

TERMS OF THE GLOBE.

Per annum in advance \$1 50... Six months 75... Three months 50... A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

Four lines or less 1 insertion 2 do. 3 do. One square, (12 lines) 25 50 75 1 00 1 50 2 00 Two squares, 50 1 00 1 50 2 00 2 50 3 00 Three squares, 75 1 00 1 50 2 00 2 50 3 00 Over three weeks and less than three months, 25 cents per square for each insertion.

LADIES' ONE PRICE FANCY FUR STORE!

JOHN FAREIRA, No. 718 Arch St., between 7th & 8th Sts., PHILADELPHIA. (Late of 818 Market St.) Manufacturer of and Dealer in all kinds of FANCY FURS.

Having removed to my new store, 718 Arch St., and being now engaged entirely in the manufacture and sale of Fancy Furs, which, in accordance with the principle, I have marked at the lowest possible prices consistent with a reasonable profit, I would solicit a visit from those in want of furs for either ladies or children's wear, and an inspection of my selection of these goods, satisfactory as I am, of my ability to please in every desired essential.

VALUABLE TAVERN STAND FOR SALE.

The undersigned offers for sale, that fine and profitable stand, in the borough of Huntingdon, fronting on Allegheny street, opposite the Broad Top Coal Depot, and known as "The Broad Top House."

HAINES BROS.' OVERSTRUNG GRAND ACTION PIANO FORTES.

Celebrated for superior quality of tone and elegance and beauty of finish. These pianos have always taken the FIRST PREMIUM when placed in competition with other makers. ON VIEW AT ALL COMPETITIONS. A splendid assortment of LOUIS XIV and plain styles always on hand. Also Second-hand Pianos and PHINEAS IMPROVED MELODEONS from \$40 to \$550.

NEW AIR LINE ROUTE TO NEW YORK.

SHORTEST IN DISTANCE AND QUICKEST IN TIME BETWEEN THE TWO CITIES OF NEW YORK AND HARRISBURG VIA READING, ALLENTOWN AND EASTON. MORNING EXPRESS, WEST LEAVES NEW YORK AT 6 A. M., arriving at Harrisburg at 12:45 noon, only 6 1/2 hours between the two cities.

G. A. & E. A. LANDELL, MANUFACTURE AND HAVE FOR SALE CANDLES.

No. 110 North Wharves, Philadelphia. Sperm, Patent Sperm, Hydraulic, Adamantine, Hotel, Car and Tallow Candles. OILS, Pure Sperm, Lard Bleached Whale, Sole, Elephant, Strained Whale, Tanners', Carriers', Palm, Oleine, and Red Oils.

FARMERS' & DEALERS' HEAD-QUARTERS!!!

HANCOCK, CAMP & CO., Produce and General Commission Merchants, No. 47, North Water St., below Arch St., Philadelphia. Agents for all Gleaners' Super Phosphates of Lime, Potashes, and other kinds of Fertilizers.

COAL OIL!! COAL OIL!!

James A. Brown sells the genuine "PORTLAND KEROSENE" or COAL OIL, clear as water. This is the only kind of oil that gives entire satisfaction as an agent for light.

FRANKLIN HOUSE, IN THE DIAMOND, HUNTINGDON, PA.

VALENTINE CROUSE, Proprietor. The citizens of the county, and strangers and travelers generally, will find comfortable accommodations at this house. Give us a trial. (April 4, 1860.)

CALL AT D. P. GWINN'S if you want GOOD GOODS.

DARK COLORED Palm Hoods, best quality, only 50 cts. each. FISLER & SON.

THE best Tobacco in town, at D. P. GWINN'S.

A Splendid variety of Carpets, only 25 cts. per yard. FISLER & SON.

CARPET Sacks and Fancy Baskets at D. P. GWINN'S.

The Globe.

WILLIAM LEWIS,

—PERSEVERE—

Editor and Proprietor.

VOL. XVI.

HUNTINGDON, PA., OCTOBER 10, 1860.

NO. 16.

