



D. W. MOORE, G. B. GOODLANDER, Editors.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS—\$1 26 per Annum, if paid in advance.

VOL. XXXIII.—WHOLE NO 1760

CLEARFIELD, PA WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1863

NEW SERIES—VOL. III.—NO 47.

SPEECH

WM. M. McCULLOUGH, Esq.

Before the Central Democratic Club, in the borough of Clearfield, May 26, 1863.

Mr. President and Fellow-Citizens:

This is the first time in my life that I have been called upon by the citizens of Clearfield to address them. Whether it has been an act of kindness towards me, or a want of confidence upon their part in my ability to do so, I am at a loss to know; but as it is more pleasant to human aspirations I will receive it as the former. A little before this hour, last evening, I was informed, officially, not that I was to address the Club, but that I was to address it. The announcement came upon me like a clap of thunder from a cloudy sky; but seeming to be imperative, I consented to hear the toll, and to endure the pain, supported by your patience and attention—having in the interval prepared a few hasty and imperfect notes which I shall serve as my guide to mark out the course I intend to pursue.

I am convinced, sir, from the many exhibitions of patriotism and loyalty in this town, as well as elsewhere, and especially by the godly number of my fellow citizens I see here to-night, that it is no vain thing to wait upon "copperheads." They seem to me, sir, to be a prolific race; gaining strength from sound doctrine, and increasing numbers, as the people become enlightened and christianized. Unlike that besetling species after which they are named, they increase as civilization advances, and nearly all over this great country, at this time, there is a "copperhead" presiding as president of a local Democratic Club, and another leading forth his venereal, as the tongue might say, in support of the Constitution, the Union, and the enforcement of the laws. It is not my design at this time, if I possessed the ability, to enter into the discussion of the numerous issues that agitate the public mind, but merely to pay passing notice to some which more immediately concern our personal and private rights, and our public and common rights, as citizens of a free and common country, leaving great questions to be discussed by great men.

There are in this country, at this time, three always have been and always must be, two great political parties. These consist of the loyal Union men, called Democrats, Copperheads, or by whatever name you prefer, and are composed of Unionists south and disunionists north; or in other words, the secessionists of the South and the abolitionists of the North. That they are both aiming at the same end—the dissolution of the Union—is beyond the suspicion of a doubt. The one, by trampling under foot the authority of the Government, would seek by rebellion to overthrow the foundation upon which the grand structure of this Republic is founded; the other, by force of arms, would set at naught the written Constitution of the land, and by the tyrant's plea of necessity suspend the regular action of the law, and wrench away for supposed offenses, every right of the citizen and by government hostility, seek to intimidate the noble freeman into the abject slave of the abolition tyranny. That the rebels of the South are the enemies of the country and seeking its destruction, I presume we all will admit. That the abolitionists, and also the North are likewise its enemies, and also seeking its ruin, I think we are equally convinced; the evidence of which fact, however, I will endeavor to present. Although in doing this it is unnecessary for me to go back to the time that tried men's souls, in which this nation was founded, and find there these same enemies of free government, yet without otherwise name. Nor is it necessary to go through a recital of the long and bloody struggle of the Revolution, which immediately followed, and being up these same varieties of tyranny who refused their men from New England's sacred soil to aid the colonies in their efforts for independence; and who even petitioned Congress for the removal of the Father of his Country as Commander in Chief of the American army, as they did in a later day, yet with greater excess, our gallant McClellan. Neither is it important that I should review the actions of these opposers of the Government in all its wars, and especially in that with Mexico, which they declared to be unjust and unholy, and although our national character was at stake, they voted against giving men and money to President Polk to carry on the war, and proclaimed to the world, through their Congressmen that they were Mexicans they would welcome our soldiers with bloody hands to hospitable ground. And just here let us note the difference in the sentiments of these loyal men in that struggle in which were involved our just rights and national honor; and in this abolition crusade in which are invested the interests of the negro, regardless of the lives and money of white men; the result of which, I fear, if conducted upon the principles of the present policy, will be our national degradation and shame. Then, when the Government was battling for its just dues and to maintain its character among the nations of the earth, these same Union Leaguers were against it, without the charge of treason being laid at their doors. Then, to speak and write and vote against the Government and criticize the actions of the President were not disloyal practices. They met him with some objection at every turn made. But now, when the only visible purpose for the prosecution of this war is, the abolition of negro slavery; we hear almost daily of some one being arrested by Marshal somebody, for disloyal practices, and taken off to Fort Lafayette, or some other hot-house of the Administration, to be cooked over and made palatable to the abolition taste of Abraham Lincoln and his worshippers.

