THE BEAVER ARGUS
will be Published Every Wednesday
IN MINIS' BUILDINGS,
THIRD ST., BEAVER, PA.
At $2.00 per annum in Advance

Letters and contributions, by mail, will have prompt attention.
J. S. RUTAN & Co. Eds. & Pro'rs.

BEAVER ARGUS.

Vol. 42-No. 5. Beaver, Wednesday January 31, 1866. Established 1818.

Letter from Nashville.

HDQ'RS MIL. DIV. OF THE TENN.,
NASHVILLE, January 18th, 1866.

Dear Argus:—To those of your readers, who, like the Athenians, spend their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing," this letter will offer little or nothing of interest. Knowing, however, that sundry things have materially changed recently, the class of persons St. Paul encountered in the famous Grecian city has no counterpart among your Beaver subscribers at least, I venture to commence writing on a very limited capital of news. In fact, the only new thing I have heard of or seen today was a suit of new clothes I observed a mustered out "veteran" endeavoring to purchase from a clothier of the Jewish persuasion. The latter was loudly extolling the strength and finish of the "shoddy" in a pair of unmentionables cut in the tight fitting style of ten years ago, and which fully displayed the elegant proportions of his warlike customer's locomotive apparatus. I left before the bargain was concluded, but as the soldier had evidently just arrived from the South, and therefore would hardly be acquainted with recent fashions, it is fair to suppose that he will astonish his friends and relatives at an early day by appearing with scarcely any "visible means of support."

Our winter, thus far, has been very mild as compared with the weather North. To-day one cannot resist the temptation to throw open the windows and allow the genial air and bright sunshine to enter uninterrupted. I understand that skating has become a favorite amusement with the belles of both sexes in and around Beaver. It is to be hoped that this rational and healthful amusement may continue in favor with the ladies, who cannot but admit that it is a more agreeable and effective beautifier than rouge and its kindred cosmetics, with which so many of the fair sex attempt to improve the color of their countenances.

Another cheering evidence of social progress may be found in the greatly increased length of the weekly marriage list since the termination of the war; in many cases the male party to the contract being "a lad who went for a soldier." Heroes, who passed safely and gloriously through hard fought battles, return to fall by the arrows of Cupid, and he who once considered it a condescension to salute a Major General, now, with a right hearty good will, presents arms to some conquering beauty. As well the mighty must fall; every Simpson has his Delilah, and as Orpheus C. Kerr elegantly expresses it, "a woman is never farther from her conqueror's foot than when she yields to his arms."

Next week sees the execution of four of the Hefferman murderers, who were tried by a Military Commission some lately after the commitral of the rest, and sentenced to be hung. General Thomas suspended the sentence until it could be acted upon by the President. The latter orders it to be carried into effect. The criminals are young men who were employed in the government corral at this city, and carrying on the business of highway robbery in addition to their regular occupation. Mr. Hefferman, an old and respected citizen, was attacked, near the suburbs of the city, by these miscreants, and murdered while endeavoring to defend himself. Public sentiment, previously aroused by the enormity and number of crimes of this description, runs high, and will not be allayed until the extreme penalty of the law is visited upon the offenders.

Proper efforts have never been made heretofore, to develope the manufacturing and mining interests of the State of Tennessee. Since the close of the war, capitalists have begun to turn their attention to this region, and several associations have been organized, with every prospect of securing remunerative returns. Prominent among these is the Tennessee and Alabama Manufacturing and Mining Company, presided over by General J. D. Whipple, and embracing among its members a great number of men of wealth and influence. The illy concealed hostility to the development of the mineral wealth of the Southern States, formerly evinced by the planters, has passed away with its prime cause—slavery; and a broad field is now offered to enterprising men of means, from all sections.