LETTER

FROM HON. AMOS KENDALL TO HON. JAMES L. ORR, of South Carolina. WASHINGTON, Sept. 10, 1860. HON. JAMES L. ORR—My Dear Sir: Your letter of the 15th ult., reached Washington while I was absent in the North.

Though I did not contemplate when I wrote you on the 9th ult., anything beyond a limited private correspondence, yet, having no opinion on the portentous condition of public affairs which I have a motive to conceal, or am ashamed to avow, I cheerfully comply with your suggestions.

You quote from my former letter the declaration that "my mind is equally clear that the South has long had a peaceful remedy within her reach, and has it still, though impaired by the recent conduct of some of her sons," and you ask me a full explanation of my opinions on that point as well as "the remedy to be resorted to by us (the South) should the Government in November pass into the hands of a party whose declared purpose is to destroy our property, amounting in value at the present time to not less than three billions one hundred and fifty millions of dollars."

In a subsequent part of your letter you call my attention to certain grievances endured by the South, and conclude your commentary thereon as follows, viz: "Is it wise, if we do not intend to submit to such consequences, to allow a Black Republican President to be inaugurated, and put him in possession of the Army, the Navy, the Treasury, the arsenals and arsenals, the public property—in fact the whole machinery of the Government with its appurtenances and appointments? If the South should think upon this subject as I do, no Black Republican President should ever execute any law within her borders unless at the point of the bayonet and over the dead bodies of her slain sons."

I shudder at such sentiments coming from one whose sincerity I cannot doubt. The time was when 150,000 men tendered their services to the President to aid him if necessary in executing the laws of the United States; the time will be when 200,000 men will volunteer for a like purpose, should resistance be made to his legitimate authority, no matter by what party he may be elected.

There seems to me to be in the course recommended to the South, in the event of Mr. Lincoln's election to the Presidency, a fatality little short of madness. Would you pull down the canopy of heaven because wrong and crime exist beneath it? Would you break up the earth on which we tread because earth-quake sometimes heave it and pestilence walks its surfaces? The Union, sir, is too precious to the people it protects, North and South, East and West, to be broken up, even should a Black Republican be elected President next November.

Should the attempt be made, an united North and three-fourths of a divided South would spring to the rescue. No, no, the remedy for the evils of which you justly complain are to be found within the Union, and not among its bloody ruins.

I admit that the grievances which you enumerate are hard to be borne; but a few Southern men are not without responsibility for their existence. The general sentiment of the country, North and South, at the close of the Revolutionary war was Anti-Slavery. It has changed in the South, but remains unchanged in the North. There, however, it has been roused to unwonted activity by the preachings of fanatics and the denunciations of political demagogues, aided not a little by the arts, the language and the violence of Southern disunionists.

port of the Lecompton Constitution, which the country generally believed to be a fraud, was made the test of Democracy; one leading Democrat after another was proscribed because they would not submit to the test, and as if to deprive Northern Democrats of the last hope of successfully vindicating the rights of the South, an act of Congress was passed for the admission of Kansas into the Union at once, provided she would consent to become a slave-holding State, but postponing her admission indefinitely if she refused.

In your published letter you justly condemn the seceders from the Charleston Convention, who, you think, ought to have remained, and prevented the nomination of a candidate who is obnoxious to the South. Do you not perceive, sir, that the secession was a part of the programme for breaking up the Democratic Party? And is it not palpable that after absolutely vacating their seats at Charleston, they went to Baltimore for the mere purpose of more effectually completing the work of destruction by drawing off another detachment? I, Sir, entertain no doubt that the secession was the result most desired by the disunionists; that the object of the new issue then gotten up was merely to form a pretext for secession, and that its adoption was the last thing they desired or designed.

Glance a moment at a few facts: Alabama, led by an open disunionist, went to Cincinnati, in 1856, under instructions to secede unless the equal rights of all the States in the Territories should be conceded and incorporated into the platform of the Democratic Party. The concession was made, and they had no opportunity to secede.

They came to Charleston under the same leader, again instructed to secede unless the Convention would put into the platform a new plank, the effect of which, if adopted, would be further to disgust and alienate the Northern Democracy. In this instance the *sine qua non* was not complied with, and the Disunionists floated off on the rejected plank into an unknown sea, unfortunately carrying with them a large number of good and true Union men.

