



A Weekly Paper Devoted to Literature, Politics, the Arts, Sciences, Agriculture, &c., &c.—Terms: One Dollar and Fifty Cents in Advance.

BY DAVID OVER.

BEDFORD, PA. FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1862.

VOL. 35, NO. 11

## REMARKS OF COL. S. S. WHARTON.

IN PA. SENATE, FEBRUARY 2, 1862.

The Senate having under consideration the resolution instructing our Senators to vote for the expulsion of Jesse D. Bright:

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to occupy the attention of the Senate upon this question; but I do not feel at liberty to pass it by, content with merely casting my vote. I desire only to say a few words, however, in relation to points which I think have not been touched upon in the discussion. In the first place I will say to my friend of Bradford, (Mr. Landon), that I am afraid he entertains a mistaken notion upon the question: I do not think it is of that character which can properly be denominated "a lover's quarrel." If it was of such a character, then its adjustment might be expected to resemble that which has been suggested. He talks of tears of joy and sorrow being shed, the adoption of stern resolutions by both parties in the quarrel, and then a mutual good feeling; but there is more than that embraced in the action had upon this resolution. It is plainly evident that the instincts of party politics are the ruling motives in the disposition of the present subject. Although, perhaps, every member of the Legislature has stated his belief that the object of our present action is not designed to magnify or lessen the standing of any political organization before the people, yet upon nearly all occasions of importance to the interests of the whole country, this disposition has been privately indulged in the Legislature. I do not think there should be any studied demonstrations of party tactics, on questions of so much vitality to our common country; but we have political parties, and I would as readily recognize party lines at this time upon material questions of policy, as I would have previous to the dawning of the present great crisis upon the country. It does not necessarily follow that because parties do exist, their adherents are not therefore patriotic. As an individual member of society, belonging to a political organization, I can state without the least provocation that my party feelings do not make me less patriotic than if I repudiated all party lines or political principles; and I suppose the same may be said of the members of the Democratic party generally. I suppose they are carrying out their convictions of duty; and if they are honest in those convictions, they will favor all measures which look to promoting the best interests of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can see no reason why there should be any difference of opinion on this resolution, between the two Houses, if it was not for the fact to which I have referred. It is owing to the tactics of party—to a kind of mania for a change of what one political party in this Senate had proposed and to substitute the proposition of our Democratic friends in the House. The party in the House seems to have lost sight of the fact that this Senate finally voted unanimously for the resolution of instruction to our Senators in Congress, to vote for the expulsion of the traitor, Jesse D. Bright. Whether the action of the Democracy of the House is based upon the assumption that they are better leaders than those of their party in the Senate, I am unable to say; but one thing, Mr. Speaker, is certain—that the tendency to differ between the two Houses on this question, at the present time, can have no good effect upon the interests of the people. If our Senators in Congress are to be instructed to vote for the expulsion of the traitor Bright, why not give them direct instructions? They are men of direct and positive dealings and they would certainly greatly prefer that if instructed at all, those instructions should be plain and to the point. Now, Mr. Speaker, having made these preliminary remarks, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the somewhat mooted question of the right of instruction. That is a doctrine as old as Democracy itself; it is so well understood and has been so well practiced in years gone by, and is so generally practiced at this day, that it seems to be a part and parcel of the government itself. Members of all parties have long since come to the conclusion, that, in point of principle, the doctrine of instruction is just and proper. Why, sir, if I felt satisfied in regard to the instructions of my constituents upon any one question, I would feel that I was not discharging my duty as a Senator if I did not obey those instructions; the only alternative left me as an honorable man, in such a case, would be to resign my position. In the present instance, we have clearly the right to assert that principle, and especially so at the present session when many members of the Legislature are present, by whose votes the present Senators in Congress were elected to their high and honorable offices. The Legislature is that power by which our Senators in Congress are officially created, and the right of this body to instruct those representative officers is not only clear but eminently just and proper, and in accordance with the republican institutions of our country. Furthermore, necessity requires that those representatives should know our opinions upon all questions of vital interest to this people. The Democratic party having, at all times and on all occasions agreed to the right of instruction, it is most singularly strange that the organization should now profess to avoid the doctrine of voting for distinct and positive instructions. I make no charge against that party on the ground of disloyalty; I will not say that they are not as patriotic as myself, for I think that every Democratic Senator is as patriotic as he who

