BEDFORD INQUIRER.

BEDFORD, Pa.

Friday Morning, Feb. 1, 1861.

"FEARLESS AND FREE."

D. OVER—Editor and Proprietor.

ATTENTION!

We have been sending out for several weeks, accounts to our delinquent subscribers. We most earnestly request them to pay up. Others that we may have overlooked, will please do the same thing. Court Week will be a favorable opportunity for them to pay. Our circumstances are such that we must have money, as we have about $900, to pay on first of April. Crops have been good, and persons have no excuse for not paying us. If they have not sold their grain, let them bring the amount of their indebtedness to us in that kind of *stuff*, and we will make the money out of it. We hope every one owing us will pay attention to this notice. Town subscribers, please pay attention.

"The Union must and shall be Preserved."---JACKSON.

MASS MEETING OF THE PEOPLE.

A mass meeting of the Republican party of Bedford County, will be held at the Court House, in Bedford, on the evening of Tuesday, the 12th day of February, inst., being the Tuesday evening of Court Week.

The members of the party, and all others who are opposed to secession and disunion, now attempted to be carried out by the Democratic leaders of the South, all opposed to treason, and to breaking up the Government, and who are in favor of the Constitution, the Union, and the Laws, are invited to be present. By order of the County Committee.

S. L. RUSSELL,
Feb. 1, 1861. *Chairman.*

"WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE?"

Under this caption, the Gazette of last week has an article, in which it attempts to place the blame of the present difficulties between the North and the South, upon the Republican party. We can clearly prove by the Southern traitors themselves, that it has long been their settled purpose to secede from this glorious confederacy, and set up a great cotton government, with the avowed purpose of Free Trade, and the reopening of the hellish African Slave Trade. These plans were formed and matured long before the rise of the Republican party. What are the facts?

When, in the year 1850, it was proposed to convene a "Southern Congress" for the initiation of measures looking to the defence of the South, a debate was had on the topic in the Legislature of South Carolina, from which we take a few excerpts, sufficient to show the spirit which then prevailed in that body. We quote from the Charleston Courier's report of the debate at that time:

"Mr. W. S. Lyles said he would not recapitulate the series of wrongs inflicted upon us, and the only question which he would consider was the *remedy*. The remedy is the union of the South *and the formation of a Southern Confederacy*. The friends of the Southern movement in the other States *look to the action of South Carolina;* and he would make the issue in a reasonable time, and the only way to do so is by secession. There would be no concert among the Southern States *until a blow is struck*.

"Mr. Sullivan proceeded to discuss the sovereignty of the States and the right of secession, and denied the right or the power of the General Government to coerce the State in case of secession. He thought there never would be a union of the South *until this State strikes the blow*, and makes the issue.

"Mr. F. D. Richardson would not recapitulate the evils which had been perpetrated upon the South. Great as they have been, they are comparatively unimportant when compared with the evils to which they would inevitably lead. We must not consider what we *have* borne, but what we must bear *hereafter*.—There is no remedy for these evils in the Government; we have no alternative left us, then, but *to come out of the Government*.

"Mr. Preston said he was opposed to calling a Convention, because he thought it would impede the action *of this State* on the questions now before the country. *He thought it would impede our progress towards disunion.* All his objections to a Convention of the people applied only to the proposition to call it *now*. He thought Conventions dangerous things, except when the necessities of the country absolutely demand them. He said he had adopted the course he had taken on these weighty matters simply and entirely *with the view of hastening the dissolution of this Union*.

"Mr. Keitt said he would sustain the bill for electing delegates to a Southern Congress because he thought it *would bring about a more speedy dissolution of the Union*."

Equally significant are the declarations made in the open sessions of the "Sovereign Convention" lately assembled at South Carolina. A few extracts from the debates had on the passage of the ordinance of secession, and other proceedings, will set this point in a clear light:

"Mr. Parker. Mr. President, it appears to me, with great deference to the opinions that have been expressed, that the public mind is fully made up to the great occasion that now awaits us. *It is no spasmodic effort that has come suddenly upon us, but it has been gradually culminating for a long series of years, until at last it has come to that point when we may say the matter is entirely right.*

Mr. Inglis. Mr. President, if there is any gentleman present who wishes to debate this matter, of course this body will hear him; but as to delay for the purpose of a discussion, I for one am opposed to it. As my friend (Mr. Parker) has said, *most of us have had this matter under consideration for the last twenty years, and I presume we have by this time arrived at a decision upon the subject.*

"Mr. Keitt. Sir, we are performing a great act, which involves not only the stirring present, but embraces the whole great future of ages to come. *I have been engaged in this movement ever since I entered political life.*—I am content with what has been done to-day, and content with what will take place to-morrow. We have carried the body of this Union to its last resting place, and now we will drop the flag over its grave. After that is done, I am ready to adjourn and leave the remaining ceremonies for to-morrow.