And what is this principle, the non-recognition of which has riven asunder the Democratic Party and apparently threatens the dissolution of the Union? It is that, it is the right and duty of Congress to legislate for the protection of slave property in the Territories. Now, I take it upon me to say that a more latitudinarian and dangerous claim of power in Congress never was advanced by Federalists of the Hamilton school. Look at it in a constitutional and practical light: If Congress have the right to legislate for the protection of slave property in the Territories, they have a right to legislate for the protection of all other property; and if they have a right to legislate for the protection of property, they have a right to legislate for the protection of persons. The assumption that you can legislate for the protection of slave property leads, logically and inevitably, to the conclusion that they have power to legislate for the Territories in all cases whatsoever.

If you can put your finger on the grant of this power in the Constitution, please put it also on its limitations, if any can be found. Upon this principle, Congress may acquire an empire outside of the organic States, over which it may exercise unlimited power, governing it as the Roman Senate did their conquered provinces. And this under a Constitution which jealously restricts the exclusive power of legislation by Congress to a few spots of land purchased, with the consent of the States, for specified objects, and grants no power of general legislation over a Territory whatsoever.

To verify these positions we need only advert to the Constitution. Among the grants of power to Congress is the following viz: "To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States; and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings."

Mark the jealousy with which this power is restricted. For the protection of the Government even it is limited to a Territory not exceeding ten miles square, and it cannot be exercised over the "forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings," situated within the States, unless the land on which they may be located shall be first purchased with "the consent of the Legislatures" of those States. Is it conceivable that the wise men who restricted the exclusive power of legislation in Congress to a territory not exceeding ten miles square, did, by any indirection, grant that power broadly enough to cover the whole continent outside of the organized States, should it be annexed by purchase or conquest?

The following provision is the only one in the Constitution which has been chiefly, if not exclusively relied upon to sustain the position that Congress has any power whatsoever to legislate over the Territories, viz: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Moreover, this grant of power extends as well to property within a State as within a Territory. In a State the general power of legislation is in the State Legislature; yet the power of Congress to make "rules and regulations" respecting the public property, is the same in a State as in a Territory. The scope of the grant can, of course, be no greater in the Territory than in a State, and it necessarily follows that this clause of the Constitution confers on Congress no general power of legislation, either within States or Territories.

It is not a satisfactory reply to this argument to say that such a power has, to some extent, been exercised. Is it better to acquiesce in and extend the usurpation than to put a stop to it, as in the case of the United States Bank, by bringing the Government back to the constitutional test? Which is safest for the South, the constitutional principle that Congress shall not legislate for the Territories at all, or the adoption of a principle unknown to the Constitution, which, in its general application, would not only defeat the object it is advanced to promote, but would enable the Free State majority to surround the Slaveholding States and encircle the Union with an empire outside the organized States, over which that majority should exercise the power of unlimited and exclusive legislation? If such an idea be chimerical, the apprehension is not chimerical that the Black Republicans, should they acquire the control of all branches of the Government, will use the claim now set up for Congressional legislation over one species of property in the Territories, as an apology for assuming the power of general legislation, involving the power to destroy as well as to protect.

The Constitution of the United States was not made for Territories but for States, as its name implies. It has, by strict rules of construction, nothing to do with the Territories outside of the States united, beyond the protection and disposition of the common property therein. It seems to contemplate that the Territories shall be left to themselves until they have a population adequate to the formation of a respectable community, when their independence should be acknowledged and their admission into the Union granted on the sole condition that they adopt a Republican Government.

But if there be a doubt as to the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories, is it not safer, and far more consistent with Democratic principles to deny the power than to assume it? Some of the original States when admitted into the Union, had not the population of a third-rate city of the present day, and no harm would likely arise by leaving the Territories to themselves until they double the population of Delaware or Rhode Island in 1789. But would it not be incomparably better to admit them into the Union as States, with a much less population than to leave them to be a bone of contention among demagogues and disunionists, disturbing every essential interest of the country and jeopardizing the union of the existing States?

