

Montrose Democrat.

A. J. GERRITSON, Publisher.

MONTROSE, PA., TUESDAY, FEB. 27, 1866.

VOLUME XXIII, NUMBER 9.

FOR THE DEMOCRAT. A True and Complete History of the Great Conflict between Democracy and Abolitionism, and of the War between the North and the South.

Great have been the rejoicings of a portion of the American people over the downfall of Democracy and the triumph of Abolitionism! Whether these rejoicings will yet be turned into mourning, is not for the historian of the past to foretell. But when a republic, a dynasty, or any form of government is overthrown, and a new one erected in its place, it is customary for the historian, who gives an account of its rise and fall to the world, to give a history also of the characters who led the revolution, or gave principal aid to the downfall, or the victory.

Following then the example of other historians, we will introduce the reader to a scene in a principal city in the year 1815:

"The whole square around the City Hall, and the streets leading to it, were lined with people. An arch was erected in the middle of the grand square, opposite the entrance to the cathedral. Two lines of battalion lined both sides of the way, from the entrance of the square toward the river to the church. The balconies of the windows of the City Hall—the parsonage house, and all the adjacent buildings were filled with spectators. The triumphal arch was supported by six columns. Among those on the right was a young lady representing Justice, and on the left another representing Liberty.—Under the arch were two young children, each on a pedestal, holding a crown of laurel. From the arch in the middle of the square to the church, at proper intervals, were ranged young ladies, representing the different States and Territories composing the American Union, all dressed in white, covered with transparent veils, and wearing a silver star on their foreheads. Each of these young ladies held in her right hand a flag, inscribed with the name of the State or Territory she represented, and in the left a basket trimmed with blue ribbons and full of flowers. Behind each, was a shield, suspended on a lance stuck in the ground, inscribed with the name of a State or Territory. The intervals had been so calculated, that the shields, linked together with verdant festoons, occupied the distance from the triumphal arch to the church. The hero of the scene, accompanied by the officers of his staff, arrived at the entrance of the square, and walked to the church by the walk prepared for him. As he passed under the arch, he received the crowns of laurel from the children, and was congratulated in an address spoken by a young lady, who represented the State. He then proceeded to the church, amidst the salutations of the young ladies, representing the different States, who strewed his passage with flowers. At the church he was received by the Abbe Dubourg, who addressed him in a suitable speech, and conducted him to a seat prepared for him near the altar. Te Deum Laudamus was chanted with impressive solemnity, after which a guard of honor attended him to his quarters, and in the evening the City with its suburbs, was magnificently illuminated.—Parton.

What City is this which presents so gorgeous a pageant? and who is the personage whose head is thus crowned with the laurels of honor, and his pathway strewn with flowers? This is the City of New Orleans—and that crowned hero is the champion of Democracy—the defender of the people of the South in after years from the incendiary torch of abolitionism; the patriot who declared that the Union there represented by the young females, with silver stars in their foreheads, must be preserved against the conspirators who denounced it as an unholy alliance; the President of the United States, who warned his people in two annual messages against the party which now bears rule over the once happy Republic of America.

What were the circumstances which brought this illustrious character to that far-off City in the South, where even in the temple of the Most High, praises were chanted to Almighty God for victories vouchsafed by his hand? The following ballad will be the first answer, and let it be here observed, that these verses were printed in a Federal newspaper, an organ of the party which has labored for sixty years to overthrow the principles of this Old Hero, and which was then so hostile to Democracy, that when the nation desired to reward the valor of this patriot warrior by elevating him to the Presidency, they detracted from his merits, denounced and persecuted him, as they denounced and persecuted another illustrious hero during this war, because he would not renounce the principles of Democracy, bow his knee at the shrine of Abolitionism, throw aside the banner of Washington and Jackson, and raise the dark and bloody banner of the great conspirator, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and his first officer, Capt. John Brown, senior.

The Battle of New Orleans—Written for the Gleaner, Feb. 1815.

Bold Pakenham came, with Gibbs and Keane,
And thousands of warriors—the heroes of Spain;
New Orleans to capture they thought would be play,
"Come on," cried their Chief, "I will lead you the way."
"Behold yonder steeples and houses so close—
They stand, my brave boys, but a league from our line;
Storm their works and the City shall be your reward,
Remember that 'Beauty and Booty' the word!"

Disgrace to thy country! Thou monster accursed!
To inflame the foul soldiers with avarice and lust,
Was honor and courage extinct in each breast?
To rouse them, must passions like these be addressed?