"Mr. Rhett. *The secession of South Carolina is not the event of a day. It is not anything produced by Mr. Lincoln's election, or by the non-execution of the fugitive slave law. It has been a matter which has been gathering head for thirty years.* Now, in regard to the fugitive slave law, I myself doubt its constitutionality, and I doubted it on the floor of the Senate, when I was a member of that body."

We think these extracts prove clearly the settled purpose of these traitors for many years past to break up this government. Gen. Jackson, in a letter dated Washington, May 1, 1833, to Rev. Andrew J. Crawford, after he had put down nullification, says:

The tariff, it is now known, was a mere pretext. * * * * Therefore, the tariff was only the pretext, and disunion and a Southern Confederacy the real object. *The next pretext will be the Negro or Slavery question.* * *

Who will say that Gen. Jackson did not understand these men? His prophecy has been verified to the letter.

One of the pretexts of these traitors is that they cannot have their rights in the Territories. In other words, that they cannot carry their local slave institutions there. This is all pretense. It is a new doctrine started at this late day as a pretext for their treason. The fathers of the Republic never advocated such absurd doctrine. Indeed we can prove from leading Southern disunionists, that so late as 1848, they held no such views. The first extract we shall give is from that arch traitor, Robert Toombs, in the House of Representatives in 1848, at the same time that Abraham Lincoln was a member. Here it is:

"To lull the popular apprehension at the South, some gentlemen on this floor have spoken of it as a judicial question. *The Supreme Court has ever been an unsafe reliance upon political questions.* Its duty is to decide what law is—and that duty it performs well—and not what it ought to be. Their former adjudication settles these principles: that if, under our system the Constitution of the United States does extend over our conquests without further action of this Government, it does not otherwise affect the question of Slavery there, except to authorize the owners of fugitive slaves, who should escape to these Territories, to recover them under its provisions; that the Constitution, though it recognizes and protects Slavery both in the States and in the Territories of the Union, when and where it lawfully exists, establishes it nowhere. And, as the necessary result from these adjudications, Slavery being abolished in New Mexico and California, the Southern slaveholder who emigrates to these Territories with his slaves has no legal guaranties for the protection of this property. Let us not deceive ourselves; these questions have already been settled by our courts, and if we are wise we will act in reference to them."

The following paragraphs from the speeches of two other distinguished Southern statesmen go to show that the buoys have been shifted a good deal since they navigated the Slavery waters of the Constitution in 1848.

Mr. Alexander H Stephens of Georgia, in a speech in the House of Representatives, August 7, 1848, said:

"The Constitution secures to all the citizens of all the States and Territories of this Union the rights to which they are entitled by the laws of the place. If Virginia or Georgia should abolish Slavery, the Constitution no more reestablishes it there than it has reestablished it in Pennsylvania, New York, and other States where it has been abolished. The Constitution no more carries the local law of Slavery of any State into a State or Territory where, by law it is prohibited, than it carries any other local law—no more than it carries the law of interest upon money, the statute of limitations, the laws of distribution, or the penal laws of a State.

"Slavery is an institution which depends solely upon the municipal laws of the place where it exists."

There is nothing in the speeches of these two distinguished Southern gentlemen, in 1848, claiming that slaves are property under the Constitution, as horses and cattle are property, and that the slaveowner can anywhere hold his slave property, by virtue of the Constitution only.

As to slaves being property under the Constitution, Mr. George E. Badger of North Carolina, one of the ablest lawyers in this country, in a speech in the Senate of the United States, July 26, 1848, said:

"Slavery, as it exists under the Constitution of the United States, is a State institution. * * * It does not exist as an institution of the United States. * * * * Nor is it recognized as an institution of the United States, otherwise than as a State institution.