Let us briefly consider the practical workings of the remedy for Southern wrongs, which you suggest, in case a Black Republican is elected to the Presidency. You ask, "Is it wise, if we do not intend to submit to such consequences, to allow a Black Republican President to be inaugurated," &c., and you say, "If the South should think upon this subject as I do, no Black Republican President should ever execute any law within her borders unless at the point of the bayonet and over the dead bodies of her slain sons."

I know there are men in the South who would sacrifice their lives and endanger the communities in which they live, upon a point of honor, and that such men often fire up with unwonted fierceness if reminded of the probable consequences of their own rashness. But the time has come when consequences should be looked in the face, not for purposes of defiance, but that we may consider whether the policy which would lead to them is required by Southern interests or honor.

How do you propose to prevent the inauguration of a Black Republican President should such an one be unfortunately elected? Will you come to this city with an armed force, and attempt to prevent an inauguration by violence? In that event, force would be met by force, and there would be instant civil war, in which the country and the world would declare the South to be the aggressor.

He would be inaugurated here or elsewhere in spite of you. Well, suppose you then attempt to secede from the Union and resist the execution of the laws? Every lawyer in the South knows that every citizen of every State is as much bound by the laws of the United States constitutionally enacted as by the laws of his own State, and that it is impossible for the State to relieve its citizens from allegiance to the United States as it is for the latter to relieve them from allegiance to their own State. And it is the sworn duty of the President to take care that the laws of the United States shall be faithfully executed upon every citizen of every State, and as long as we have a faithful President, they will be executed if the Courts, the Marshals, the Army and the Navy remain faithful to their respective trusts.

I know that much has been said in the South about reserved rights of nullification, secession, and not coercing a sovereign State, &c.; when in fact the Conventions representing the people of the several States which adopted the Constitution, made no such reservations, but bound their constituents, one and all, to allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, as firmly as similar Constitutions bound them to the State Constitutions. And although the General Government cannot technically coerce a State, it can rightfully coerce all the citizens of a State into obedience to its constitutional laws. The pretended reserved rights of nullification and secession, therefore are in effect, nothing more nor less than an outspoken right of rebellion when wrong and oppression become intolerable. But when the crisis comes, there are two parties who must necessarily decide, each for itself, whether circumstances justify the act—the seceders

and the Government of the United States.—And do you conceive that the mere election of a President entertaining obnoxious opinions, or even entertaining hostile designs against the institutions of the South, checked as he must necessarily be, by a Senate and Judiciary, if not a House of Representatives, without one overt act, can justify any portion of the South even to their own consciences in an act of rebellion?

There is one notable feature in the attitude of the South. The cry of disunion comes—not from those who suffer most from Northern outrage, but from those who suffer least. It comes from South Carolina, and Georgia, and Alabama, and Mississippi, whose slave property is rendered comparatively secure by the intervention of other Slaveholding States between them and the Free States, and not from Delaware, and Maryland, and Virginia, and Kentucky, and Tennessee, and Missouri, which lose a hundred slaves by Abolitionist thieves were the first named States lose one. Why are not the States that suffer most loud in their cry for disunion? It is because their position enables them to see more distinctly than you do at a distance, the fatal and instant effects of such a step. As imperfect as the protection which the Constitution and laws give to their property undoubtedly is, it is better than none. They do not think it wise to place themselves in a position to have the John Browns of the North let loose upon them with no other restraints than the laws of war between independent nations construed by reckless fanatics. They prefer to fight the Abolitionists, if they fight them, within the Union, where their adversaries are somewhat restrained by constitutional and legal obligations. No, Sir; Delaware, Maryland and Virginia do not intend to become the theatre of desolating wars between the North and South; Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri do not intend that there peaceful channels of commerce shall become rivers of blood to gratify the ambition of South Carolina and Alabama, who at a remote distance from present danger cry out disunion.

