

Clearfield

IN THE



PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

D. W. MOORE, Editor and Proprietor.

VOL. XXXVI.—WHOLE NO. 1859.

GENERAL NEWS ITEMS.

The heir to the Russian crown is dead.

The one-year man in the army will be mustered out before those having longer terms.

A national cemetery is to be established at Antietam. Maryland has appropriated \$1000 for the purpose.

The colors of the Empire of Mexico are to be green, red and white. The Liberals have captured Saltillo, Monterrey and Victoria.

A boy in Ashley Falls, Mass., the other night cracked 32 eggs for a wager, and offered to take down another dozen for a dollar, but could find no takers.

President Johnson has issued a proclamation declaring rebel cruisers to pirates after they shall have notice of his proclamation.

The first man killed in this war was Daniel Howe, of New York, at Fort Sumter, in 1861, by the premature discharge of a gun.

Gov. Curtin has changed the day of humiliation in Pennsylvania to June 1st, so as to conform to President Johnson's proclamation.

The rumor of a plot to burn Philadelphia is now said to have been gotten up by some prize fighters, to divert the attention of the police from a projected fight.

The new military establishment of the United States will be an army of 150,000 men, divided into four corps: one of regulars, one of white volunteers, and two of negroes.

Mr. John Dama, of Schenectady, drove his mare, "Lady Fisher," from Albany to Schenectady in that short space of fifty-eight minutes—distance sixteen miles—on a wager of \$200.

A number of unemployed generals will be mustered out of the service in a week or two, if they do not take the hint and resign. It is intended to retain only about fifteen major-generals, sixty brigadiers, and one hundred and fifty colonels.

The tax of 3 per cent. on goods sent to the South has been abolished. The President has issued a proclamation removing all restrictions on Southern trade, except such as are necessary to prevent the introduction of contraband goods.

Bass Butler is to have a military trial, with a view, we are told, "to have justice done him." We should think he'd be like the Irishman, who, when told by a learned judge that they would do him justice, exclaimed, "Jabbers, and that's what I'm afraid of!"

Much excitement exists in Pittsburgh about a house on Pennsylvania Avenue in that city, which is said to be haunted. Several columns of marvelous things are published in relation to it, enough to make any person believe that he saw a ghost himself every dark night through the terror of reading of such dark horrors.

They tell a good story of a Haasler officer, who on receiving a note from a lady requesting the "pleasure of his company," at a party to be given at her house, on the evening designated took his volunteers and marched them to the lady's residence. When it was explained to him that it was himself who had been invited, he replied "The letter said company, and I thought the lady wanted to see all my boys."

A young girl, fifteen years of age, residing at Bethlehem, South, a few evenings since, while going up stairs with a lighted coal oil lamp in her hand, accidentally let it fall, when it broke. The flaming oil caught her clothes, and she ran into the street. Some neighbors, in attempting to extinguish the flames, were severely burned. The poor girl was almost burned to a crisp, and died the same night.—*Allegheny Democrat.*

A SIGNIFICANT LETTER FROM GEN. SHERMAN.—*His course in the Negotiations.*—A letter from General Sherman was received here to-day, in which he says that the war now being over, he expected to be at home in a few days.—He refers to the peace conference with Johnson and states that when the facts are officially promulgated, his course will be sustained by the country. The party who received the letter, being familiar with Sherman's policy, as instructed by the late President Lincoln, asserts that the agreement with Johnston was only that which Mr. Lincoln forced upon General Sherman at the meeting at City point. The hasty and gratuitous conduct of Halleck and Stanton in censuring Sherman, it is predicted, will react upon these gentlemen with tenfold severity. Mrs. General Sherman is here, and will remain in Cincinnati until the arrival of her husband.—*Cincinnati Gazette.* May 2.

A BLUNDER.—The following occurrence, the unhappy result of a blunder on the part of an express agent took place in this city recently. A young lady in delicate health, daughter of a prominent and highly esteemed citizen, was sent to a water cure establishment in Wisconsin, where it was hoped that her health would improve. They, however, were disappointed, and the girl died, and her remains were forwarded to that city by express for burial. When the afflicted family were about to take a last look at the face of the deceased, and the lid of the coffin was raised, they were shocked and mortified to discover that the corpse was the body of a man, which by some unfortunate blunder of the agent of the express company, had been sent to them instead of the lady intended. Investigation showed that the coffins had been exchanged in Chicago and each sent in the wrong direction.