"Gentlemen say that every American citizen has a right to go into the newly-acquired territory. It is needless to examine that, for no one proposes to exclude them. But it is another and a different question whether he has a right to carry a slave there; and, because the slave was recognized as property in the State from which he came, to insist that, therefore, such slave shall be recognized as property in the Territory to which he goes. The affirmative of this question cannot, in my opinion, be maintained."

There is the Republican doctrine for you, announced by Southern members and Senators thirteen years ago, and long before the Republican party had an existence. Is it treason for Republicans to hold to those principles now—rather is it not patriotism?

The venerable and gallant John E. Wool, the Commander of the Northern Division of the U. S. Army, himself a Democrat, and frequently mentioned in connection with the Presidency by that party, in a letter to a member of Congress, dated Troy, N. Y. Dec. 10, 1860, says:

"It is suggested that the Constitution ought to be so amended as to conform to the views and wishes of the South. The Constitution needs no amendment. All that the South requires can be accomplished through Congress and the Supreme Court. It appears from the Press that Senators Davis and Iverson ridiculed the idea that the non-execution of the Fugitive Slave law, or the Liberty bills of certain States, had anything to do with the secession movement.—They both, no doubt, uttered the truth. The movement is not influenced by the one or the other, that is, so far as South Carolina is concerned. Her object, at least that of her leaders, is to leave the Union and to form a grand independent Slave Confederacy."

No. The Republican party is not responsible. Toombs says this secession business "has been gathering head for thirty years." It was not the election of Lincoln and Hamlin. It is was not the violation of the fugitive slave law; for Toombs says "I myself doubt its constitutionality." The true reasons are, their anxiety for a Great Southern Confederacy, cheap niggers, Free Trade—and a particular dislike to the rapid progress in population and wealth by the North, in fact, "figure three complaining that it is not equal to figure five." These are the true reasons, and it is no use to attempt to conceal them.

HIGH TREASON DEFINED.

The excitable people of New York appear to have been completely surprised at the charge delivered in that city by Judge Smalley (a Democrat) of the United States Circuit Court, to the Grand Jury, on last Monday two weeks, defining the crime of high treason, and showing that not only those who are now actively engaged in the secession movement in South Carolina are guilty of that offence, but that also those who furnish them aid and comfort encounter the risk of incurring the penalty of death, which the law of 1790 affixes to this crime. The gist of the doctrine laid down may be found in the following extracts from the charge referred to:

"What overt acts, then, constitute treason? A mere conspiracy to subvert by force the Government, however flagitious the crime may be is not treason. To conspire to levy war, and actually levying war, are distinct offences.

"If a body of people conspire and meditate an insurrection to resist or oppose the laws of the United States by force, they are only guilty of a high misdemeanor; but if they proceed to carry such intention into execution by force they are guilty of high treason by levying war. In the language of Chief Justice Marshall, "It is not the intention of the Court to say that no individual can be guilty of this crime who has not appeared in arms against his country.

"On the contrary, if war be actually levied—that is, if a body of men be actually assembled for the purpose of effecting, by force a treasonable purpose—*all those who perform any part however minute, or however remote from the scene of action*, and who are actually leagued in the general conspiracy, are to be considered as traitors."

"As the court has already said to you, the combination and assemblage of a body of men with the design of seizing, *and the actual seizing of the forts and other public property in and near Charleston, South Carolina, and in some other States, is a levying of war against the United States.* Consequently, any and every person who engages therein is by the law regarded as levying war against the United States; and all *who adhere to them* are to be regarded as enemies, and *all who give aid and comfort in South Carolina or New York*, or in any other portion of the United States or elsewhere, come within the express provisions of the first section of the act of 30th April, 1790, and are guilty of treason.

"What amounts to adhering to and giving aid and comfort to our enemies, it is somewhat difficult in all cases to define; but certain it is that *furnishing them with arms and munitions of war, vessels, or other means of transportation, or any materials which will aid the traitors in carrying out their traitorous purposes, with a knowledge that they are intended for such purposes*, or inciting and encouraging others to engage in or aid the traitors in any way, does come within the provisions of the act. And it is immaterial whether such acts are induced by sympathy with the rebellion, hostility to the Government, or a desire for gain.

"Under the second section of the act of 1790, all who have any knowledge of any such acts of treason, and do not, as soon as possible, make it known in the manner therein prescribed, are guilty of misprison of treason, and subject to the punishment therefor."