represents my own political creed. But I object to this universal prejudice in favor of party. In the disposition of the measure before us, that prejudice is based upon the hope entertained by Democratic politicians that the difficulties of the country are but temporary, and that they must take care of the party in the meantime or else the cooperation of the south would be lost to them when the war is over. They argue that Mr. Bright is a Democrat and a friend of the South, and if matters become quieted down the Democracy of the North will require the aid of the South in order to obtain possession of the reins of government. Members of the Legislature would be a great deal better off if they acted frankly in these matters and either came out boldly against traitors or against the government.—These party arrangements to go before the people next fall, are subjects which frequently engross the attention of representatives of the people in these halls; and I would suggest to those gentlemen that there is no use in winning the master. It presents a question upon which we must go before the people of the nation.—There is not a man here who does not believe that Senator Bright wrote the treasonable letter with which he is charged. I ask how can a sensible man conscientiously believe that a person writing a letter at the time at which this one was dated—three or four days before the present President of the United States was inaugurated under frowning batteries of cannon, ranged for the defence of the capital, (which preparations were rendered necessary because of rumored attempts to take possession of the government by a lawless band of rebels)—how can any man under such circumstances, refuse to believe that that letter furnishes evidence of treason? I have already put the question to the Senator from Berks, (Mr. Clymer), whether he believed that letter was genuine—whether it was written by Mr. Bright. He admitted the authenticity of the letter; and yet with all these facts before us, the members of the opposite party talk about the Senate of the United States being a judicial body, sitting for the trial of the case of the Government vs. Bright; and therefore upon that question we should not instruct our Senators. Sir, you may readily find an excuse even for a bad case, and that excuse may satisfy us as partisans, though it never can as conscientious and responsible men. When our consciences and judgments are appealed to, the aspect of a case which to our heated partisan prejudices may appear proper, will become greatly changed. I think the time has arrived when we should take action upon this subject, and thereby render a precedent for the punishment of traitors in all departments of the government; for there are many employees of the present administration whose sympathies are in favor of the rebels. I have no doubt that such is the case; but how are they to be found out? They do not write letters, or if they do they are not detected as has fortunately been the case in the present instance. The real question at issue is not as to the legal or technical settlement of this question; it is higher than that. The point is whether Mr. Bright is a fit adviser of the President of the United States, whether he has the interests of the loyal people at heart. In that view there should be no hesitation on the part of any Senator here to vote in favor of this resolution of instruction for his expulsion. I repeat the question is not whether he can be legally convicted of the crime of treason, but it is whether the imperative requirements of the hour do not demand that the necessities of the nation shall be placed above all doubt or disloyalty in their councils. Why was that great writ of habeas corpus suspended? The object was to catch such men as could not be convicted of treason or unfriendliness to the government of our country, that they might do no injury; that is the reason why we have so many men at present confined in prisons.—Their incarceration is necessary in order to prevent them from doing vast injury to the welfare of the country, by giving information to the rebels and traitors of the South. As an illustration of the injury which such men have caused our country, I would refer to the fact that upon the occasion of a military expedition leaving our shores, the rebels always knew the destination and purposes of that expedition, while loyal people had not the slightest information as to where their fellow countrymen were destined. So long as we have quibbling here in Pennsylvania amongst loyal men, this state of things will continue to exist.

The Senate resolution requests our Senators in Congress, in precise language, to do just as you or I, Mr. Speaker, would be likely to ask a representative to act upon a question affecting our private interests. It contemplates no other than a direct answer. In reply to the Senator from Berks, (Mr. Clymer), who complained that the original resolution of the Senate was passed in great haste, I would remind that Senator that it was not adopted with any greater haste than was the amendment of the House by that body.—Why, Mr. Speaker, when the House amendment was submitted, its mover never stopped, but put the amendment through under the operation of the previous question; that proceeding was not adopted here. The Senator from Berks is not justified in stating as a fact that which does not exist. The Senator knew that the proposition was not passed through here in such a manner, for every Senator had sufficient time to deliberate before voting on the resolution, and to express his sentiments in the freest and fullest manner.