And what constitute these disloyal practices? The right of free speech, free

press, and of exercising the right of suffrage according to the dictates of our own consciences? Certainly not, for the Constitution guarantees us all of these; yet for these we have been and are to be arrested. What then? Why the right which we exercise of supporting or not supporting a particular Administration, which is short-lived and passing away, and which is not the Government; or supporting the Constitution, which is durable and which is the Government. In short, disloyal practices, in the estimation of the present rulers, is being a free man, thinking for yourself, being a man at all, or anything you see proper, except an Abolition nigger worshipper, and this I hold, neither the Constitution, christianity, nor common sense allows any man to be.

But to return. What has been the course of the present party in power, and what is the evidence of its loyalty to the Union since the inception of this rebellion? Immediately upon the convening of Congress it was resolved by that body that this war should be carried on strictly in accordance with the Constitution—that it should be waged, not for the subjugation of the Southern States, not for freedom to the black race, but for the restoration of the Union, the maintenance of the Constitution and the supremacy of the laws, and that when these ends were attained the war should and ought to cease.

The first gun was fired—the President issued an order calling for seventy-five thousand troops. Under this guarantee given by Congress to the people, nearly twice that number of patriotic men rushed to arms. You, sir, and all of us remember how the American heart was fired—how the public mind was intoxicated with war. Nearly every man could boast that "war was his glory." Thousands of our most cool-minded and moderate men, irrespective of party, were carried away with this outburst of public enthusiasm, and every thing bid fair to the people being united as one man in support of the Administration, and that the rebellion would be crushed as these were acres declared, in sixty days. Again, and again he called for more men, and as often did the people respond to these calls, with a bravery and patriotism that have ever characterized the American nation. Then came, on the 22nd of September, 1862, and again reiterated on the 1st of January, 1863, the famous Emancipation Proclamation, which entirely paralyzed enlistments, that already had become a slow process, no doubt from the many encroachments made upon the rights of the people by the Administration, and the hoards of military officials placed under it. So directly was this proclamation in opposition to the former pledge given by Congress, that enlistments entirely ceased, the result of which was, the government had to offer bounties to volunteers, and finally, resort to a draft in order to raise the quotas of the States. And yet during all this time, loyal citizens were arrested for discouraging enlistments, while Abraham Lincoln, himself, had done more, by his Emancipation Proclamation, to discourage enlistments, than any one man in the United States. Notwithstanding, he goes unimpunished, and by the late Indemnity Bill, unimpeachable. But again, as an evidence that these men are the enemies of the country, let me cite you to just one instance. We hear Thaddeus Stevens, (I blush that Pennsylvania should send such a traitor to our legislative halls,) the leader of the Abolition Republican party in Congress, declare, after descending upon the absurdity of restoring the Union upon the Constitution, "that he does not desire the restoration of this Union with slavery in it, and with his consent it never shall be." Can there be a traitor more black, treason more unadulterated? And yet this is the man who was sent to Congress by the Abolitionists to represent, in part, Pennsylvania. Thank God he does not represent the Democracy. But I allege they have violated the Constitution; and in what way? I cannot better show this, than by reading from the speech of Hon. D. W. Voorhees, of Indiana, delivered in the House of Representatives, Feb. 18th, 1863. In speaking of these violations he uses the following language:

"In violation of the Constitution, American citizens have been arrested for using the freedom of speech."
"In violation of the Constitution, their houses have been forcibly entered."
"In violation of the Constitution, their persons have been seized with armed violence."
"In violation of the Constitution, they have been deprived of liberty without due process of law."
"In violation of the Constitution, they have been held to answer infamous accusations without presentment or indictment of a grand jury."
"In violation of the Constitution, they have been denied the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury."
"In violation of the Constitution, they have been carried out of the State and district in which their offenses, if any, were committed."
"In violation of the Constitution, they have been kept in ignorance of the nature and cause of the accusation against them."
"In violation of the Constitution, they have not been confronted with the witnesses against them."
"And in most supreme and wicked violation of the Constitution, they have been denied counsel for their defense, and informed in all the insolence of a fanatical disregard of every principle of humanity as well as law."