Major General Donaldson, Chief Quartermaster, Military Div. of the Tennessee, recently issued a call to all ex-officers, officers, soldiers, and others, having any knowledge of cemeteries, places of burial, or of the scattered graves of our brave soldiers," in the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama and Georgia, inviting them to send such information to Capt. Whitman, Murfreesboro, Tenn. It is intended by the Government to collect and deposit in National Cemeteries the remains of the thousands of unknown but gallant soldiers who sleep their last sleep far from home and kindred. Myriads are buried upon the battle fields whereon they fell; others rest in the vicinities of the rude hospitals in which they breathed their last. Wherever our armies marched, mounds of earth remain to speak more eloquently than tongue or pen. The Government, in taking charge of this matter, does but justice to the dead, and the feelings of the living. How many bereaved families there are to-day who are denied even the poor consolation of knowing the spot where their loved ones are laid. How many a mother's sad heart would be relieved and gratified to receive the assurance that the country, for which her boy offered up his life, cares reverently for his ashes. This subject recalls the following touching and musical lines, first published in the Baltimore *American*; they perhaps may have some interest, for those of your readers to whom they are new.

"SOMEBODY'S DARLING."

Into a ward of the whitewashed walls,
Where the dead and the dying lay,
Wounded by bayonets, shells, and balls,
Somebody's darling was borne one day;
Somebody's darling so young and so brave,
Wearing yet on his pale, sweet face,
Soon to be hid by the dust of the grave,
The lingering light of his boyhood's grace.

Matted and damp are the curls of gold
Kissing the sun of that fair young brow,
Pale are the lips of delicate mould—
Somebody's darling is dying now.
Back from the beautiful blue-veined brow
Brush all the wandering waves of gold,
Cross his hands on his bosom now,
Somebody's darling is still and cold.

Kiss him once for "Somebody's" sake,
Murmur a prayer soft and low;
One bright curl from its fair mates take—
They are somebody's pride, you know;
Somebody's hand hath rested there—
Was it a mother's, soft and white?
And have the lips of a sister fair
Been baptized in those waves of light?

God knows best. He was somebody's love;
"Somebody's" heart enshrined him there;
Somebody" wafted his name above,
Night and morn on the wings of prayer
Somebody" wept when he marched away,
Looking so handsome, brave, and grand;
Somebody's" kiss on his forehead lay
"Somebody" clung to his parting hand.

Somebody's" watching and waiting for him,
Yearning to hold him again to their heart
And there he lies, with blue eyes dim,
And the smiling childlike lips apart.
Tenderly bury the fair young dead,
Pausing to drop on his grave a tear;
Carve on the wooden slab at his head,
"Somebody's" darling slumbers here.

J. WICKHAM.

RECOLLECTIONS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

BY F. B. CARPENTER.

