## THE BRADFORD REPORTER

ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

VOL. XXII.-NO. 50.

## PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O. GOODRICH.

TOWANDA: Thursday Morning, May 15, 1862.

Selected Poetry.

TO A SECESSION SYMPATHIZER.

Twill be no thanks to you, good sir ! 'Twill be no thanks to you, When our troops come marching home from war, The Red, the White, the Blue,

Still floating o'er them like a cloud Of glory as they come, While a nation's blessing, long and loud,

Shall shout their welcome home ! Oh! then, 'twill be no thanks to you! You frowned upon their toil;

At best, 'twas folly in your view-Until you saw the spoil. You sighed, and looked amazing wise At Justice's long delay, And talked about a " Compromise"

To keep the hounds at bay. Oh! yes, 'twill be no thanks to you! You never spoke one word

Where heart and hands and all were due, That I have ever heard-One cheering word of sympathy.

One patriotic prayer— One word of faith and hope, to be A charm against despair. Yet, you shall reap what they have sowed, A country shall be yours ; For beroes' blood in streams has flowed.

A richness that endures. Bought by the brave and true-And yet, remember, as you eat. It is no thanks to you!

## Political.

Speech of Hon. David Wilmot In the United States Senate, April 30, 1862, on the bill t confiscate the property and free the slaves of rebels.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the

bill (S No. 151) to confiscate the property Mr. WILMOT. Mr. President, the second

section of the bill reported from the Judiciary Committee is an act of emancipation, giving freedom to the slaves of those who, during the present rebe lion, shall take up arms against ort to said rebellion. The bill itself declares their emancipation without the interof court or commissioners, and protate of rebels who shall, after the passage of national existence.

inniversal emancipation.

ondary to the safety and preservation of sla- unmade, built up and torn down at pleasure. very. The property of the nation is to be It has enforced upon the Government and tens of thousands of its citizens sacrificed, bun of the Constitution by threats of disunion and dreds of thousands of widows and orphans cast | blood. interests, shall the slaveholding traitor grasp belief of the leaders of the South.

to ce or vote can reach him. We must rightly comprehend the unparal- individual and national freedom.

perious oligarchy never ruled a government.

destroy whatever enemy threatens its life.

Vattel, a writer of caution, and of high authority on national law, lays it down that-" A State has a right to everything that can secure it from threatened danger, and to keep at a distance what-ever is capable of causing its ruia. A nation is obliged to preserve it-elf, and the law of nature gives it the right to everything without which it could not fulfill this obli-

gation.
"The law of nations is originally no more than the law "The law of nations is originally no more than the law of nature applied to nations. We call that the necessary law of nature to nations. It is recessary because nations are absolutely obliged to observe it. The necessary law of nations, being founded on the nature of things is immutable. Whence, as this law is immutable, and the obligations that arise from it necessary and indispensable, nations can neither make any changes in it by their containing the property of the containing nations can neither make any changes in it by their conventions, dispense with it themselves, nor reciprocally with each other."

Again, Mr. Rawle, in his view of the Constitution, in speaking of our duty to maintain the Union, says :

Slavery is the parricide that now aims at perpetual bonds, it we would secure to the naon safety and peace.

The right of a State to preserve itself is

o to do by a necessary and paramount law .-Every writer of authority on the law of nations agrees with Vattel touching the right of national self defense. The law is consonant with eason and justice and the common sense of

Government, and the hostile character of the bitter enmity for generations to come. enemy by which it is assailed. If we are a league of independent States, each having the right to withdraw ut pleasure, and for causes the sufficiency of which each may judge, then in any proceeding by the master to the Confederate States are right in the independence they assume, and the war on our establish his lovalty before an order shall be part is a war of subjugation, flagrant and unnade for the surrender of the slave. The bill just. Our right to carry on the war can only also provides for the confiscation to the nation | be defended on the ground that we are a neal Treasury of both the real and personal estion, bound by the obligation to defend our