"That the general government will not recognize any one as an attorney for political prisoners, and will look with distrust upon all applications for release through such channels; and that such applications will be regarded as additional reasons for declining to release such persons."
And to use his language still further, "I challenge the worst ages of the most profligate and corrupt despots for a more intolerable picture of personal outrage

than is here presented. Yes, sir, the American people have suffered outrages of executive usurpations and they will solemnly and deliberately utter their denance. The voice of the Barons, the voice of John Hampden, and the voice of Patrick Henry, crying, "give me liberty or give me death," will all be concentrated in the voice of the people of this country, in the ballot-box, at the next Presidential election."

I have said the Constitution is the Government. If this be true, then he who violates that Constitution, as I have endeavored to show that the Abolition party have, must also be a traitor to the Government. This is but a necessary and natural deduction of reason. But let us admit, for argument's sake, that these acts referred to, are not unconstitutional; or as they say, although unconstitutional, are justified by the "necessity" of the case. Who makes the necessity? They do themselves. How? I answer, by waging an unconstitutional war of subjugation upon the South, for the Abolition of slavery. We might as well say that the man who went into a crowd and picked a quarrel, and then killed the one with whom he was fighting, in order to save his own life, would not be guilty of murder, upon precisely the same plea of "necessity."

The great, but lamented Douglas said, "war is disunion—final, eternal separation." If this be true, and the history of nations forbids us to doubt it, then he who is an unconditional war man, according to my method of reasoning, must also be an unconditional disunionist and traitor. What then, is the conclusion to arrive at, from all the facts before us? It is, that this party, now in power, who are so eager for war, and who are carrying it on in a manner peculiarly their own, are not now, and never have been, the friends of the Government.

Having thus briefly and imperfectly shown who are the enemies of the government, let us now consider who are its friends and supporters. I allege that these consist of the loyal Democratic party, and all others who are in favor of a speedy and honorable return to peace and order. Yes, and for this we are called traitors. Peace—it is the grandest, most sublime and holy cause that ever produced a traitor, and if like causes continue to produce like effects, they will be the best traitors the world ever saw. Would to heaven this country were full of them. Peace! the brightest jewel that glitters along the pathway of life, to the christian as well as the statesman. Peace! the dearest promise that adorns the pages of Holy Writ. Peace! the offspring of innocence, the life of the nation, and the hope of the world. It is an old and wise adage, "in time of peace prepare for war," and it should be an equally wise one, in time of war prepare for peace. War can never restore the Union as it was, nor produce a permanent peace. I admit, that in some cases, the majority have arisen and put down a minority, as Abraham Lincoln declared they had a right to do, but it was where nature had fixed their boundaries, and every circumstance was favorable to such a peace; and even then it required vast standing armies, maintained at an intolerable expense, to quench the flames of rebellion, that burst forth afresh upon every suitable occasion. But here, in this country, where it would seem nature had decreed we should live together as brothers of a common household—staying the angry waves of the Atlantic and the Pacific upon our Eastern and Western borders, I hold it would be impossible. As well might the Great Master, when called upon from his slumbers to quell the surging billows of Genesaret, have commanded one mighty wave to follow after another and engulf it, in order to produce a calm, as to say that war, upon unconditional terms, will produce peace. No, never—never as long as Americans remember their ancestry.

I am opposed to war as a Democrat. It has never been the policy of my party. It is true, they have carried on war, but it was with a foreign foe, where sooner or later peace must be the result. Because then, they could treat with each other and make peace, but in this struggle, the present Administration will receive no propositions of peace from the South. Nothing but an unconditional surrender of everything upon their part—their States to be converted into dependent territories—their forts, to be turned upon them—their arms to be used in their destruction, and their leaders to be hung—will satisfy the Administration at Washington. Where will you find a people as rich in everything that makes a nation great, as they are, who will submit to such humiliation? Certainly not in America. I am opposed to this war, because I believe it to be impracticable. I believe, if the North were united as one man, and the Administration could get all the men and money it wanted, (which it has had, however), and every man, woman and child in the loyal States was for war, it could never, no never subdue the Southern people and bring them into the Union, with the hope of retaining them. And here it might be asked, what would we do, could we treat with rebels with arms in their hands? In the language of a certain peace Democrat, whose name I do not remember, I answer most emphatically "yes, if treating with them will take the arms out of their hands, and restore the Union."

I am opposed to war politically, because it never has been, is not now, and never can be, the true policy of the country. Under the policy of peace, we rose from thirteen feeble Colonies, to a great and mighty nation. For more than three quarters of a century we stood a living, moving, brilliant evidence that "all men were created equal," and that free government was no longer an experiment, but an established fact. Our vessels ploughed every known sea, bearing at their masts, the emblem of our national great-

ness, and almost "from the rivers to the ends of the earth," our flag was known and respected.