But lo! they approach: in their columns they come.
The red cross flies high: hark, the life and the drum!
Meanwhile in the fort, all prepared for the strife,
Brave Jackson resolves to yield only with life.

Surrounded by freemen, all hearty and bold,
Who fight not for booty, or rapine, or gold;
But who to the conflict have cheerfully come,
In defence of their altars, wives, sweethearts and home.

"Protect us, O God! from these merciless hands,
Inspire us with courage, and strengthen our bands."
Thus Jackson, to Heaven sent up a short prayer,
And then to the battle directed his care.

Our thirty-two pounders then blazed on the foe:
Lo! heaps upon heaps by our fire were laid low;
"They falter," cries Jackson, "behold they retire;
Again, boys, they rally—haste, pour in your fire!"

Behold in their ranks what confusion is spread;
Three times have they rallied, three times have they fled:
A thousand and more of their best troops have been slain—
Gibbs falls badly wounded, and Pakenham's dead!

New Orleans is safe! Yet see on beauty's cheek
The frowning tears, which strong emotion speak;
But oh! those tears are not to sorrow given—
They flow from joy and gratitude to Heaven.

While old Mississippi to Ocean shall flow,
The laurels of Jackson shall flourish and grow;
Future ages with transport shall publish his fame,
And mingle his praises with Washington's name."

Washington achieved the first victory over the British crown, and when England attempted the second time to subjugate America, Jackson, imbued with the spirit of Washington, delivered his country again from the British yoke. When Washington was fighting for his country, a scene occurred in Boston similar to this in New Orleans, where the aged, the infirm, the matrons, the daughters and the children of the City all went out to meet their deliverers—to receive with felicitations the saviours of their country.

Every countenance was expressive of gratitude, joy sparkled in every feature, on beholding fathers, brothers, husbands, sons, who had so recently saved the lives, fortunes and honor of their families, by repelling an enemy come to conquer and subjugate their country—and all were present to see their hero crowned with laurels.

After Washington had compelled the British army to evacuate the City of Boston, "the exiled people and their friends streamed in, and all hearts were touched at witnessing the tender interviews and fond embraces of those who had been long separated. The select men of Boston addressed Washington in the name of the liberated inhabitants: "Next to the divine power we ascribe to your wisdom that this acquisition has been made with so little effusion of blood," and words of gratitude hung on the faltering lips of all the people."

Washington and Jackson did not believe with the Abolitionists of the present day that the life-blood of a man was not more precious than so much water.—Washington drove the British from Massachusetts, with the loss of but twenty American soldiers, while Gen. Jackson drove them from New Orleans with a loss inferior even to that. And let it be here remembered that both these saviours of our country were Southern born men—that we are indebted to the South for our own independence from the tyranny of Great Britain; that both these patriot warriors who achieved these great victories were slaveholders—that they were Christians—whose last of earth will be described, and that so far from believing in negro equality, they both aided in founding a government which excluded the African race from any share therein.

The following letter was addressed to the Earl of Liverpool, in England, upon the arrival of the intelligence of the victory of New Orleans, by Wm. Cobbet, who had resided sometime in America, which will give a further view of that achievement:

"My lord, within the last week I received a bundle of American newspapers, for which I am indebted to a gentleman of that country, which I immediately perused, and hasten to inform your lordship of their contents. The first paper I laid my eyes upon was headed in large capitals, 'Glorious News! Unparalleled Victory obtained by the American arms under General Jackson, at New Orleans!'"

"Should I tell you that it was with astonishment that I read of the unexampled defeat and carnage of the forces under Major General Pakenham, brother-in-law of our immortalized living General, the Duke of Wellington, and Marquis of Talavera; should I say I, who have so often told you—so often forewarned you of what would be the fate of all the armies you should send to America—should I own to you my astonishment at their being beaten and driven off the field by a yankee general, what would your lordship think? But, my lord, I was amazed! I was under the agony of an ague, and

the very highest paroxysm of a fever. I, who had ever said from the very day of the sailing of the regiments under Gen. Ross that they only went to meet disgrace; I, who have ever been repeating to you that your sappers, your miners, and your rocketmen were nothing at all in comparison to a Kentucky rifle in the hands of a backwoodsman—shall I again own to you that I was amazed. You must recollect, my lord, that I deprecated the cruelty of sending men to America who were just panting from their fights and fatigues in Spain and in France, yet, although I calculated on their being beaten, I did not expect to see them shot down, one hundred men, rank and file, for one of the enemy.