tricts where they can be held, of the property freedom given to no other people, a prosperity and each nation has the right to decide for it This must of necessity be so. The right is estimated in the blessings it conferred. The armed revolt of the sential to the freedom of nations. Vattel says: The second section, that providing for slaveholders against a Government so just and the emancipation of the slaves of rebels, I sus- benificent is the most detestible crime on retsia in the whole length and breadth of its cord. Slavery arms brother against brother, provisions. While I shall claim for the Gov- and imbrues the nation in fraternal blood. It tument full power over the subject of slavery, offers alliances with foreign despots and con-I would not at this time go beyond the pro- sents to the establishment of monarchies on fisions of this bill. I would to day give free our continent. Does any Senator on this side om to the slaves of every traitor; and after of the Chamber doubt that slavery is the imhat would confidently look for the early adop- mediate cause of our troubles? If not, then I on of the policy recommended by the Presi- claim his support for such measures against ent, gradually to work out the great result | slavery as shall make it powerless for future and how far we will be bound by the customa-Special guarantees are claimed for the pro- security for the future. The nation must never ction of slavery. Exemption is demanded again pass under the yoke of the slave power. for it from the hazards and necessities of war. We must have no reconstruction reestablishing questioned. Greater security is attempted to be thrown the domination of slavery. We shall deserve, around it than is accorded to any other inter- and will receive, the scorn and execration of est or right. I deny the legality of this pre- the civilized world if we step back from the that the law of nations is violated? If nationtension in behalf of slavery. It has no constitutions duty before us. We must give the countail all law is invaded nations must come to its suptational basis. Its claims of peculiar sacred try lasting peace; we must cripple forever the port. Does any Senator believe that the pasness, and for special protection, are an in-ult power of slavery, and enfranchise the nation sage of this bill would provoke towards us the to the nation. Life and liberty are made sec from its insolent rule. Slavery has made and

upon the charity of friends for support, all that It is an element of constant disturbance and pation would be hailed with joy throughout the we possess, life and property, ere at the dis- danger. Mr. Calhoun earlier saw and more civilized world. For this we would receive the Posal of the Government : slavery alone claims | clearly compreheaded than his cotemp raries | plaudits instead of the censure of nations. exemption, the cause of the rebellion, the par- the irreconcilable antagonism between freedom ent of all the calamities that threaten and and slavery. Commodore Stewart is the witoffict as. This great revolt against the integ ness that, as early as 1814, Mr. Calhoun be tity and sovereigney of the nation has no other came satisfied that the two systems of society foundation than slavery. Democratic govern- and labor could not both stand under one Gov ment is a perpetual danger to slavery. The erament; that slavery must go to the wall, or government of an oligarchy is demanded as a dissolution of the Union was inevitable. He enemy in time of war, and who, at the time security for its perpetuity and power. Here devoted his life in giving strength to slavery, is the cause of the rebellion with its immense and thus preparing for the conflict which he sacrifices of life and treasure. Amidst the saw must surely come. What Mr. Calbonn sacrifices of this hour, this universal wreck of saw in 1814 is now the philosophy and fixed securely his human chattel? Not, sir, if my on their part is for the perpetuity of slavery, and this can only be secured at the expense of

elled wickedness of slavery, and the desperate The Constitution is continually pushed for determination with which it makes war on the ward in support of the inviolability of slavery. Gorernment, or we shall fail to deal with it as Sir, I deny that the Constitution contains any our security and peace demand. For thirty special guarantees in behalf of slavery. It pro-Jears slaveholders have looked with fear and vides for the surrender of persons owing labor hatred on our free system of government. - or service escaping from one State into another Universal suffrage and the wide diffusion and to the person to whom such labor or service is increase of knowledge were sources of constant | due. This is as applicable to apprentices as to dread. For years they have kept the peace slaves; and, at the time the Constitution was only on the terms of their domination and our framed, embraced a large number of emigrants surjection. They have governed the country, known as redemptioners. No one ever claimed shaped its foreign and domestic policy, con- that property in the service of an apprentice trolled its legislation on all questions of interest | was specially placed under national protection to themselves, and administered, in their own because of this provision. If, however, the