William Wallace Lincoln died Thursday, February 20, 1862. After the funeral the President resumed his official duties, but mechanically, and with a terrible weight at his heart.—The following Thursday he gave way to his feelings, and shut himself from all society. The second Thursday was the same; he would see no one, and seemed a prey to the deepest melancholy. About this time the Rev. Dr. Vinton, of Trinity church, New York had occasion to spend a few days in Washington. An acquaintance of Mrs. Lincoln and her sister, Mrs. Edwards, of Springfield, he was requested by them to come up and see the President. The setting apart of Thursday for the indulgence of his grief had gone on for several weeks, and Mrs. Lincoln began to be seriously alarmed for the health of her husband, of which fact Dr. Vinton was apprised. Mr Lincoln received him in the parlor, and an opportunity was soon embraced by the clergyman to chide him for showing so rebellious a disposition to the decrees of Providence. He told him plainly that the indulgence of such feelings though natural, was sinful.—It was unworthy one who believed in the Christian religion. He had duties to the living greater than those of any other man, as the chosen father and leader of the people, and he was unfitting himself for his responsibilities by thus giving way to his grief. To mourn the departed as *lost* belongs to heathenism—not Christianity. "Your son," said Dr. Vinton, "is *alive* in Paradise. Do you remember that passage: "God is not the God of the *dead*, but of the living, for all live unto Him." Mr. Lincoln had listened as one in a stupor, until his ears caught the words, "Your son is alive." Starting from the sofa, he exclaimed, "Alive, alive! Surely you mock me." "No sir, believe me," replied Dr. Vinton, "It is a most comforting Doctrine of the Church, founded upon the words of Christ Himself." Mr. Lincoln looked at him a moment, and then, stepping forward, he threw his arm around the clergyman's neck, and laying his head upon his breast, sobbed aloud, "*Alive! alive!*" he repeated, "My dear sir," said Dr. Vinton, greatly moved, as he twined his own arm around the weeping father, "believe this, for it is God's most precious truth. Seek not your son among the dead, for he is not there; he lives to-day in Paradise! Think of the words I have quoted. The Sadducees, when they questioned Jesus, had no other conception than that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, were dead and buried. Mark the reply: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living: *for all live unto Him.*" Did not the aged patriarch mourn his son as dead; Joseph is not, and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin also." But Joseph and Simeon were both living though he believed it not. Indeed Joseph being taken from him was the ultimate means of the preservation of the whole family. And so God has called your son into his upper kingdom—a kingdom and an existence as real, more real than your own! It may be that he, too, like Joseph, has gone, in God's good Providence, to be the salvation of his father's household. It is a part of the Lord's plan for the ultimate happiness of you and yours. Doubt it not. I have a Sermon," continued Dr Vinton, "upon this subject, which I think might interest you." Mr. Lincoln begged him to send it at an early day, thanking him repeatedly for his cheering and hopeful words. Through a member of the family I have learned that the sermon was sent and read over and over by the President, who caused a copy to be made for his own private use before it was returned.—Upon the same authority I have been informed that Mr. Lincoln's views in relation to spiritual things seemed changed from this hour. Certain it is that thenceforth he ceased the observance of the day of the week upon which his son died, and gradually resumed his accustomed cheerfulness.

My friend, George E. Baker, Mr. Seward's private Secretary, informed me that he was much amused and interested in a phase of Mr. Lincoln's character, which came under his own observation. It was Mr. Baker's province to take to the President all public documents from the State Department requiring his signature.—During the first few months Mr. Lincoln would read each paper carefully through, always remarking "I never sign a document I have not first read." As his cares increased he at length departed from this habit so far as to say to the messenger, "Won't you read these papers to me?" This went on for a few months, and he then modified this practice by requesting "a synopsis of the contents." His time became more and more curtailed, and for the last year his only expression was, Show me where you want my name."

It is not generally known that the speech always made by the President upon the presentation of a foreign minister is carefully written for him by the Secretary of State. A clerk in the Department, ignorant of this custom, was one day sent to the White House by Mr. Seward, with the speech to be delivered upon such an occasion. Mr. Lincoln was writing at his desk as the clerk entered, a half a dozen Senators and Representatives occupying the sofa and chairs. Unable to disguise a feeling of delicacy in the discharge of such an errand, the young man approached, and in a low tone said to the President: "The Secretary has sent the speech you are to make to-day to the Swiss Minister."—Mr Lincoln laid down his pen, and taking the manuscript said in a loud tone: "O, this is a speech Mr. Seward has written for me, is it? I guess I will try it before these gentlemen and see how it goes." Thereupon he proceeded to read it, in a waggish manner, remarking, as he concluded, with sly humor, "There, I like that, it has the merit of being original."

Speech of Mr. Conkling, of New York, on the Proposed Amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker:

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."—*Constitution*, art. 1, sec. 2.

This is the provision by which apportionment and representation have till now been regulated in the United States. It is one of the compromises of the Constitution.

Strange as it may seem to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rogers] it owes its existence to the same principle asserted in the pending amendment. What is that principle? That political representation does not belong to those who have no political existence.