Under the policy of war, in two years, we have undone the work of little less than a century. We have drained the country of its best available young men—exhausted our real wealth—contracted a debt we never intended to pay, and are proving to the world that a free government, "deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed," is a farce, and that the power of the government consists in the authority of the ruler. And finally, I am opposed to war, as an individual. It is barbarous, inhuman, and akin against the best laws of society, morality and God. If I differ with a neighbor, and in order to maintain my position, or my property, kill him, it is murder, and I must suffer the penalty of a broken law. If nations differ, a few ambitious and blood-thirsty leaders inflame the public mind, and urge on their followers to deeds of blood and of death; and it is called by that milder name, to some—war! In my humble opinion, war is nothing more nor less than wholesale murder, which could and should be avoided in any country. Upon the leaders of the rebellion in the South, and the Abolitionists of the North, must forever rest the blood of the thousands already slain, and the thousands who may yet be slain, in this wicked and unholy waste of human life. For all these things they will be brought into judgment, and the tears of the widow and the wails of the orphan, will rise up in that day and condemn them.

How, then, can our difficulties be settled, and peace restored? This is a question I have neither the time nor ability to answer. It is one of the great questions I leave to great men. They have answered it. Bigler has answered it—Cox has answered it—Voorhees has answered it—Vallandigham has answered it—the Seymour has answered it, and the people will answer it, in language that cannot be misunderstood, if ever they get another opportunity to vote for a President. But if, my fellow-citizens, in conclusion, the Democratic party, composed of all the loyal men in the country, should fail, in this, the darkest hour of our nation's history, to restore and preserve the Union, God grant that my eyes, at least, may not rest on that saddest of human calamities—the wreck of a nation—the loss of liberty to a free people.

VERACITY.—The groundwork of all manly character is veracity. That virtue lies at the foundation of everything solid. How common it is to hear parents say, "I have faith in my child so long as he speaks the truth. He may have many faults, but I know he will not deceive me. I build on that confidence." They are right. It is a lawful and just ground to build upon. And that is a beautiful confidence. Whatever errors temptation may betray a child into, so long as he is true, open truth remains, there is something to depend on, there is an anchor-ground, there is substance at the centre. Men of the world feel so about one another. They can tolerate and forbear so long as their ering brother is true. It is the fundamental virtue. Ordinary commerce can hardly proceed a step without a good measure of it. If we cannot believe what others say to us, we cannot act upon it, and to an immense extent that is saying that we cannot act at all. Truth is a common interest. When we vindicate it, we vindicate our own foothold. When we plead for it, it is like pleading for the air of health we breathe. When you undertake to benefit a lying man, it is like putting your foot in the mire.—F. D. Huntington.

THE ORIGIN OF FAMILIAR FRUSTRATIONS.—The term "masterly inactivity" originated with Sir James Mackintosh. "God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb," when every body who did not suppose it was in the Bible, credited to Sterne, was stolen by him from Geo. Herbert, who translated it from the French of Henry Zetanne. "The cup that cheers but not inebriates" was conveyed by Cooper from Bishop Berkeley in his "siris."—Woodworth's "The child is father to the man," is traced from him to Milton, and from Milton to Sir Thomas Moore. "Like angels' visits—few and far between," is the offspring of Hook; it is not Thomas Campbell's original thought. Old John Norris (1658) originated it, and after him Robert Blair, as late as 1745. "There's a good time coming," is Scott's phrase in Rob Roy, and the "almighty dollar," is Washington Irving's happy thought.

THE ORIGIN OF HAND SHAKING.—The Romans had a goddess whose name was Fides or Fidelity—a goddess of "faith and honesty," to whom Numa was the first to pay divine honors. Her only dress a white veil, expressive of frankness, candor and modesty, and her symbol was two right hands joined, or sometimes two female figures holding each other by the right hands, whence in all agreements among the Greeks and Romans it was usual for the parties to take each other by the right hand, as a token of their intention to adhere to the compact; and this custom is in more general use even among ourselves, at the present day, than would at the first thought be realized.

GEN. BEN BUTLER, in his Cooper Institute speech, said the South were "alien enemies." Thereby he recognized the Confederacy, and gave the Confederates aid and comfort. Is he therefore not a more proper subject for a trial for treason than Mr. Vallandigham was, who expressly refused, in the very speech for which he was kidnapped at night, even to consent to any division of the Union? Besides, Mr. Vallandigham never proposed to share a military cap contractor's profits, and never plundered his Government or a helpless community of millions of dollars. Hartford Times.