hands or through northern men subservient to Constitution were all that slavery claims for it them, every high office of State. A more im- in this respect, the paramount law of self-preservation is not the less obligatory on the nation. The freemen-the democracy of the nation | Whatever we deem necessary, in the exercise -in the election of Abraham Lincoln, vindi- of an honest and sound discretion, as a means cated their right to administer the Govern- of preserving national existence, that we have ment, and in the first hour of victory were met the authority of reason and of law to do. This by the armed rebellion of the slaveholders - doctrine is clearly recognized in the late spe-Shall slavery overthrow this Government ?- | cial message of the President to Congress re-The nation has the right of self defense, of commending national aid to the liberating self protection—the right to make secure its border States. It is sound law, and has both peace and safety, and to remove whatever reason and authority in its support. Slavery stands in the way. Slavery, in the war it has is not only the cause, but one of the great supprovoked, perils the national existence. It is ports of the rebellion. Slaves do much of the the immutable law of nature and of nations, work of the rebel army -throw up the intrenchthat a State shall preserve itself, that it may ments and build the fortifications of the enemy Their labor, in a large degree, furnishes the means of support to the armies employed against us, and gives to the Confederate States the little credit they have either at home or abroad. Yet slavery is the one thing we must not disturb. We must not directly attack it, even though the nation petish through our forbearance. To no other interest do we accord this exemption from the dangers and necessities of war.

visions are not as broad and sweeping as its of confiscation against the property of all rebels, but against the property of such only as shall be beyond the reach of judicial process. The bill is based on the principle that if the "In every aspect, therefore, which this great su ject presents, we feel the (expest impression of a sacred obligation to preserve the Union of our country; we feel our glory, our safety, and our happiness involved in it; we finite the interests of those who coldly calculate advantages with those who glow with what is little short of flifal affection, and we must resist the attempt of our own citizens to destroy it with the same feelings that we should avert the dagger of the parricide."

The Union, says:

rebel can be arrested, and punishment inflicted upon him through the courts, his property is not moiested. But if he abandon his property, and flee the country, or be within territory where the rebellion has overrided; the authority of the United States, the bill proposes, after condemnation in court, or by military commissioners when no courts can be held, to take and selfrebel can be arrested, and punishment inflicted when no courts can be held, to take and sell the national life. We must bind the criminal in his property, placing its proceeds in the national Treasury. I favor the amendment adopted on Thursday last, of the Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Sherman.) I desire to reach only learly set forth by Vattel; may, it is obliged the property of the leaders of the rebellion -To the masses of the southern people, who have been grossly deceived, I would grant an am-

esty, a full and free pardon.
Three grounds of objection are made to this bill. It is claimed to be in contravention of mankind, and needs no citation of authorities the law of nations; violative of the Constitu tion of the United States; and that its pas-The law being established, the only questions sage would be most impolitic, driving our enepen for examination are, the nature of this mies to desperation, and sowing the seeds of

> I will consider, briffy, the objections presented. The Senator from Missouri, (Mr Henderson) labored learnedly to make good the first ground of objection. He cited authorties of weight and respectability; but upon urther examination be will find, I think, the law settled against him, both on general au-

thority and by the decision of our own courts. National law rests upon the law of nature, conventional law, or treaties, and upon general customs which, by common consent, have this act, be engaged in the rebellion, or in give ing it aid and comfort, and who are beyond the United States, or, if within the United states, or, if within the United states are unity and life? All enlightened and impartial men will give the same answer of nations. Of this I considered in speaking the force of law. Nations are bound by the States, are beyond the reach of judicial process. Slavery is that enemy—the deadly and persist.

The bill does not per se work a forfeiture, but ent foe of the nation. Slavery has organized versal obligation, binding at all times and unforfeiture takes place after seizore and appro for the overthrow of the Government the der all circumstances. Conventional law rests iation by the commissioners appointed to act greatest rebellion in history, and without cause, apon conventions and treaties, and of course within those States and districts where the re- save its fear and batred of republican institu. binds those mations only that are parties to bellion makes the holding of courts impossible, tions. The nation was prosperous and happy: them. General customs or usage have the auand after condemnation by the courts, in dis- life and property were secure ; we enjoyed a thority of law only by the consent of nations, seized, upon proceeding in rem, as in prize full to overflowing. Every blessing and every self under what circumstances and to what cases, or cases of forfeiture arising under the right was ours. The Government was only extent it will submit to a custom or usage —

"The natural society of nations cannot subsist if the rights each have received from nature are not respected.