I have said that the South has all along had a peaceful remedy and has it still. The Union sentiment is overwhelming in all the Middle and Western States, constituting two-thirds of the Republic. Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois are as largely inclined to become frontier States as Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky. Had the present Administration cut loose from the disunionists, instead of virtually ministering to their designs, and planted itself firmly on Union ground, the secessions at Charleston and Baltimore would never have occurred, and the "Constitutional Union Party" would have been an impossibility, the Democracy would have recovered its ascendancy in the North, and an united party, embracing two-thirds of the North and of the South, would now have been marching to certain victory next November. What ought to have been the preventive, must now be the remedy. Should Lincoln in November next secure a majority of the Electors, patriotic men, North and South, without waiting for his inauguration, irrespective of party lines, and throwing aside all minor considerations, must band together for the triple purpose of preventing any attempt to break up the Union, checking the Republican party while in the ascendant and expelling them from power at the next election. Let the toast of Gen. Jackson, "The Federal Union—It must be preserved," become the motto of the party, while strict construction of the Constitution and a jealous regard for the rights of the State shall be its distinguishing principle and unwavering practice. Let the constitutional principle be adopted of no legislation by Congress over the Territories, or the throw aside altogether the mischievous issues in relation to them, of no practical utility, gotten up by demagogues and disunionists, as means of accomplishing their own selfish ends. Let them inflexibly refuse to support, for any Federal or State officers, any man who talks of disunion on the one hand or "irrepressible conflict between Freedom and Slavery" on the other. Throw aside all party leaders except such as "keep step to the music of the Union" and are prepared to battle for State rights under its banner.

Be this your "platform": Let the South rally into it as one man, and I would pledge all but my life, that at least one-half of the North will join you in driving from power the reckless assailants of your rights and institutions. But whether the united South come up to the rescue or not, I foresee that in the natural progress of events, the central States from the Atlantic to the far West, will band together on this ground, leaving the Abolitionists of New-England and the Disunionists of the South to the harmless pastime of belching fire and fury at each other at a safe distance, protected by the patriotism and good sense of nine-tenths of their countrymen, against the evils they would bring on themselves.

Can you doubt the success of such a reunion? Not an advocate of disunion under any probable circumstances can be found among the candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. The supporters of Bell to a man, the supporters of Douglas to a man, and more than three-fourths of the supporters of Breckinridge, are staunch friends of the Union, and staunch adversaries to Northern interference with Southern institutions. When, convinced of the folly and madness of their warfare on each other as they will be after the election if not before, they band together in a common cause, and that cause the preservation of our glorious Union and its invaluable Constitution with their attendant blessings, will they not be irresistible?

How much more hopeful and cheering is a prospect like this than the contemplation of a standing armies, grinding taxes, ruined agriculture, prostrate commerce, bloody battles, ravaged countries and sacked cities.—This Continent like Eastern world, is destined to have its "Northern hive." Shall its swarms be repressed by the strong hand of the States united, or are they, by a dissolution of the Union, to be let loose upon Southern Europe? True, their blood might, in that event, fertilize your desolated fields, but your institutions, like those of the Roman Empire, would sink to rise no more.

These are the thoughts of an old man whose only political aspirations are, that when he dies he may leave his country united, happy and free. With sincere regards, AMOS KENDALL.

Germans and Irish, Read, Pauso and Reflect.

John M. Wilson, the author of the following, a Lincoln Elector in Massachusetts, some time ago addressed a Republican meeting, in a speech of considerable length, from which we make the following extracts. The German or Irishman, who can read this and then vote for Lincoln, has very little self-respect:—

"In the heart of the foreigner beats not one single noble impulse—not one single throbb of patriotism. He is so brutish and degraded that he has no sympathy for anything but cabbage and lager beer, potatoes and buttermilk, or some other abominable outlandish dish; only fit for hogs of the street or pen.

"Some tell you that many foreigners are intelligent; yes, intelligent. How in the name of Almighty God can they say it?—Look at the pot-gutted Dutchman smoking his pipe, and if you can see a ray of intelligence in that dirty, idiotic-looking face of his, show it to me? Look at the drunken, bloated, Irishman, with his rot-gut whiskey-bottle in pocket, and he drunk and swearing and reeling, and shows not in that polluted face one spark of morality, intellect or education. The idea is absurd—it is perposterous.