ARMY CORRESPONDENCE.

ON PICKET, May 19, 1863.

Dear Father:—I have particular reasons for writing just now: first, I wrote a letter on last Friday morning wherein I said we were going to cross the river; but that was all a mistake; the wagons I heard and took for pontoons were only supply trains coming in, and the alarm was caused by a train of cars coming in from Richmond to supply the rebel army, and our pickets thought they were putting in bridges to cross on us—hence the alarm which we interpreted to mean an advance. My next reason is caused by your silence towards us. We never hear from you any more than a casual remark about your health, or some such thing; and more especially, we hear nothing concerning your politics. When we have changed our opinions on the political questions that have agitated the country for the last several years, and that still continue to agitate it, we are anxious to know how our friends feel upon the matter, and especially one so near to us as our Father. This anxiety has determined me to touch the subject, as it were, in your presence, and solicit a reply.

You and I used to sit and talk over the war, and the questions relative thereto; and I remember having heard you say you "feared this was only the beginning of sorrow; that after this rebellion was over we would have another; we would have the principles of religious liberty to re-establish, and the inalienable rights of the people to re-affirm, by the power of the sword. I greatly fear your prediction will come true, notwithstanding I doubted its correctness then. And I fear, too, that it will become necessary to assert those rights, and inaugurate that rebellion, or rather revolution, before the present rebellion is crushed. We see the liberty of the press assailed, the liberty of speech stifled, and the influence of the Church and the power of the State, are combined to enforce the usurpation. Our political papers laud the church for her assistance in quieting the minds of the citizens, while the political power fastens the yoke of eternal bondage upon them; and she looks confidently forward to the day when she will be recognized and supported as a part of the Government of the United States. In proof of this, I send you a couple of extracts from what are termed highly loyal journals, and the one which notices the sermon of the Rev. Dr. Channing in the Administration organ at Washington, the Daily Morning Chronicle; and the other is from the loyal Lebanon (Pa.) Observer. Read them, carefully, and then answer the question for me, "from which we have most to fear, the encroachments of the Church, or the toleration of the political heresy of Jeff. Davis?"

Under this Administration, it seems we must build up one evil to delirious another; and how are we to prevent these evils from befalling us? The Administration has deprived the people of the right to criticize its conduct under penalty of banishment, thus preventing us the only means we have for escape from the clutches of our oppressors. I refer to the case of C. L. Vallandigham. Davis proposes to take a portion of our republic and rule it himself; while the Administration proposes to rule with absolute power the whole country, and banish from it all who dare question its constitutional rights, or rather those that endeavor to confine its actions to a purely constitutional basis.

Father, the cause of this war is found entirely in this fault of our Government—It is too strong; and the people are too weak, and too much governed, and the Government too much power to compel them to submit to its authority—hence the rebellion, Rebellion never ensues in private, social arrangements, from the fact that co-partnerships are valid only so long as the parties wish them to exist, reserving to themselves the right to dissolve them whenever their interests demand the separation. Whereas, the social arrangements where slavery exists; where men are subject to the absolute control of other men; where women and men are bound by arbitrary laws to live together; where the monarch rules at will; or where the written Constitution and laws give the Governor the power to oppress the governed, there you find rebellion. The slave rebels against his master, with the hope of bettering his condition, because he cannot change it by any other means. The wife and husband fall out and become quarrelsome, "rebels," because they are prevented from bettering their condition by the laws of matrimony. And the subject, or citizen, rebels against his governor, or government, because his government oppresses him.—Consequently we must look for reform by reducing the power and strength of the government, instead of augmenting that power, and depriving the citizen of the public privilege of speaking his honest sentiments. This privilege is the only safeguard we have against the encroachments of the usurper; and when I see our rulers depriving citizens of that privilege, and at the same time using the lives of others to enforce their authority over an extent of territory, and over the persons of ten millions of unwilling subjects, who have the hardihood to oppose his encroachments, I feel that my place, and the place of all true men, is to cleanse the fountain-head of our own government before we use the sword to crush the spirit of rebellion, and destroy the lives of those who are unwilling to surrender their rights. It may be said that the South are not deprived of their rights; but whatever we conclude on that subject, we must agree that they claim to have been abused and oppressed by the North, or dominant party—also they would not have taken up arms against us.

But, father, I will dismiss the subject by saying that I believe our side is right in

its endeavors to restore the Union; but very wrong in its conduct of the war, both military and political, for which cause I look for a failure of our arms.