None would willingly renounce its liberty; it would
rather break off all connection with those that should attempt to violate it. From this liberty and independence t follows that every nation is to judge what its conscience

As an independent member of the commonwealth of nations, we alone determine when mischief. I demand indemnity for the past and ry law. Upon the hypothesis, then, that the measure before us is in conflict with international law, still our right to enact it cannot be

Should we pass this bill, what power will annul it within our jurisdiction, on the ground hostility of nations? Would the foreign ministers resident here, protest on behalf their respective Governments? Sir, we know subjected to heavy contributions, the lives of country novel and unwarrantable constructions they would not, and for the best of reasons; the bill does not impinge on the national law. So much of the bill as is a measure of emanci-

I have thus far considered the case on the hypothesis that the bill is violative of national law, and presented the ground that we are bound to obedience by our consent alone. But the law is well settled in favor of our right to seize and confiscate the property of an alien of seizure, is engaged in peaceful commerce .-The case is greatly strengthened against a rebel in arms. The point was decided in our Supreme Court, in the case of Brown us. The United States, (8 Cranch, 110.) The points

raised for adjudication were: 1. May enemies' property found on land at the commencement of hostilities be seized and condemned? And

2 Is an act of Congress, anthorizing such seizure and condemnation, necessary; or does the right follow a declaration of war ? The opinion of the court was delivered by

Chief Justice Marshall. On the first point, the court says: the court says:

"Respecting the power of the Government, no doubt is entertained. That war gives the sovereign fall right to take the persons, confiscate the property of the enemy wherever found, is conceded. The mitigations of this rule, which the humane and wise policy of modern times has introduced into practice, will more or less affect the exercise of this right, but cannot impair the right itself. That remains unfimilished, and when the sovereign and the right is the control of the control hority shall choose to bring it into operation, the judi-tal department must give effect to its will."

Kent, in commenting on this case, says: " However strong the current of authority in favor of "However strong the current of authority in favor of the modern and milder construction of the rule of national law on this subject, the point seems to be no longer open for discussion in this country. It has been definitely settled in favor of the ancient and sterner rule, by the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of war on British property, found in the United States, on land, at the commencement of the war, was learnedly discussed and thoroughly considered, in the case of Brown; and it was decided as upon a settled rule of the law of nations that the goods of an enemy found in the country, and the vessels and cargoes found affort in our ports, at the commencement of hostilities, are liable to seizeure and confiscation; and the exercise of the right vested in the discretion of the sovereign of the nation."

The right to seize and confiscate the proper-

adjudications of our own courts can establish change the punishment of treason by declarit. He who is both a public enemy and a traitor surely cannot claim to stand in a better position than an alien enemy actually guilty of no offence. The traitors of our country occupy a very different position from that of lawful belligerents. It is true that we accord to live in Europe inaffluence on the revenue from them many belligerent rights, but we may properly treat them as traitors. As against them, we are possessed of every belligerent right, as fully as if they were an independent nation Mr. President, I come now to consider the levying war against us; and we are also posbill as an act of confiscation. Here its pro sessed of all the rights of a legitimate sovereign against traitors in armed revolt. Their opponents represent. It is not a general act property cannot be reached, because they are citizens, and entitled to the protection of the Constitution!

" No person shall be deprived of life, liber y, or property, without due process of law;" that is, without proceedings according to the course of the common law. How grossly we iolate the Constitution in shooting down these citizen traitors! There can be no mistake.The violation of the Constitution is most palpable. We take the lives of these citizens and brothers without due process of law. How abserd is all this. Those in rebellion are both traitors and public enemies, and are ameanable to the laws provided against both. An alien nemy, whose property is found among us, naving never himself borne arms against the country, this property we seize and forfeit ; but f his allegiance were due to us, if we had sworn to support and defend the Constitution. and then wickedly perjured himself, if he had borne commission in tebel armies, and devoted his all to the overthrow of the Government, we cannot take and forfeit his property ; it is under the segis of the Constitution, and must be used only in the service of the rebellion !-The very point I am now considering was recently before the United States district court for Massachusetts.