"This military miracle, for I can call it nothing else, really places all of Bonaparte's former victories in the shade; they bear no comparison; in a word, it has not its parallel anywhere. The strongest fortress that was ever besieged—Gibraltar itself—refer to history, my lord, I beg of you, for three hundred years, and see if you find anything like it. Gracious God! it is too shocking for animadversion. Half a dozen more such expeditions, and I fear we should have scarcely men left to walk the parade of St. James, or to change duty at the Horse Guards.

"And here I must not omit to mention the reward the American Congress bestowed upon their gallant officer, General Jackson. Gallant I am forced to call him, although he has been our severest enemy. A resolution was passed that 'the thanks of Congress be presented to General Jackson, and to the brave officers and men under his command; and that the President be requested to cause a gold medal to be struck and presented to him.' This is the reward which the American government is in the habit of showing to bravery; and the bravest man in it neither looks for or expects a greater remuneration. But alter the position, and let us suppose that Sir Edward Pakenham had been successful, what would you and the British parliament have done for Sir Edward? Would a dukedom have been too much for him had he gained possession of the great key to all the commerce of the western States, even to the heart of Pennsylvania, the Mississippi river? Would the dukedom of Orleans in reversion, with a grant of as many thousands sterling as there are stars in the firmament, been too much, in your imagination, for the man who would have possessed himself of this magical padlock and key, which opened or closed at pleasure the gates of all the commerce of a country seven times as large in extent as England and Scotland together?"

"And yet, my lord, the American general who defended that important spot, and who in defending it gave such a lesson of military self-defence as never an army of the world received before, is doubtless well contented, thankful and grateful, with the thanks of his countrymen, and I would wager that he values the little gold medal full as much or more than you or your generals would value the dukedom and the estate.

"My lord, had the duke of Wellington been at New Orleans, what would have prevented him sharing the same fate of Pakenham?"

The party which is now so anxious to reward the negroes for helping to fight the South, were not so anxious to reward General Jackson for helping to conquer our British foes.

Had this been a monarchical government like England, he would have received a dukedom, with all other honors that that could have been bestowed upon him, and yet the very party which now rules over America treated him with contempt, and heaped upon him every indignity, because that, although he was the "Hero of New Orleans," he was a Democrat, and they would rather live under a monarchy than under a Democracy, where all white men had an equal right to power. Their love for the negroes is based solely on the hope that by their aid they can establish a despotism instead of a Democracy over the great American Republic.

The New York Enquirer of 1827, says: "The federal journals are warmly attacking the character and military services of Gen. Jackson. It is the same party which encouraged rebellion and a separation of the Union during the late war. When the British troops arrived in New Orleans, the Boston Sentinel said: 'They have acquired laurels in Spain, and we hope they may reap fresh laurels in America.'"

These stories wanted to come under the British Crown rather than to live under a Democratic form of government. When they separated from Great Britain they intended to have a monarchy of their own. The Democratic principle prevailed, and they mean now to establish such a government as they wanted at the first. Democracy being overthrown in the North, if they can keep the South under their feet, then farewell to the liberties achieved for America by Washington and Jackson. Farewell to the Union of our Fathers! Farewell to our white brothers and sisters in the South, and all hail to negro equality, and negro fraternity, under a black republican monarchy!

READ THE VETO MESSAGE.

THE FREEDMAN'S BUREAU.

A VETO MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

To the Senate of the United States:

I have examined with care the bill which has been passed by the two Houses of Congress, to amend an act entitled an act to establish a bureau for the relief of freedmen and refugees, and for other purposes. Having, with much regret, come to the conclusion that it would not be consistent with the public welfare to give my approval to the measure, I return the bill to the Senate with my objections to its becoming a law. I might call to mind in advance of these objections that there is no immediate necessity for the proposed measure. The act to establish a bureau for the relief of the freedmen and refugees, which was approved in the month of March last, has not expired. It was thought stringent and extreme enough for the purpose in view in time of war. Before it ceases to have effect, further experience may assist to guide us to a wise conclusion as to the policy to be adopted in time of peace. I share with Congress the strongest desire to secure to the freedmen the full enjoyment of their freedom and their prosperity, and their entire independence and equality in making contracts for their labor; but the bill before me contains provisions which, in my opinion, are not warranted by the Constitution and are not well suited to accomplish the end in view. The bill proposes to establish, by authority of Congress, military jurisdiction over all parts of the United States containing refugees and freedmen. It would, by its very nature, apply with the most force to those parts of the United States in which the freedmen most abound—and it expressly extends the existing temporary jurisdiction of the Freedmen's Bureau, with greatly enlarged powers, over those States in which the ordinary course of judicial proceeding has been interrupted by the rebellion. The source from which this military jurisdiction is to emanate is none other than the President of the United States, acting through the War Department and the Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau. The agents to carry out this military jurisdiction are to be selected either from the army or from civil life; the country is to be divided into districts and sub districts, and the number of salaried agents to be employed may be equal to the number of counties or parishes in all the United States where freedmen or refugees are to be found. The subjects over which this military jurisdiction is to extend in every part of the United States, includes protection to all employees, agents and officers of this bureau in the exercise of the duties imposed upon them by the bill in eleven States. It is further to extend over all cases affecting freedmen and refugees discriminated against by local laws, custom, or prejudice. In those eleven States the bill subjects any white person who may be charged with depriving a freedman of any civil rights or immunities belonging to white persons, to imprisonment or fine, or both, without, however, defining the civil rights and immunities which are thus to be secured to the freedman by military law.