Considering that contracts are even now being daily made for the delivery of arms and ammunition to those who have already defied the authority of the Federal Government, and openly announced their determination to overthrow it, Judge Smalley has not spoken a moment too soon, and his remarks should serve as a warning to all who are solicited to strengthen the hands of the avowed enemies of the country in their treasonable movements. Several arrests, it is thought, will be made of persons who have sold arms to the traitors.

The House of Representatives, on Monday last, concurred in the Senate amendment in relation to the admission of Kansas, as a State in the Union. She is now, consequently the 34th member of the confederacy, and the 19th free State.

For the year ending 31st Dec. last, there was transported over the Broad Top Railroad, one hundred and eighty-seven thousand, eight hundred and fifty-three tons of coal.

Mr. Buchanan sent into the House on Monday, a special message favoring the Virginia Resolutions. Ex-President Tylor was the Commissioner from that State to the President.

We call attention to the able speech on our outside, to-day, by Col. S. S. Wharton, our State Senator. His remarks are appropriate, and we hope his speech will be read by all our readers.

THE CRITTENDEN COMPROMISE.

There is such an evident misapprehension in the minds of many, with regard to the so-called compromise, prepared by Mr. Crittenden and such an effort making by the locofocos—particularly of the Breckinridge stripe—to impress upon the uninformed the idea that it is identical with the 'Missouri Compromise,' that we republish the Crittenden resolutions in another column, and call attention to their plain purport as proving the utter lack of identity between them and the Missouri Compromise.

It will be rembered that the Federal Government acquired by purchase from France the territory of Louisiana. In 1820 the State of Missouri was carved out out of a portion of this Territory, and applied for admission into the Union as a Slave State. Her admission as such was contested, a struggle ensued that threatened a disruption of the Union, and finally a compromise was made by which it was agreed that in consideration of the North assenting to her admission as a Slave State, that slavery should forever thereafter be prohibited in the rest of the old Louisiana territory which lay north of the south boundary line of Missouri, which was the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min., and nothing was *said or done* as to the remainder of the territory south of that line. Thus the North for agreeing to the admission of Missouri as a Slave State secured by the compromise the freedom of all the territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. Now, what does Mr. Crittenden's resolution propose To extend the line of 36 deg. 30 min. to the Pacific, prohibiting slavery north of that line, but also to incorporate into the Constitution an article *recognizing and protecting slavery* by Federal power in all the territory we now have *or may hereafter acquire south of that line.* Is this restoring the Missouri Compromise? Is it not rather incorporating the Breckinridge Platform into the Constitution of the United States, and making it irrepealable?

Recall for a moment the history of this proposed Federal protection of Slavery. During the last session of Congress, Senator Hunter, of Virginia, introduced a set of resolutions proposing to form a slave code for the territories, and thereby protecting, by Congressional enactment, slavery in all our territories. The proposition was lost, and was freely denounced throughout the North without distinction of party. The Democratic National Convention assembled at Charleston and afterwards at Baltimore, and was totally split asunder, because the Breckinridge men insisted upon incorporating into the Cincinnati platform resolutions precisely like Mr. Crittenden's, recognizing and protecting slavery in the territories.

The Douglas men resisted this, and nominated and supported their candidate on the ground that the question of slavery in the territories should be left to the decision of the people of the territories alone. This was the principal issue of the last campaign. And now, after the Douglas men refused to let this proposition be injected into their platform, after the people at the polls rejected it by a most overwhelming majority, it is gravely proposed by Mr. Crittenden to incorporate it into and make it part of the Constitution of the United States.

The fifth clause of these propositions have also apparently escaped observation and are invariably ignored by the advocates of the compromise in this region. Do our people want a clause in the constitution compelling them to pay for rescued slaves? Suppose some bigoted and landless citizen lends himself to rescue a fugitive, would we be grateful at being made to pay for his folly? And yet here it is proposed we should do so. The owner sues the State, the State the county, and the county the individual. The latter being worthless, the County must pay. Will the advocates of this measure stand surety in time to come that our county will never contain a citizen foolish enough to resist the recapture of fugitives?