The government of a free political society belongs to its members, and does not belong to others. If others are allowed to share in its control, they do so by express concession, not by right.

It was this principle which rendered necessary such a provision as I have read. It was this principle which brought that provision into our national charter.

The slaves of the South were not members of that political society which formed the Constitution of the United States. They were without personal liberty, and therein they were without a natural right, not a political right; but they were also without political rights, and therefore they were not members of the political community.

From this it followed that they were not to be represented as members.

From this it followed that political power was not to be apportioned by treating them as political persons.

Natural persons they were, producers they were, and the product of their labor was the proper subject of taxation.

But direct taxes and representation ought to be distributed uniformly among the members of a free Government. All alike should bear the burdens; all alike should share the benefits.

Here was a clear principle palpably right, and easy and certain in its application. It applied itself. It applied itself universally and covered the whole case without one exception.

I do not treat Indians not taxed" as an exception, because the civilized Indians in their tribal state were so far beyond the scope within which the Constitution was to act that they were named only to prevent possible mistake as to the meaning of language.

Neither was a fixed exception, or even an obstacle, found in the case of aliens or unnaturalized foreigners.

The Constitution was to leave to the States and to give to the Congress power to clothe foreigners with full political rights as fast as they should be prepared to assume them. The only question remaining therefore, as to them, was how they should be treated during the interval between their arrival and their naturalization, during their political nonage.

This question was disposed of in the liberality in which the Government was conceived. The political disability of aliens was not for this purpose counted at all against them, because it was certain to be temporary, and they were admitted at once into the basis of apportionment.

The slave alone was the anomaly and the nondescript.

A man, and not a man, in flesh and blood, alive politically, dead.

A native, an inhabitant, a producer but without recognized political attribute or prerogative; the representative in the system of nothing but value.

What could be done with him? He was now here.

It could not be maintained by the slaveholding States that slaves were persons to be represented. It could not be maintained by the free States that slaves were persons to be taxed. For these purposes slaves were excluded altogether by the principle on which the Government was built.—They were not embraced within it because they had no political standing in the States wherein they were held. Without some special provision therefore, they would have been altogether ignored.

Taxes, however, were desirable on the one side and representation on the other, and for more convenience a compromise was invented for the sake of both.

A purely arbitrary agreement was made and inserted in the Constitution an agreement with nothing to support it but the consent of the parties, based upon the facts as they then stood. It was agreed in substance that the free people of all the States should be counted alike, and should all have their fair share of power as thus ascertained, and that then the free people of the slaveholding States should have as much power beside as would be measured by counting every slave as three fifths of a person," direct taxes to follow the same rule. The power thus agreed upon could not be exercised by the fractional persons themselves, but as somebody else owned them, it was so arranged that that somebody else should own the political power also.

The covenant, whether wise or not, was operative as long as there was anything for it to operate upon.

That time is past. The provision has become impotent. The fall of slavery has superseded it. We have nothing now to rely upon in its place but the residue of the second section of the first article of the Constitution. That section, owing to the rupture of the technical tie of slavery, would, as it stands, work out results now which, when the Constitution was made, were condemned by the judgment of all.

"Free persons" was the term employed to describe all who had political rights and standing, because only slaves had neither.

But now a new anomaly exists.—Four million people are suddenly among us—not bound to any one, and yet not clothed with any political rights. They are not slaves, but they are not in a political sense, "persons."

No figment of slavery remains with which to spell out a right in somebody else to wield for them a power which they must not wield themselves. This was one of the appurtenances of property in man, and has been extinguished by constitutional Amendment; it is not destroyed before.

This emancipated multitude has no political *status*.

Emancipation vitalizes only natural rights, not political rights.

Enfranchisement alone carries with it political rights, and these emancipated millions are no more enfranchised now than when they were slaves.

They never had political power.—Their masters had a fraction of power as masters. But there are no masters now.