SPEECH OF ANDREW JOHNSON

OF TENNESSEE,

In the United States Senate, Dec. 12, 1859, on the resolution asking for the appointment of a committee to investigate the facts attending the attack upon Harper's Ferry, in the fall of 1859—commonly known as the "John Brown Raid."

[Continued.]

So much for giving a literal construction to the Declaration of Independence. So much as to getting at what the Republican party would do who claim sovereign power over the Territories. You talk about a freeman, and yet this man who is free and equal, according to your idea of the subject, is not permitted to come into a court of justice as a competent witness against a white man, is not permitted to stand in the ranks as a master, is not permitted to intermarry with a white, is not permitted to vote. What, then, does constitute a freeman? Oh, yes, I suppose he enjoys liberty. Liberty! Deprived of every privilege, he yet enjoys liberty! He is a freeman, and yet can exercise no franchise that pertains to a freeman! He is a worse slave, in fact, than the African who is in the South and in bondage; a great deal worse, for by these restraints and restrictions he is made a slave; he enjoys the shadow and the name of being a freeman, but is stripped of all the franchises that constitute a freeman. He is a slave, in fact, without a master; and I think his is a great deal worse condition than that of a slave who has a master.

In connection with this point, the Senator has thrown out another idea which I do not know whether I clearly apprehend or not. Of course that is my fault and not his. He says, in another portion of his speech:

"We will perpetuate free government, by controlling the principles that he advocates. But, sir, what beyond that? How

have it come from a gentleman upon that side of the House, to tell us we must not call ourselves Republicans, when they assume to call themselves Democrats—Democrats! And the illustration of your principle, democracy, is the supremacy of an aristocracy of slaveholders in this country.

Any man can be a member of the Democratic party who will adopt your creed on the subject of the spread of slavery, and the upholding of slaveholding institutions in this country, which concern directly not one man in sixty of the population of this Union. That is the party that has arrogated to itself the name of Democrat, and that repudiates orator calling ourselves Republicans, Democrats! A party that legislates for the interest of one out of sixty; forgetting the interest of four-fifths of the families of the South to promote that of one-fifth—free white men."

If I understand him correctly, he proceeds upon the idea that any one can be a Democrat who is in favor of the spread of the maintenance of slavery; he seems to say that down as an abolition or anyone of being a Democrat. Now, when we come to look at the broad principles of the Democratic party, we find that, so far as the institution of slavery is concerned, it constitutes a very small portion of the basis and principles on which they intend and expect to administer this government, and have administered it herefore; but the Democratic party assumes to be a national party; the Democratic party assume to maintain the Constitution and all its guarantees, as it is. They assume that this Constitution was made and handed down to us by our forefathers guarantees the institution of slavery wherever found within the United States, they, in advocating the Constitution of the country as it is, stand by this institution called slavery, it being recognized by the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees that it shall not be disturbed. Then the Democratic party stand on the Constitution of the country. They propose no innovation. They have made no advance on the North. They propose the introduction of no new institution, so far as the northern States are concerned; but they are disposed to stand by the Constitution of the country, as it has been handed down to them, willing and anxious to abide by its guarantees. Because a man in the North, who agrees that the institution is constitutional, who agrees that the southern States have constitutional guarantees, stands by an individual in the South maintaining these great constitutional rights, does that argue that he is in favor of the spread of African slavery; that he is for continuing it any more than the Constitution continues it? It seems to me not; and what the Senator lays down as the touchstone of the Democratic party, is not the basis of that party. It is a question now before the country, and has been one among other questions for a considerable length of time; and the time has well nigh arrived, I think, when Senators, North and South, East and West, had better begin to look into it, and see where it is driving us.

In the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, which I just now quoted, there is another idea thrown out, seemingly not only to affect the people outside the slaveholding States, but to affect those inside the slaveholding States. It is said that the legislation of the South is for the benefit of one out of twenty of the southern people. We deny it. We say our legislation is in accordance with the Constitution and for the country, and not for one out of twenty or one out of sixty of the people. I have heard that idea suggested before. It is intended to have its influence in the southern States. It is based on the old idea that a man who owns one hundred slaves stands equal to sixty white persons in political rights, by reason of the three-fifths clause of the Constitution. How does this matter really stand? Why will you not look at it

on its true basis? Let us get at this legislation under the Constitution of the United States, and we will show that the Senator's argument is sophistry—pardon me for calling it by that name—that is not sound in logic, that it is not sound in the premises, and, of course, not in the conclusion.