Mr. CLYMER. I desire to ask the Senator a question. The SPEAKER. The Senator cannot be interrupted unless he consents. Mr. WHARTON. I do consent, sir. Mr. CLYMER. I desire to ask the Senator from Huntington whether, when the motion was made on last Thursday by the Senator from Erie, (Mr. Lowry), that the committee be discharged and the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution—whether

I did not ask the Speaker to have that motion divided; whether upon that question (requiring but a mere majority to discharge the committee,) the Senate did not do so by an almost strict party vote—the thing that the Senator from Huntington so much despises—agree to discharge the committee, which was contrary to the rules of this body? Then I ask him if that was not followed up by a motion to proceed to a consideration; whether upon that there was not a strict party vote; whether the rule (which requires two-thirds to suspend it,) was not suspended by a strict party vote; whether the Senator from Huntington did not vote with his party, and whether it was not a party movement throughout?

Mr. WHARTON. Certainly, sir. All that the Senator from Berks has stated, is precisely so. I have stated, however, that I could see nothing wrong in the drawing of party lines, when the object is to rid the country of traitors. I have made that declaration heretofore, and proclaim it now. I see no reason why a man cannot be a partisan and a patriot. The fact of his connection with the Democrats, Republicans or People's party (with the latter of which I have the honor to hold communion) does not in my opinion, render his patriotism less conspicuous. There is no reason why such should be the case. But I object to the attempt, on the part of any set of men, to do privately, that which will not bear public scrutiny.

But, in regard to the assertion of the Senator from Berks, I would repeat that the resolution of the Senate was not hurried through here with any more haste than was the proposition of the House hastened through that chamber. He asserts that the members of that House took pains to deliberate upon the subject, but I suggest that no Senator of this body was deprived of an opportunity to be heard upon the question. Mr. LOWRY. Will the Senator give way until I move the postponement of the present subject, in order to extend the session?

Mr. WHARTON yielded the floor; and the question before the Senate being postponed. On motion of Mr. LOWRY, the hour of adjournment was extended. The Senate resumed the consideration of the House amendment. Mr. WHARTON continued: I was about stating when interrupted, that the Senator from Berks has misconceived my position in regard to the propriety of party organizations. I say that I have no objections to party lines or party policy but am rather inclined to favor them. When the Senator rose to an explanation, I was referring to the fact that this branch of the Legislature had not pressed through the question on the subject before us; and in that particular the action of the House does not compare favorably with that of this chamber. I was not present in the hall of the House when the amendments were offered; I do not know how many members may have made speeches upon it, but I have no doubt it was discussed at some length. I know that some members were deprived of an opportunity to deliver their sentiments upon it. I occupied a seat alongside of a gentleman who tore up his notes when the previous question was called; so it will be seen the question was pressed in that body with greater strictness than in our own. A suspension of the rules was decided upon in this body, but no Senator was deprived of his right to make any remarks he thought proper. Now, Mr. Speaker, such being the case, I say that members should not approach a question of this kind by making statements of a character to cause doubt and uncertainty in the minds of the people at large. That is what I object to. Were I so unfortunate as to state that which was calculated to make a wrong impression upon the people in regard to the opposite party, I would acknowledge my error at once. Every politician, Mr. Speaker, in times like the present, should be a statesman. He should not merely be a lawyer or a trickster, but he should rise above all such ideas; and if such was the case in this Legislature, I would have no hesitation in declaring that the Senate and House of Representatives would give a unanimous vote in favor of the expulsion of Jesse D. Bright, because there is no man (leaving aside the technicalities of the law) who can conscientiously think for a moment of keeping Jesse D. Bright in the Senate of the United States, as the adviser and confidant upon all questions affecting the prospects and duties of the government. If there ever was a time in the history of Pennsylvania when men were called upon as partisans to rescue the suffering interests of their country, it is the present, and no man, whose head is not filled with legal technicalities, will fail to see as his duty dictates in this emergency, and vote for the expulsion of the traitor Bright. Lawyers are all right when in the right place, but they do not always make the best statesmen, and if Mr. Cowan does not vote for the expulsion of Jesse D. Bright, I can only account for it on the ground that he is more of a lawyer than he is a statesman. I do not attribute to him any want of loyalty; I know that he is a loyal man; I know that both of our Senators are loyal men, though they stand divided upon this question. Is not the State of Pennsylvania, which has sent one hundred thousand men into the field, to have a voice in the Senate of the United States? I think I can safely aver that there is not a member of this Legislature who, if he was a member of that high body, would not vote to expel Jesse D. Bright upon the evidence of guilt contained in the letter he has written; at least I am led to infer as much from the speeches to which I have listened; yet they now vote for a preamble and resolution that mean nothing at all for by the amendment of the House, Mr. Cow-