For our part, we are inexorably opposed to these resolutions—1st. Because they propose an alteration of the constitution made by the wisest, purest and best men the world ever saw, and under which our county has arrived at its present eminent greatness. 2d. Because they propose amending the Constitution in an unconstitutional way. 3d. Because they concede the newly invented doctrine that slaves are property. 4th. Because they propose to incorporate into the Constitution the Breckinridge platform, of a slave code for the territories, when an overwhelming public sentiment has just pronounced against it.—5th. Because they provide for the surrender to slavery by *constitutional amendment* of all territory hereafter acquired, it being notorious that we cannot acquire any more territory except south of that line. 6th. Because it makes entire localities amenable in damages for the acts of individual citizens. 7th. Because it is not a compromise, but simply a concession, the north deriving no benefit but surrendering everything by it. And 8th. Because the parties whom it proposes to conciliate not only reject, but spurn it.

Those who think that the present Constitution and laws are not sufficient to sustain the government and maintain peace, may if they please bind themselves and their children's children by this cunning scheme to protect, extend and make perpetual slavery, but for our part, we stand by the Constitution as our fathers made it, and insist on its preservation by all the means and power of the government.—*Somerset Herald and Whig.*

The Appointment of Gen. Cameron.

HARRISBURG, Jan. 27.—Mr. P. Fassett, one of the committee from the Republican Club of Philadelphia to Springfield, has just returned to this place. He says that the appointment of Gen. Simon Cameron as Secretary of the Treasury, is certain. The opposition to his appointment, he states, was confined to a very small circle in this State, it being principally from the free traders of New York.

Mr. Buchanan has withdrawn from his official organ, *The Constitution*, all the Executive advertisements, and has given them to *The Intelligencer*, which will hereafter express the views of the Administration. The late attack upon the President and Mr. Secretary Holt, which appeared in *The Constitution*, and the ultra disunion sentiments advocated by its alien British editor, have caused this change. In the venerable old *Intelligencer* the President will have what he has never had before, a respectable organ.

Bailey, the South Carolinian who stole the Indian securities at Washington, is one of the Clerks who gave notice that he wouldn't serve under Lincoln! It is alleged that some of the funds thus abstracted are used in the Secession movement.—The Congressional Investigating Committee has not yet reported.

Gen. Cameron and the Crisis.

In the Senate on Monday week the Crittenden Resolutions were taken up.

Mr. Bigler spoke at considerable length in favor of their passage, and argued the necessity and propriety of a Convention of the people to adopt amendments to the Constitution. He urged the Republican Senators to consider the necessity of the passage of these or similar resolutions. He appealed to the South to consider if its rights could not be obtained in the Union. He opposed secession, but could not see how they could coerce a State. Coercion was delusion.

Mr. Cameron would not make a speech, for though his colleague offered the olive branch, the other side would not listen or respond. He was inclined to do all he could to save the Union.

Mr. Green said the well known patriotism of the Senator from Pennsylvania precluded the necessity of watching him, but the other side could not hear the words of patriotism

Mr. Cameron was sorry that the Senators who left would not wait till they heard from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Iverson asked if Mr. Cameron approved of Mr. Bigler's speech.

Mr. Cameron—Very much; and will vote for his proposition if it will save the country.

Mr. Saulsbury thought that Mr. Cameron's devotion to the country might well be imitated.

Mr. Cameron—I say to Senators from Georgia and Alabama, if they will take my colleagues proposition, we will pass it.

Mr. Iverson asked if he approved of the sentiments of his colleague against coercion? That's the point.

Mr. Cameron—Coercion is the last remedy.

Mr. Green—Is it a remedy at all?

Mr. Cameron—It is a bad remedy. Don't know as we shall ever resort to it. It is certainly a last remedy.

Mr. Mason referred to the fact that the Senator voted against the Crittenden resolutions and for the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. He also said that Wade presented resolutions from Ohio, one of which was against the Personal Liberty bill, while the Ohio Legislature refused to pass that bill. He wanted to show the people the difference between professions here and practice there.

Mr. Cameron said Mr. Mason seemed anxious for an excuse for leaving the Union. He had voted as he did, because he saw no disposition of compromise from the other side, unless he went on bended knees and asked forgiveness because he had done no wrong, but was still willing to forgive the backsliding South. He would do all he could to preserve the Union, but was not to be dragooned or driven.

Mr. Mason was unconscious of saying aught to arouse the wrath of Mr. Cameron. Did not want an excuse to leave, but did want an excuse to remain in the Union. Six Senatorial chairs were vacated to-day, and the Union was practically dissolved. What is the remedy?—Coercion? Would you use the discipline of the pedagogue? Would to God the Senator from Pa. would give me an excuse to stay in the Union.