The Army Warwack was captured on the igh seas by the United States ship of war Quaker City, August 10, 1861. The libel was against both vessel and cargo. The vessel and eart of the cargo were admitted to belong to itizens and perminent residents of Richmond, Virginia. The hearing was confined to the property so owned; the question as to the est of the cargo being left for future investigation. Sprague, Justice, delivered the opinon of the court. I give so much as bears on he point under consideration :

Some have apprehended that if this conflict of arms s to be deemed war, our enemies must have, as against he Government, all the immunities of international bel-igerents. But this is to overlook the double character acter of beligerent and sovereign, and have the rights of both. These rights coexist, and may be exercised at pleasure. Thus we may treat the rebel crew of a rebel privateer, merely as prisoners of war, or as pirates or traitors; or we may at the same time give to a part of the crew the one character, and to the residue the other, and after treating them as prisoners of war, we may expend after treating them as prisoners of war, we may expended the crew the one character, and to the residue the other, and after treating them as prisoners of war, we may ex-ercise over them sovereign power and deal with them as itors. The temporary non-user of such rights is not renunciation of them, but they may be called into

Mr. Wharton, in his Elements of International Law, nave been intended; for if sovereign rights be at an end, the war is merely international. Civil war, ex vi termini, imports that sovereign rights are not reling ed, but insisted on. The war is waged to maintain them. Rose vs. Himely (4 Cranch. 272) was a case arising out of the exercise of sovereign rights by France in her civil war with St. Domingo. The court recognized the coexistence of belligerent and sovereign rights."

"The United States have, during the present war, exercised both belligerent and sovereign rights."

ercised both belligerent and sovereign rights. Examples of the former are, receiving capitulation of the enemy as prisoners of war, and holding and exchanging them as such; and a still more prominent ustance is the blockade which, before the assembling of longress, was astablished by millioner assembling of

"I am satisfied that the United States as a nation have full and complete belligerent rights. which are in no degree impared by the fact that their enemies owe allegiance, and have superadded the guilt of treason to that of unjust war."

The confiscation of the property of those engaged in rebellion and unsuccessful revolution is a part of the history of civilized nations. It is deeply impressed upon English legislation during the last century. Half the titles of the kingdom rest upon acts and decrees of confiscation. Such, too, is the history of France. Every one, I think, of the Thirteen Colonies confiscated the property of enemies within their respective jurisdictions in the time of our own Revolution. The property of German refugees who engaged in the revoluion of 1848 beyond question was confiscated. It is the policy and practice of every nation thus to punish rebellion and treason In passing this bill, we are traveling in the beaten path of nations. All men who understand the true nature of the struggle in which we are engaged will hail this measure as just, and demanded by a wise consideration of our own interests, and by the airocious wickedness of our enemy.

Again: objections is made to the bill because of alleged unconstitutionality. The Constitution, after defining the crime of treason, provides that-

"Congress shall have power to declare the punishi of treason; but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attained."

What is " attainder," as here used ? Simly judicial judgment against an offender for the crime of treason. The provision then is, no judgment pronounced by a court for treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture beyond the life of the party. This provision chared the rule of the common law ; the indement of a court against an offender for forfeited to the Crown. The Constitution upon the slaves for military service, and take not throw it into the nest.

simply does away with the common-law coase- him out of the power and control of his master. quences of the judgment, by declaring that no His authority as military commander goes not attainder, that is, no judgment for treason, shall beyond his lines. He has no power whatever work corruption of blood or forfeiture beyond of confiscation. He may take such military the life of the party against whom judgment stores, forage, and provisions as are necessary shall be pronounced. Our right to confiscate for the support of his Army, and this he may the property of rebels cannot be affected by a do alike from friends or foe. constitutional provision which declares that The supreme power of this Governments, certain consequences which attached to a judg- under and within the limits of this Constitument for treason at common law, shall not follow such judgment here. This bill does of Brown vs. The United States, while it was The right to seize and confiscate the property of an alien enemy, wherever found within our territory, is as clearly established as the ing a forfeiture of estate as part of the penalty. Those whose property is taken are beyond the reach of personal punishment. Are the refugees of this rebellion to live upon the revenues of large estates here? Is Slidell to estate in Louisana? Does a traitor, possessing large estate, gain immunity from all punishment whatever by fleeing the contry and making his permaneut residence abroad ?

Sir, this hill has no relation whatever to the punishment provided against treason. It attaches to the property of those in rebellion, and provides for proceedings in rem and not in personam. The two are wholly distinct. Under this bill, you take and confiscate the property of rebels; if afterwards they should come within our power, they may be indicted, convicted, and hung for the crime of treason. The bill provides for proceeding in rem, as in prize cases, and in no way affects the penalties in personam adminis-

tered by our criminal courts.