an cannot help thinking that it is intended for no other purpose than his amusement. Mr. Speaker, I hope the original resolution of the Senate will be voted for by every member of the Senate who has already voted in its favor. Let that resolution go back to the House; no man is hurt; no Democrat is injured; no Republican is maltreated thereby. We will be found consistent in our position upon this question. Let the House take the responsibility of their action; and may God be the judge between the motives of the two branches of the Legislature, as to their honesty of purpose on this resolution instructing our senators in Congress to vote for the expulsion of the traitor Jesse D. Bright.

GEN. FREMONT'S DEFENSE. A supplement of the New York Tribune of the 4th inst., contains a long defence of General John C. Fremont against the charges of the committee on the conduct of the war. It fills five pages. The General states that he has only answered the leading points brought forward, as he did not desire to cumber his defence with merely personal debates. The document is an able and entire defence and entirely exculpates him from the charges brought against him. He says: "When, in July last, I was assigned to the command of the Western Department, it comprehended, with Illinois, all the States and Territories west of the Mississippi river to the Rocky Mountains, including New Mexico. No special object was given me in charge to do, nor was I furnished with any particular plan of a campaign. The general discussions at Washington resulted in the understanding that the great object in view was a descent of the Mississippi, and for its accomplishment it was to raise and organize an army, and when I was ready to descend the river I was to let the President know. My command was then to be extended over Kentucky and down the left bank of the Mississippi. For military reasons it was judged inexpedient to do so in the beginning.

"Full discretionary powers of the amplest kind were conferred on me. Not a line of written instructions was given me. The leading object of the campaign being settled, the details of its accomplishment and the management of my department were left to my own judgment. "While at Washington I informed myself fully of the unprepared condition of the West, and its want of arms, from the Governor of Illinois."

The General then goes on to show that from the utterly unprepared condition of the Western loyal troops, from the threatening aspect of the rebellion, from the want of any kind of artillery or fortifications, and from the raw condition of the Federal levies, he was forced to buy arms, to erect fortifications, and to oversee the gigantic field of operations from Cairo to the Rocky Mountains. The emergency, General F. thinks justified him in taking \$300,000 from the U. S. Assistant Treasurer at St. Louis, and a dispatch from Hon. M. Blair shows that he acted with his concurrence, for Mr. Blair says: "You will have to do the best you can, and take all needful responsibility." In reference to General Lyon, General Fremont says that his defeat at Springfield does not lie at his door.—Had General Lyon been able to adhere to his (General Lyon's) own programme before that battle, the defeat would not have occurred.—About Colonel Mulligan's defeat at Lexington, General F. says that General Cameron was calling on him for 5,000 troops to go to Washington, and the danger of Cairo required other thousands of soldiers from his department, so that he could not do everything in the world at once. However, the General says: "On the 14th, General Sturgis was directed to move, with all practicable speed, upon Lexington. General Polk's despatch of the 16th gave me every reason to believe, as he did, that a reinforcement of 4,000 men, with artillery, would be there in abundant time, and if the committee will take the time to read the accompanying papers, it will be seen that, from every disposable quarter where there were troops the promptest efforts were made to concentrate them on Lexington, but chance defeated these efforts."

In regard to the contracts for mortars, &c., General Fremont gives an extract from a letter from Hon. M. Blair urging him to buy mortars. So far as the other contracts were concerned, he disclaims any "jobbing," and boldly justifies them from the necessities of the case. In closing his introduction to the testimony, General Fremont says: "It is not grateful to me to have been myself compelled to set out the merits of my administration; but it was necessary in order to call attention to points, which otherwise might not have been presented, and which are necessary to a clear understanding of the subjects inquired into. Many acts which have been censured, were, I think, for the public good. I know they were with that intention. I do not feel that in any case I overstepped the authority intended to be confided to me. "Myself, and the officers and men acting with me, were actuated solely by a desire to serve the country, and I feel assured that this is realized by the people of the West, among whom we were acting."