Mr. Cameron had not heard of any threats of war, but if it must come, Pennsylvania is ready to meet it.

The people of this State are ready for anything honorable to save the Union, and are ready to yield all prejudices. The North has done no wrong, and bullying cannot drive them. If you want the Union preserved let us know what is wrong and we will redress.

Mr. Saulsbury believed the Senator sincere, and though four States had gone he thought that if this side would meet the Senator with the same spirit the Union would still remain.

Mr. Crittenden urged the importance of the measure, and spoke against the postponement. Adjourned.

The Crittenden Compromise.

Whereas, Alarming dissensions have arisen between the Northern and Southern States as to the rights to the common territory of the United Srtes, it is eminently desirous and proper that such dissensions should be settled by the constitutional provisions which give equal justice to all sections, whereby to restore peace. Therefore,

Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives, that the following article be proposed and submitted as an amendment to the Constitution which ratified by conventions of three-fourths of the people of the States.

1. In all the territories now or hereafter acquired north of latitude 36 degrees 30 minutes, slavery or involuntary servitude, except punishment for crime, shall be prohibited; while South of that latitude, slavery is hereby recognized as existing, and not to be interferred with by Congress, but be protected as property by all departments of the territorial government, during its continuance as a territory.—When Territory north or south of such line, within such boundaries as Congress may prescribe, shall contain the population necessary for a member of Congress, with a republican form of government, it shall be admitted into the Union on an equality with the original States, with or without slavery, as the Constitution of the State may prescribe.

2. Congress shall have no power to abolish slavery in places under its jurisdiction, or in States permitting slavery.

3. Congress shall have no power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia while it exists in Virginia or Maryland, or either. Nor Congress shall never, any time, prohibit the officers of the government, or members of Congress, whose duties require them to live in the District of Columbia, and bringing slaves, from holding them as such.

4. Congress shall have no power to hinder the transportation of slaves from one State to another, whether by land, navigable rivers, or by sea.

5. Congress shall have power to provide by law, and it shall be its duty so to provide, that the United States shall pay to the owner who shall apply for it the full value of his fugitive slave in all cases when the marshal or other officer whose duty it was to arrest said fugitive was prevented from doing so by violence or intimidation, or when, after arrest, said fugitive was rescued by force, and the owner thereby prevented and obstructed in the pursuit of his remedy for the recovery of his fugitive slave. And in all such cases, when the United States shall pay for such fugitive, they shall have the right in their own name to sue the county in which said violence, intimidation or rescue was committed, and to recover from it, with interest and damages, the amount paid by them for said fugitive slave. And the said county, after it has paid said amount to the United States, may, for its indemnity, sue and recover from the wrong-doers or rescuers, by whom the owner was prevented from the recovery of his fugitive slave, in like manner as the owner himself might have sued and recovered.

6. No future amendments shall affect the preceding articles, and Congress shall never have power to interfere with slavery in the States where it is now permitted.

WASHINGTON, January 25, 1861.

Startling Disclosures—Indictment of an ex-Member of the Cabinet.

The Grand Jury of the District of Columbia today presented ex-Secretary J. B. FLOYD for malfeasance in office, and conspiracy to defraud the Government. Thomson, late Secretary of the Interior, Drinkard, chief clerk of the war Department, and other high Government officials, were examined before the jury, and upon their testimony, and facts derived from the House Committee in regard to the stolen bonds, that presentment was made. Startling disclosures of the most villainous frauds are spoken of, and the fact is very evident that the Secession movement was nothing but an attempt to scuttle the ship after robbing it.

THE ABANDONED FORTS IN FLORIDA.

Commodore Armstrong, late commander at Pensacola, was before the special committee on the President's late message. The committee intend thoroughly to investigate the condition of all Southern fortifications, and the circumstances attending their surrender to the Disunionists, with a view to ascertaining whether there has not been a criminal neglect of duty by the President in the premises.

A ROAD FOR THE GUILTY TO ESCAPE.

In the event of an indictment by the Grand Jury, now investigating the charges against Wm. H. Russell, and others, for the abstraction of the Indian trust bonds, from the Department of the Interior, it is said by the legal profession that new questions, arising under a recent statute, will be presented for the consideration of the court.