May, 20th.

Just nine months this morning since I bid my family and friends farewell and started for the tented field. I shall long remember the parting so affecting to all. Yet how insignificant the separation of a few friends compared with the destiny of nations. I am sitting here this pleasant day beneath the thick foliage of a large poplar tree on the banks of the Rappahannock. The rebel picket is walking his beat on the other shore, while we are doing duty on this side. We are watching each other as though we were members of one family. The river here is only about a hundred yards wide, and if we were permitted we could easily hold converse with the enemy. They are very friendly to us and have often expressed a willingness to settle the questions if they had the power. But our pill of utter subjugation is more than they can swallow. On last Sunday I was in swimming in the river just above here, and the rebels were in on the other side, some of us crossed over and traded coffee for tobacco, &c. They were not allowed to come to our side but they would put their things on boards and sters them over and call for us to come for them. We would swim out and get them, and take back ours in turn. The captains in charge of the two posts exchanged civilities by letter, they were of the 13th Georgia regiment, ours the 4th New Jersey regiment. The rebel captain wished the war was over; he called it a cruel and unnatural war; still he claimed that he was fighting for the rights of the States, as well as for the rights of the people; he argued that the future destiny of our country depended upon the success of their arms—that they were the real supporters of the principles of republicanism, &c. I must confess I was affected by the earnest and unassuming style of his letter, it seemed to betoken the honest devotion he felt for his cause; from that moment I felt that we were fighting a people determined to be free. Maybe I am wrong in my conclusion but I feel that no mean cowardice has driven me to it. I feel, dear Father, that this war cannot be settled by fighting. The spirit of amity and peace is as much in the hearts of the people as it ever can be, and the sooner we avail ourselves of its influence by declaring an armistice and appointing a convention to take the state of the country into consideration, the sooner we will see peace spread her balmy wings o'er the land.

Evening—Since writing this far I have enjoyed a mental feast. I have been surrounded by rebel soldiers. George Loize and I slipped off from the relief station and went to the river to catch some fish, and when we went down the bank two rebels came up and asked us how they bit; well, we said they didn't bite at all. They wanted to exchange papers with us, but we had none to trade; we struck up a conversation with them for about an hour, but we got afraid our officers might hear us, so I proposed to go over if they would let me come back again; they said they would, and so I stripped off my duds and ploated in. It was a pretty hard swim, but still I made it. When the rebel pickets saw me coming they ran down to the river, and by the time I got over there was about thirty of them who had come down to the bank to meet me. George said he thought I was gone up then, sure. But I walked out on the shore and sat down on a log right among them, they were all anxious to ask questions and got answers, and they kept me busy for a while you had better believe; well we talked on until the time for George's relief made it necessary to break up the interview. We talked about the late fight, and about politics and all such matters, and they were as friendly as friends can be—whether that is caused by the natural affinity between the rattlesnake and copperhead, I don't know—but I do know it is hard to be compelled to fight and kill such good hearted fellows. They say they can't come back to the Union—that they will fight until every man is dead before they give up; and let our army sweep over their land; 'But, said I, 'suppose we had McClellan for president, and such men as Vallandigham and Seymour at the head of our Government, you wouldn't be such bitter enemies of us, would you? 'No,' they said they would not. I told them that this ultra abolition party was losing ground, and would not rule the country much longer. 'But, said I, 'what do you say about an armistice and letting a convention settle questions between us? 'They said 'that was their hand, exactly,' then said they, 'let us make the Chancellorsville battle the last,' they said 'that they were tired of fighting, and thought that they ought to know by this time that we could not whip them,' and that it was only murder for us to continue the war when all can be compromised now that can be gained by any means. I asked them 'what would be the conditions of a peace which they would be willing to accept? 'They said 'free trade and Southern rights,' I said 'what about the Union? Can't you get that? 'But, said I, 'will you accept a treaty of offence and defence against other nations? 'Oh yes, we will do that.' They asked where McClellan was? I told them, and said 'we had some hope of getting him back soon.' They replied they hoped we would not, for he was 'not so easily whipped as the other generals.' Said I, 'You don't fight so hard against him, maybe?' well there might be something in that, they answered.

Let us make a dialogue of it. Rebel—Did you hear of Jackson's death? Yankee—Yes, long ago. Rebel—I reckon you was glad to hear the news? Yank—No; we respect brave men too much to rejoice at the death of Jackson. Who takes charge of his corps now?