The case of the Palmyra (12 Wheaton, p. 1) was the case of seizure by a Government vessel, the Grampus, under the acts of piracy, of the 3d March, 1819, and of 15th May, 1820. One ground taken against a condemnnation of the vessel was, that it was not averred in the libel that there had been a conviction in personam of the offense charged in the libel; and it was contended that there must be a conviction upon an indictment for the offense in personam, averred and proved, in order to maintain the libel in rem.

Justice Story, who delivered the opinion of

the court, in noticing this objection, says :-"The point of objection is of an important and diffi-cult nature. It is well known that at common law, in many cases of felonies, the party forfeited his goods and chattles to the Crown. No right to the goods and chat-tles of the telon could be acquired by the Crown by the mere commission of the offence; but the right attached vested until conviction. But this doctrine never was ap-plied to seizures and forfeitures created by statute in rem, plied to seizures and forficitures created by statute in rem, cognizable on the revenue side of the exchequer. The thing is here primarily considered as the offender, or rather the offense is primarily attached to the thing. Many cases exist where the forfeiture for acis done attaches solely in rem, and there is no accompanying penalty in personam. Many cases exist where there is both a forfeiture in rem, and a personal penalty. But in neither class of cases has it ever been decided that the prosecutions were dependent upon each other. But the practice tions were dependent upon each other. But the practice has been, and so this court understand the law to be that the proceeding in rem stands independent of and wholly unaffected by any criminal proceeding in personam." Here the offense is attached to thing, and

the bill provides for proceedings in rem, as in prize cases or forfeitures arising under the revenue laws. It has no connection whatever with criminal proceedings in personam; they are still open to be resorted to, if the offender nal process.

The Constitution provides that " no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed;" and it is objected that the bill under consideration impinges on this constitutional provision. It is claimed to be a bill of pains and penalties within the mischief, and therefore within the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder. I agree, if this be a bill of " pains and penalties," that we have no constitutional power to enact it. A bill of "attainder," differs from a bill of " pains and penalties," only in pronouncing the judgment of death, instead of a milder punishment .-Both are equally within the reason and spirit of the constitutional prohibition. In both, the Legislature assumes judicial functions, and pronounces sentence for past offenses, and without the safeguards of a trial. No jury, co court, no evidence-the Legislature, by an act of legislation, pronounces sentence. Both a bill of attainder and a bill of pains and penalties are of the nature of ex post facto laws .-In both, the Legislature assumes judicial functions, and proceeds to conviction without law

This bill has no feature of a bill of pains and penalties. It is not ex post facto ; it inflicts no penalty for past offenses, but only infliets forfeiture against such as shall, after its passage, be guilty of bearing arms against the United States, or in giving them aid and comfort. It pronounces no legislative sentence .-The bill itself does not appropriate any propty, but only makes the appropriation after condemnnation by the courts, or through commissioners where the rebellion makes the sitting of courts impossible. If it is complained that the bill gives too great power to the commissioners. I answar that this objection is not open to those who, by arms, have set up another jurisdiction, and driven our courts from the territory of several States. This would be to give exemption to the property of traitors because of their treason. Very extraordinary powers are claimed for

of slaves and the confiscation of property. As Commander-in-Chief, it is claimed that he has full power to emancipate the slaves, and the right to take for public use such property of the robels as he pleases. This, sir, is claiming sess them, then, indeed, does war make him as absolute as the Czer or Sultan. The Presideut, as commander in Chief, has no power to emancipate slaves, except as actually connect. "Oh, yes," said editor No. 1, "Jones here ed with his military operations, and here he is did the "lyin," and I did the "lammis'," and limited to the actual power of the force under of course we came down together." his command. A general in the field has the same power. A proclamation by the Presi deut of general emancipation, or of emancipaof the slaves of rebels, is utterly without force. He may control by martial law (which, for the treason did corrupt the blood, and destroy its time being, supersedes the municipal law) inheritable qualities, and his property became within his military array. Here he may call

not pronounce judgment against any one. No determined that we might confiscate enemies' property found on the land; it was also decided-and the case turned on this pointthat the power of confiscating enemies' property is in Congress. After citing the acts of Congress declaring war against Great Britale, the court says :

"There being no other set of Congress which bears up-on the subject, it is considered as proved that the Leg-islature has not confiscated enemy property which was within the United States at the declaration of war, and this sentence of condemnation cannot be sustained."