There are no slaves now. The whole relationship in which the power originated and existed is gone. Does this fraction of power still survive? If it does, what shall become of it? Where is it to go?

We are told the blacks are unfit to wield even a fraction of power, and must not have it. That answers the whole question. If the answer be true, it is the end of controversy.—There is no place logically for this power to go save to the blacks; if they are unfit to have it, the power would not exist. It is a power astray, without a rightful owner. It should be resumed by the whole nation at once. It should not exist; it does not exist. This fractional power is extinct.

A moral earthquake, has turned fractions into units, and units into ciphers. If a black man counts at all now, he counts five-fifths of a man, not three-fifths. Revolutions have no such frequent go about, as rhetoric, war and humanity join hands to blot them out.

Four millions, therefore, and not three-fifths of four millions, are to be reckoned in here now, and all these four millions are, and are to be, we are told, unfit for political existence.

Did the framers of the Constitution ever dream of this? Never, very clearly. Our fathers trusted to gradual and voluntary emancipation, which would go hand in hand, with education and enfranchisement. They never peered into the bloody epoch when four million fetters would be at once melted all in the fires of war. They never saw such a vision as we see.—Four millions, each a Caspar Hauser, long shut up in darkness, and suddenly led out into the full flash of noon, and each one are told, 190 blind, to walk politically. No one foresaw such an event, and no provision was made for it. The three-fifths rule gave the slaveholding States over and above all their just representation, eighteen Representatives beside, by the enumeration of 1860.

The new situation will enable those States when relationships are resumed, to claim twenty eight Representatives beside their just proportion.

Twenty-eight votes to be cast here and in the Electoral College for those held not fit to sit as jurors, not fit, to be plaintiff in a suit, not fit to approach the ballot box. Twenty-eight votes to be more or less controlled by those who once betrayed the Government, and for those so destitute, we are assured, of intelligent instinct as not to be fit for free agency.

Shall all this be? Shall four million being a count for millions in managing the affairs of the nation, who are pronounced by their fellow beings unfit to participate in administering government in the States where they live, or in their counties, towns, or precincts; who are pronounced unworthy of the least and most paltry part in local political affairs?

Shall one hundred and twenty-seven thousand white people in New York cast but one vote in this House, and have but one voice here, while the same number of white people in Mississippi have three votes and and three voices. Shall the death of slavery add two fifths to the entire power which slavery had when slavery was living? Shall one white man have as much share in the Government as three other white men merely because he lives where blacks outnumbered whites two to one?

Shall this inequality exist, and exist only in favor of those who without cause drenched the land with blood and covered it with mourning? Shall such be the reward of those who did the foulest and guiltiest act which crimsons the annals of recorded time? No, sir; not if I can help it!

This is privilege, class, aristocracy, in its most hateful form. It is not democracy or republicanism of free government at all. I take issue with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rogers] at this point, as at many other points. I say it is monstrous and not fit to be. I deny that the law shall invest any man, though the blood of all the Howards were running in his veins, with one political right, with one home or fireside immunity not given to the humblest and the poorest patriot I am permitted to represent.

To level this favoritism which has come out of the results of the war, three modes have been proposed, each of course by way amendment to the Constitution.

First. To make basis of representation in Congress and in the Electoral College consist of sufficiently qualified voters alone.

Second. To deprive the States of the power to disqualify or discriminate politically on account of race or color.

Third. To leave every State perfectly free to decide for itself not only who shall vote, but who shall belong to its political community in any way, and thus to say who shall enter into its basis of representation and who shall be shut out. What the States decide for themselves in their own affairs they decide for themselves in their national affairs. If any State contains a class unfit or supposed to be unfit for political rights, unworthy to act politically in the States, this class shall not be put upon the nation as fit and worthy to be represented in the nation's councils.

The last proposition has met the approval of the committee, and the others have not. To the first proposition several objections have been urged, some of which will probably be found exaggerated, if not untenable, yet there are serious objections.