"We must change the laws of the land, and prevent these ignorant, degraded paupers here from voting and holding office. They are a set of unprincipled villains and ruffians, who congregated in and around our large cities and villages, and live by stealing from the Americans.

"Would you have the American to stand back, and let a bloated Irishman vote instead of yourself? See the wretch as he approaches his knees knocking and the slobber of tobacco running down his jaws, and as he comes, you hear him hurrah for 'Democracy,' and here he comes fresh from the bogs, just one year ago, and wants to vote—and because the boys cry 'move him,' and he gets knocked down for his impudence, a great cry is made about it by old line demagogues. I say it is right, let them stand back.

"Again; you see a top-headed, wide-mouthed, mullet-headed Dntelman, coming up just from some hut in the land of Krout, with the foam of beer still sticking to his horsetail whiskers, and his breath smelling of garlic and onions enough to kill a white man three hundred yards, and before he can say anything in the world but 'Democrat' he must vote, and that vote counts as much as yours or mine. This is outrageous and abominable. These foreigners that have carried elections for old liners, will have to learn their places. They have no more right to vote than the brutes of the field, and have not half the sense of a good Newfoundland dog; and God knows, were I a candidate for any office, I would tell these paupers and vagabonds, these vile, dirty, filthy, degraded, idiotic foreigners, I did not want their votes; and if I ever am a candidate, I hope to God I never will get them.

Ex-President Fillmore and Douglas. The Buffalo correspondent of the Albany (N. Y.) Argus and Atlas, in giving an account of the Douglas demonstration in that city, says:—

"One of the most gratifying incidents of Mr. Douglas's visits to Buffalo was his interview with Ex-President Fillmore. That gentleman has retired from public life, and takes no part in politics; but he was one of the first, after the excitement of the reception and the speaking was over, to pay Judge Douglas a visit at the Clarendon Hotel, and welcome him to the city. The interview was on both sides marked by most cordial feelings, and Mr. Fillmore expressed himself deeply gratified at the magnificent reception that had been tendered to Mr. Douglas by the citizens of Buffalo, and at the triumphant success that had marked his progress through so many of the States of the Union."

Breckinridge Now and Then. HE SEES IT.

At Frankfort, Ky., Dec. 1859, he said: I perceive a sensible loss of that spirit of brotherhood—that feeling of love for a common country—that flavor of loyalty which are at last the surest comment of the Union; so that in the present unhappy state of affairs I am almost tempted to exclaim that we are dissolving week by week and month by month, the threads are gradually fretting themselves asunder; and a stranger visiting Washington might imagine that the Executive of the United States was the President of hostile Republics.

The Representatives from South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Missouri, not to mention other Southern States, say they represent their constituents—say, that they scarcely go as far as their constituents—and most of them declare that they are ready at any moment for a separate Confederation. Some of the Southern Legislatures have passed resolves of this character—and we may safely assume that it is the true feeling of the people.

At Lexington, Ky., Sept., 1860, he said, forced to take the other tack by Douglas' Norfolk speech: I have no doubt a great many gentlemen in the Southern States of the Union think that their constitutional rights will never be recognized. A few are perhaps, per se Disunionists, though I doubt if there are fifty such in the Union.

UNION IN NEW YORK.—The Committee, appointed by the monster Union meeting held in New York, last week, to form a Union Electoral Ticket, for the support of all parties in the State opposed to the election of Lincoln, have completed their labors. They present a ticket composed of 28 Douglas men, 10 Bell men, and 7 Breckinridge men.—Should this ticket be accepted by the State Committees of the parties interested, its election will be sure, and Lincoln's chances for the Presidency ended.

Douglas in Kentucky. LOUISVILLE, Sept. 29.—The booming of cannon shortly after moon to-day, announced the arrival of Douglas. He was received by a large multitude, and escorted to the Louisville Hotel. This afternoon he addressed an audience of some thirty thousand people at Preston's woods. He charged that Buchanan and Breckinridge would be responsible if Lincoln was elected, as they were working to that end. Breckinridge had sacrificed himself to the bolters, who would not vote for him while in the regular Convention.