The second section of the act of January 24, 1857, is as follows:

"*And be it further enacted*, That no person examined and testifying before either House of Congress, or any committee of either House, shall be held to answer criminally in any court of justice, or subject to any penalty or forfeiture, for any fact or act touching which he shall be required to testify before either House of Congress, or committee of either House, as to what he shall have testified, whether before or after the date of this act, and that no statement made or paper produced by any witness before either House of Congress, or before any committee of either House, shall be competent testimony in any criminal proceeding against such witness in any court of justice; and no witness shall hereafter be allowed to refuse to testify to any fact, or to produce any paper touching which he shall be examined by either House of Congress, or any committee of either House, for the reason that his testimony touching such fact, or the production of such paper, may tend to disgrace him or otherwise render him infamous, *provided*, that nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any witness from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed by him in testifying as aforesaid."

Now, Mr. Russell, having been several times *examined* before the Special Committee of the House of Representatives, and having testified, cannot "*be held to answer criminally in any court of justice*" * * * "*for any fact or act, touching which he shall be required to testify*," and may successfully plead this law in bar of any indictment that may be found against him touching the matter of the abstracted bonds. This defence will also be available to all the officials implicated in the bond larceny, abstraction, as it is softly called, from the highest to the lowest, as well as to their out-door agents, who may have been so fortunate as to have been examined and testified before the Morris Committee of the House. This law was framed for good purposes, but may turn out to be the gate-way for the escape of the guilty. It can only be pleaded after indictment, and may not be available if the party should have refused to answer all questions propounded by the Committee. All persons connected with the abstraction of the bonds and their circulation, so far as the Committee could reach them, have been examined, except Bailey, who is the only one left as a victim to satisfy the offended law.

EX-SECRETARY THOMPSON AND THE MISSING BONDS.

It is said that the ex-Secretary is alarmed at the prospect of being made liable for the value of all the missing Indian trust fund bonds. He was the legal custodian of this property, gave a receipt to his predecessor in office, Mr. McClelland, for them, and they are charged up against him on the books of the Government. When a public officer is charged with the keeping of public property he must account for it, and no person has been more stern and firm in enforcing this accountability than Mr. Thompson. Many a poor devil in the Indian service, the wagon-road expeditions, and other branches under the Interior Department, has felt the severity of this "inflexible Administration officer" of "J. B." The loss of money by a public officer, be it accidental or otherwise, even if stolen from him, or from the Sub-Treasury in his charge, will not relieve him, and no power but Congress, in such event, can balance his account. Let Mr. Thompson's account be settled, and it the Government can make out a case of gross negligence on his part, he will be clearly liable for the loss of the bonds; and if report speak truly of his large fortune, it will not be much inconvenience for him to pay the amount.

THE PENSACOLA TRAITORS.

A draft for $74,000 in favor of the Navy Agent at Pensacola was stopped at the Treasury when just on the eve of being sent off. It would have been applied to the pay of Mr. Renshaw and other ex-officers who were engaged in the treasonable conspiracy to surrender the Navy-Yard, and who disgraced the American flag. Perhaps they will get paid by Florida, and perhaps not. Mr. Yulee can give them plenty of Fernandina Railroad bonds.

A CONSULTATION.

A limited conference was held last night, at which Messrs. Crittenden, Douglas, Seward and Dixon were present, with a view of considering some common basis of adjustment that might be shaped to satisfy these various interests. They did not agree upon a plan, but separated with a good understanding.

PEACEABLE SECESSION.—The friends of South Carolina boast that she has a right to secede peaceably, which course, they allege, she has pursued: The following is the progress of her "peaceable secession:"

Castle Pinckney; taken by storm.

Fort Moultrie; captured.

The United States Arsenal at Charleston; seized.

The U. S. Custom House and Post Office in Charleston; seized.

United States Revenue Cutter brig Aiken; taken.

New fortifications raised on Sullivan's and Johnson's Island.

Major Anderson, beseiged in Fort Sumter.

One thousand negro slaves brought into service raising fortifications to capture Maj. Anderson.

The commander of the slaver Bonita taken violently from the custody of the authority of the United States.

Seizure of northern merchant vessels.

Firing upon the United States Flag, and attempting to sink a U. S. Ship.

A STATUE MADE TO SPEAK.—The statue of Gen. Jackson, before the President's house, was most curiously ornamented the other morning. The old anti-Secessionist held in his hand the stars and stripes, while the blue cockade was tied under the tail of the horse. Great indignation was felt by the seceders, and it is rumored that they will request the Commissioners to ask for an explanation.