If voters alone should be made the foundation of representation, the actual ratio would vary infinitely among different States. One State might let women and minors vote. Another might—some of them do—give the ballot to those otherwise qualified who have been residents for only ten days. Another might extend suffrage to aliens. This would lead to a strife of unbridled suffrage.

It may be answered that restrictions would prevent all this; and one of the propositions before the committee was to confine the basis to male voters, twenty one years of age and upward. This, it will be seen, still leaves open a door for growing inequalities. California may let her Chinese and half-breeds vote, Oregon her Indians, and any State its aliens. But even with uniform State legislation, such a plan would work in tendency, if not in results, some injustice towards the States in which women outnumber men, and especially toward those States from which young men most go out in quest of more buoyant activities and more bountiful fields. It has been supposed that this injustice would be practically serious and that the newest, the wildest, the less improved States, would do great gainers by it. It has been charged that New England would lose very largely should men be made the basis of representation in place of including women and children. It has been said that the real objection to the male suffrage basis bill was the fear of taking away power from fanatical New England.

All this has no foundation. I speak from tables, carefully prepared, and showing results under all the plans proposed with almost absolute accuracy and with the utmost necessary accuracy.

No New England State would lose a single Representative either by making white men over twenty-one, or all men over twenty one, the basis of apportionment. On the contrary, taking white men over twenty one as the basis, Massachusetts would gain two, and Connecticut and Maine one each. New York would gain four.—The losses would not be in the East. Upon a basis of male voters, black and white, Ohio and Illinois would lose one Representative each, and Pennsylvania two. California, almost alone of the States heretofore free, would gain. Her extraordinary abundance of male population would double her representation. It is now three; it would be six.

The argument based on differences between the old States and the new, in respect of age and sex, in population, is overcome by the fact that although these inequalities are large, the ratio of representation is larger; that is to say, that the whole number of Representatives being only two hundred and forty one, it takes so many "persons" or "voters" to make up the required constituency for a single one, that the preponderance of men over women, except in California, is too small in State seriously to affect the result.

It has been said in aid of a voting basis that many of the abuses to which it would be liable could be prevented by restricting the enumeration to male citizens of the United States twenty one years old and upward. This would prevent much abuse, but it would shut out four fifths of the citizens of the country—women and children, who are citizens, who are taxed, and who are, and always have been, represented. It would also narrow the basis of taxation, and in some States seriously.

The second plan mentioned, the proposition to prohibit States from denying civil or political rights to any class of persons, encounters a great objection on the threshold. It trenches upon the principle of existing local sovereignty. It denies to the people of the several States the right to regulate their own affairs in their own way. It takes away a right which has been always supposed to inhere in the States and transfers it to the General Government. It meddles with a right reserved to the State when the Constitution was adopted, and to which they will long cling before they surrender it. No matter whether the innovation be attempted in behalf of the negro race or any other race, it is confronted by the genius of our institutions. But more than this. The northern States, most of them, do not permit negroes to vote. Some of them have repeatedly and lately pronounced against it. Therefore, even if were defensible as a principle for the General Government to absorb by amendment the power to control the action of the States in such a matter, would it not be futile to ask three quarters of the States to do for themselves and all others, by ratifying such an amendment, the very thing which most of them have already refused to do in their own cases? This step will be taken, if taken at all, as a last resort in the attainment of some object too wise and desirable to be opposed.

The third proposition is believed by the committee to avoid as far as the case admits of all the objections of the other two.

Let me read it as it will stand in the Constitution if adopted by Congress and three quarters of the States.

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which shall be included in the Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by counting the whole number of persons in each State: *Provided*, That whenever the elective franchise shall be denied or abridged in any State on account of race or color, all individuals of such race or color shall be excluded from the basis of representation.