The accompanying despatches, letters, and documents are very voluminous, and one would have to sift them at length to ascertain their precise value. UNPUBLISHED INCIDENTS OF THE FORT DONELSON FIGHT. The New York Tribune's Fort Donelson correspondent gives the following incidents, not published before, of that desperate fight:

A FAIR SOUTHERN TRAITRESS. A young man belonging to one of the Tennessee regiments—he held the rank of first lieutenant in his company—was very dangerously wounded in Saturday morning's strife, and was not expected to live when I left Dover, where he lay in much pain and in remorse.

The young man told me he was a native of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and had resided there until the autumn of 1859, when he went to Columbia, Tennessee, and there engaged in the practice of the law with considerable success. While in that State he became acquainted with and enamored of a young woman of culture and fortune, a distant relative, I understand, of Gen. Pillow, and was soon engaged to marry her.

The love stream of the young couple flowed smoothly enough until the fall of Sumter and the secession of Tennessee, when the affianced husband, a strong advocate for the Union, returned home, desiring to wed after the troubles were over.

The betrothed pair corresponded regularly; but, some weeks after the lover had gone to Harrisburg, the girl, who had suddenly grown a violent secessionist, informed him that she would not become his wife unless he would enlist in the rebel service and fight for the independence of the South.

The young man was exceeding loth to take such a course, and remonstrated with his beloved to no purpose, and at last, in the blindness of his attachment and in the absorbing selfishness of passion, he informed his parents of his intention to win his mistress on the tented field.

In vain they endeavored to dissuade him from his resolution. He went to Tennessee, raised a company, received the congratulations of his traitorous friends, and the copious caresses of his charming tempter.

Last December the lieutenant proceeded to Donelson, and a few days before the fight, heard his betrothed was the wife of another.

His heart had never been in the cause thought it was in another's keeping; and, stung by remorse, and crushed by the perfidy of his mistress, he had no desire to live.

Unwilling to desert on the eve of battle the cause he had embraced, lest he might be charged with cowardice, he resolved to lose the existence that had become unbearable to him; and in the thickest of the fight, while seeking death without endeavoring to inflict it, he received a mortal wound.

Before this, the misguided and betrayed lover has ceased to think of her who so cruelly deceived him; for the Lethæan stream of death is flowing around the eternity-bound island of his soul.

The double traitress will soon know all; for her lover dictated a letter to her from his couch of pain.

A BOY PATRIOT. A mere boy of about fifteen years, from Darke county, Ohio, being in Illinois, had enlisted in one of the regiments raised in the southern part of that State; but as he was very delicate health, his father was extremely anxious to have him released from the service, though the youthful soldier greatly desired to remain in it. While at Fort Henry and Donelson the boy was very ill, but still insisted upon performing his duty.

His father arrived at Donelson on Friday, the 14th inst., intending, if possible, to take him home. He had an interview with some of the officers, but could learn nothing of his son. While looking for him industriously among his companions, he learned to his surprise and horror, that the poor boy, after fighting gallantly on Thursday, had died from exposure while lying, without fire or shelter, upon the frozen ground on that bitter and desolate night.

A BULLET RESPECTED LIQUOR. A lieutenant of a company in one of the Ohio regiments, while preparing for a charge and his pipe hot from his mouth. He laughed and lighted again, and soon after his fire was extinguished by a rebel rifle ball, which killed a man three feet from him, and while wondering at his narrow escape he received a shot through his cap, and another struck his scabbard, and yet he was unhurt.

The lieutenant now thinks he was not born to die on the battle field.

The proverb that lightning does not strike the same tree twice must be truer than that balls do not design to do mischief to soldiers met more than once during an engagement.

THE DIFFICULTY OF DYING. A number of our soldiers were wounded five or six, and even seven times, none of them proving serious, and yet the variation of a quarter of an inch would have caused death in any one of the instances. Truly, to change the aphorism, in the midst of death we are in life.

DEATH AT A LONG RANGE. One of the enemy, a member of the Alabama Rifles, had his head shot off by a shell from one of Major Cavender's Barrett rifle-batteries (the First Missouri) at a distance of two and a half miles, while peeping above the breastworks. The shot, of course, was accidental, but it proves the efficacy of Cavender's guns, and the terrible execution they are capable of doing at a very long range.

A MAN WOUNDED WITH FALSE TERTH. A lieutenant in an Illinois company was shot with a musket in the left cheek, the ball passing through his mouth, which was open at the time, and, knocking out three false teeth carried two of them into the thigh of his sergeant at his side, making a painful but not serious wound.