"It appears to the court, that the power of confiscat-ing enemy property is in the Legislature, and that the Legislature has not yet declared its will to confiscate property which was within our territory at the declara-tion of war."

This disposes effectually of the extraordinary pretentions set up for the President, as a ground of opposition to this bill. Those who really favor the confiscation of rebel property. will go for some legislation to affectuate that The President has no more power of end. confiscation than any Senator on this floor.

Mr. President, the passage of the bill is demauded by the strongest considerations of justice and policy. It is very much a question, whether the property of loyal men of the North shall be confiscated by taxation, or the vast property of the leading rebels be taken to defray in part the expenses of the war? Between independent Powers, it is not unusual in treaties of peace to introduce stipulations providing for the payment in part by one party to the other of the expenses attending the war. Indeed, it is most common in modern times. If nations thus claim and receive indemnity for the expenses into which unjust war has plunged them, may we not, with m ch justice and propriety indemnify ourselves in part for the enormous cost of this most causeless and unprovoked war? All loyal men agree that the rebellion must be crushed out. This can only be done by driving the leaders from the country and confiscating their estates. They must be reduced to poverty before their power in the South can be broken. Our interests and our safety demand the speedy passage of this bill. Leniency emboldens the traitors. They feel secure in their property, come what may. Those suspected of loyalty only suffer. Refuse to pass this bill, and you offer a premium to disloyalty and treason. The safety of a man's property in the South will impel him to side with our enemies. The rebels seize and appropriate the property of loyalists; we secure and protect the property of rebels. The passage of this measure is demanded as a just measure of retaliation. Hundreds of millions of property in the South, belonging to northern men, has been confiscated or destroyed. Other hundreds of millions of debts due our merchants and manufacturers, and of investments in railroad stocks and other southern securities, has been forfeited to the rebel government. Other millions, the property of loyal southern men, have been pillaged and destroyed. " A State," says Vat'le, "taking up arms in a just cause has a double right against its enemy. A right of putting itself in possession of what belongs to it, and which the enemy withholds; and to this must be added the expenses incurred to this end, the charges of the war, and the reparation of damage." We must not give license to rebellion by the forbearance with which we treat the rebels. We must protect the interests of loyal citizens by charging the property of traitors with the expenses of the war.

A PAGAN LEGEND OF JESTS - Publing Lentuins, assumed by some to have been proconsal of Judes prior to Herod, is reported to have seen the Saviour, and to have written the following letter to the Roman Senate :

" At this time appeared a man who is still

living, and endowed with mighty powers; his name is Jesus Christ. His disciples call him the son of Goo; others regard-bim as a powerful prophet. He raises the dead to life, and beals the sick of every description of infirmity and disease. This man is of lofty stature and well proportioned; his countenance severe and virtuous, so that he inspires beholders with feelings both of fear and love. The bair of his head is of the color of wine, and from the top of his head to the ears, straight and without radiance, but descends from the ears to the shoulders in shining carls. From the shoulders the hair flows down the back, divided into two portions, after the manner of the Nazarenes : his forehead is clear and without wrinkle, his face free from blemish, and slightly tinged with read, his physonogomy noble and gracious. The nose and mouth are faultless. The beard is abundant, the same color of his hair, and forked. His eyes are blue and very brilliant. In reproving or consuring he is awe inspiring ; in exhorting and teaching his speech is gentle and caressing. His countenance is marvellogs in seriousuess and grave. He has never once been seen to laugh, but many have seen him weep. He is slender in person, his the President on this subject of emancipation | hands are straight and long, his arms are beautiful. Grave and solemn in his discourse, his language is simple and quiet. In appearance he is the most beautiful of the children of men.

Smith once met two editors who had large powers for the President, and if he pos- always been at outs, walking arm in arm in the streets.

" Hillo," said Smith, " the lion and lamb he down together, to day "

Some of the editors of the South propose to use up their type metal for balls for shooting-irons. They couldn't do more mischief that way than they do now.

Goo gives every bird its food, but does