It contains but one condition, and that rests upon a principle already imbedded in the Constitution, and as old as free government itself. That principle I affirmed in the beginning, namely: that representation does not belong to those who have not political existence, but to those who have. The object of the amendment is to enforce this truth. It therefore provides that whenever any State finds within its borders a race of beings unfit for political existence, that race shall not be represented in the Federal Government. Every State will be left free to extend or withhold the elective franchise on such terms as it pleases, and this without losing anything in representation if the terms are impartial to all. Qualifications of voters, may be required of any kind—qualifications of intelligence, of property, or of any sort whatever, and yet no loss of representation shall thereby be suffered. But whenever in any State, and so long as a race can be found which is so low, so bad, so ignorant, so stupid, that it is deemed necessary to exclude men from the right to vote merely because they belong to that race, in such case the race shall likewise be excluded from the sum of Federal power to which that State is entitled.

If a race is so vile or worthless that to belong to it is adequate cause of exclusion from political action, the race is not to be counted here in Congress.—That is all, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rogers] seems not altogether to appreciate the bearings of the subject.

The instant a State says that a man of a certain race shall not vote because he is a man, and not because of another race who is just as ignorant may vote, the exclusion is on account of race merely, whether it is honestly avowed or cunningly covered up.

The pending proposition commends itself, it is thought, for many reasons.

First. It provides for representation coextensive with taxation.

I say it provides for this; it does not certainly secure it, but it enables every State to secure it. It does not, therefore, as the gentleman from New Jersey states, should go into the cradle that representation in any State is kept unfit to vote, and fit only to drudge, the wealth created by its work ought to be taxed.

Those who profit by such a system, or such a condition of things, ought to be taxed, for it. Let them build churches and school-houses, and fund newspapers, as New York and other States have done, and educate their people till they are fit to vote.

"Fair play—A fair day's wages for a fair day's work," "live and let live,"—these mottoes, if blazoned over over the institutions of a State, will insure it against being cursed for any length of time with inhabitants so worthless that they are only fit for beasts of burden.

I have said that the amendment provides for representation going hand in hand with taxation. That is its first feature.

Second. It brings into the basis both sexes and all ages, and so it counteracts and avoids, as far as possible, the casual and geographical inequalities of population.

Third. It puts every State on an equal footing in the requirement prescribed. [illegible]

Fourth. It leaves every State unfettered to enumerate all its people for representation or not, just as it pleases.

Thus every State has the sole control, free from all interference, of its own interests and concerns. No other State, nor the General Government, can molest the people of any State on the subject, or even inquire into their acts or their reasons, but all the States have equal rights.

If New York chooses to count her black population as political persons, she can do so. If she does not choose to do so the matter is her own, and her right cannot be challenged.

So of South Carolina. But South Carolina shall not say, "True, we have less than three hundred thousand 'persons' in this State politically speaking, yet we will have in governing the country the power of seven hundred thousand persons."

The amendment is common to all States and equal for all, its operation will of course be practically only in the South. No northern State will lose by it, whether the southern States extend suffrage to blacks or not. Even New York, in her great population, has so few blacks that she could exclude them all from enumeration and it would make no difference in her representation.

If the amendment is adopted, and suffrage remains confined as it is now, taking the census of 1860 as the foundation of the calculation, and the number of Representatives as it then stood, the gains and losses would be these: Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Maine, would gain one Representative each, and New York would gain three; Alabama, Kentucky, North Carolina, S. Carolina, and Tennessee, would each lose one; Georgia, Louisiana, and Virginia would lose two each, and Mississippi would lose three.

It has been insisted that "citizens of the United States" and not "persons" should be the basis of representation and apportionment. These words were in the amendment as I originally drew it and introduced it, but my own judgment was that it should be "persons," and to this the committee assented.

There are several answers to the argument in favor of "citizens" rather than "persons." The present Constitution is, and always was, opposed to this suggestion. "Persons," and not "citizens," have always constituted the basis.

Again, it would narrow the basis of taxation and cause considerable inequalities in this respect, because