa, and the party which has brought the nation to the verge of ruin will be placed in the criminal's dock and tried like a felon by the country.—Richmond Enquirer.

The Mongrel Alarm at the Democratic Nominations. The Mongrels of all ages and degrees are displeased with the Democratic nominations. They are disappointed, unhappy. Seymour, they think, is a weak nomination. Well; if the nomination of the foremost statesman of his times, for the highest office in the United States "weak;" what is to be said of a nomination of a nincompoop and whiskey guzzler, who is admitted, on all hands, to be as destitute of statesmanship as he is of character? If that is a strong condemnation, it can be only in the sense that "smells to heaven." If that is a strong nomination, the American people must have lost, not only their virtue, but their senses. If a nominee of Governor Seymour's exalted character and statesmanship is weak, then there is no such thing as strength in the estimation of the people of this country, except in crime and foolishness. To call his nomination "weak" is to arraign the whole American people, and to say that they are no longer fit for self-government. It is to proclaim, that eminent statesmanship and exalted character are no longer deemed necessary in a President of the United States. And such, indeed, will be the declaration of every man who prefers Grant to Seymour. The Mongrels also are alarmed, not to say shocked at the nomination of Gen. Blair for Vice President, and profess to snuff the air of revolution in his election. The rascals, who are themselves carrying on a revolution which is aimed not only at our free system of government, but at our civilization, are horrified at the nomination of a man who boldly professes to stop their revolution by the assertion of the constitutional powers of the executive office. It will, we confess, be a terrible punishment for the rabid Mongrels of the Senate to be presided over by a man of Gen. Blair's decision of character and pluck. To have a man in that place who is neither their tool, nor open to their bribery, nor threats, will be good and bring them to a degree of desperation bordering on insanity. This accounts for the Mongrel howling at Gen. Blair's nomination. No better evidence of the great strength of the Democratic nominations could be asked for than is furnished by the alarm and outcry made by the Mongrel party. An inflexible instinct of common sense and good prompts the rage which they manifest. Their cries show that they are vitally hurt, and their declaration of the "weakness" of our nominations is proof that they are painfully conscious of their great strength.—Day-Book.