The Constitution of the United States provides for apportioning representation in the other House among the States, and declares that all the free population shall be included, Indians excepted; an item embraces three-fifths of the slaves, who are to be added to the whole number of white persons. From this originates the idea that the man holding a hundred slaves stands equal to sixty white men at home. That is the argument, and it is intended to have a prejuice on the public mind.

How does the matter stand? Is that the basis and is it the manner in which the thing operates practically in the states? Not at all. Under the Constitution of the United States, once in ten years the census is taken. That being done, laying down the basis that I have just stated, embracing three-fifths of the slaves, Representatives are to be apportioned, to whom? Among the slaveholders? No. Where does the Representatives go? I want to be understood. Is it given to the slaveholders individually, or where does it go? Away with this sophistry, wrapped around with deception. The Representatives are to be apportioned among the several States, not among the individuals. You have fixed your basis of representation, and in the apportionment of representation it is to be apportioned among the several States. States are not known here in detail, and especially so in apportioning the representation to the state—the sovereignty; and the sovereignty gets the benefit of the representation, and then it is that the Legislature is to prescribe the mode of electing those Representatives. What becomes of your idea of equality to one? How many of the States used to elect their Representatives by general ticket, every qualified voter standing upon an equal footing? But, moreover, all the citizens of the States stand on an equal footing as to the benefit that their State derives under the Constitution of the United States in this additional representation. The man that does not own a slave is permitted to come forward and participate in this additional Representation as much as the slaveholder. Do you understand that? What then becomes of your idea of twenty or sixty to one?

Do not Illinois and all the other non-slaveholding States get the benefit of their free colored population in apportioning representation? After getting the benefit of your free colored population in representation, do you let them vote? Do you admit them into your courts as competent witnesses? Do you permit them to master? No. Where, then, is this great injustice? Notwithstanding your clamor about all men being created equal, what is your practice? Your theory is one thing, and your practice is another. Suppose all the slaves in the southern States were free, how would the representation be?

We are told that we have a representation for three-fifths of our negroes. Do not you get representation for all your negroes—all slaves without masters? I mean the free negroes who are born of every franchise that constitutes a free man. You get a full representation for all your free negroes, and yet you complain. How would the master operate if all the negroes in the South were free? How would that affect this matter of representation? We only get three-fifths of our negroes represented now, according to the Constitution of the United States, suppose you were to emancipate them all and make them all free, when you came to apportion the representation among the South how would it be? Would it be three-fifths or five-fifths? What is three-fifths of four million, assuming the slaves to be four million in number? The three-fifths is two million four hundred thousand. What would two-fifths be? One million six hundred thousand. Then, if your ratio were one hundred thousand, we have sixteen Representatives on the other floor less than we should have if all our negroes were free men of color. We can understand that. Instead of getting twenty-four Representatives for the blacks we should have forty Representatives—sixteen more than we now have.

Where, then, is this great hardship to you? Where is the wrong in the Constitution to you? You get a full representation for your negroes, who, I think, are slaves without masters, for they are deprived of all that constitutes a free man.

Our slaves enjoy all the rights of freemen, with one or two exceptions; and to be deprived of these is an advantage to them in the relation which they occupy.

Slavery, instead of being an element of political power to the South, is an element of political weakness in the national councils.

Is not that easily seen and understood? Then, why try to poison the minds of your people? Why try to deceive them? Why not tell them that all the slaves were free, instead of the power of the South being diminished in the Congress of the United States, she would have sixteen more Representatives? Why not tell them the truth? What becomes of all your sympathetic appeals, based upon the equality of black men and white men, when everybody sees and knows that the condition of a free colored man in the North is infinitely worse than that of the slave in the South? What, then, becomes of your argument of equality? There is nothing in it. Why can we not as brothers in the same great confederacy, approach each other with a disposition to understand our Constitution as it is, and with a view to get an advantage of the argument on the popular ad captandum which may be thrown up upon the country? Let us divest our minds of all prejudice, look at things as they are, and see the truth as it is. It is the want of understanding which gives rise to discussion; not the understanding of the question which causes argument. Let us understand the principle embraced in the Constitution as they are, and then we can approach each other as brothers of the same great family, and stand by our bond of union as it is. If the Constitution is wrong, and experience and time have proved it to be so, proceed in the manner proposed in the instrument to revise or alter or abolish it; but do not let us do it by stealth and indirection.

I must notice one other paragraph in the speech of the honorable Senator from Illinois.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

Again, to the right of this man is one whom it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot.

Atzerold is pointed at as the person to whom was instigated the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather uncleanly on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.