This military jurisdiction also extends to all questions that may arise respecting contracts. The agent who is thus to exercise the office of a judge may be a stranger, entirely ignorant of the laws of the place, and exposed to the errors of judgment to which all men are liable. The exercise of power, over which there is no legal supervision, by so vast a number of agents as is contemplated by this bill, must, by the very nature of man, be attended by acts of caprice, injustice and passion.

The trials having their origin under this bill, are to take place without the intervention of a jury and without any fixed rules of law or evidence. The rules on which offenses are to be heard and determined by the numerous agents are such rules and regulations as the President through the War Department shall prescribe. No previous presentment is required, nor any indictment charging the commission of a crime against the laws, but the trial must proceed on charges and specifications. The punishment will be, not what the law declares, but such as a court martial may think proper, and from these arbitrary tribunals there lies no appeal, no writ of error, to any of the courts in which the Constitution of the United States vests, exclusively the judicial power of the country. While the territory and the classes of actions and offenses that are made subject to this measure are so extensive, the bill itself should it become a law, will have no limitation in point of time, but will form part of the permanent legislation of the country.

I cannot conceive a system of military jurisdiction of this kind within the words of the Constitution which declares that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, excepting cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in service, in time of war or public danger," and that "in all criminal proceedings the

accused shall enjoy the right to speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State or district wherein the crime shall have been committed.

The safeguards which the experience and wisdom of ages taught our fathers to establish as securities for the protection of the innocent, the punishment of the guilty, and the equal administration of justice, are to be set aside, and for the sake of a more vigorous interposition in behalf of justice, we are to take the risk of the many acts of injustice that would necessarily follow from an almost countless number of agents established in every parish or county in nearly a third of the States of the Union, over whose decision there is to be no supervision or control by the Federal courts.

The power that would be thus placed in the hands of the President is such as in time of peace certainly ought never to be entrusted to any one man. If it be asked whether the creation of such a tribunal in a State was warranted as a measure of war, the question immediately presents itself whether we are still engaged in war. Let us not unnecessarily disturb the commerce and credit and industry of the country, by declaring to the American people and to the world that the United States are still in a condition of civil war. At present there is no part of our country in which the authority of the United States is disputed. Offenses that may be committed by individuals should not work a forfeiture of the rights of whole communities. The community has returned, or is returning, to a state of peace and industry. The rebellion is at an end. The measure, therefore, seems to be as inconsistent with the actual condition of the country as it is at variance with the Constitution of the United States.

If passing from general considerations, we examine the bill in detail it is open to weighty objections. In time of war it was eminently proper that we should provide for those who were passing suddenly from a condition of bondage to a state of freedom; but this bill proposes to make the Freedmen's Bureau, established by the act of 1865, as one of many great and extraordinary military measures to suppress a formidable rebellion a permanent branch of the public administration, with its powers greatly enlarged.

I have no reason to suppose, and I do not understand it to be alleged, that the act of March, 1865, has proved deficient for the purpose for which it was passed, although at that time, and for a considerable period thereafter, the Government of the United States remained unacknowledged in most of the States whose inhabitants had been involved in the rebellion. The institution of slavery, for the military destruction of which the Freedmen's Bureau was called into existence as an auxiliary, has been already effectually and finally abrogated throughout the whole country by an amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and practically its eradication has reached the ascent and concurrence of most of those States in which it at any time had an existence. I am not, therefore, able to discern in the condition of the country anything to justify an apprehension that the powers and agencies of the Freedmen's Bureau, which were effective for the protection of freedmen and refugees during the actual continuance of hostilities, will now, in a time of peace, and after the abolition of slavery, prove inadequate to the same proper ends. If I am correct in these views, there can be no necessity for the enlargement of the powers of the bureau for which provision is made in the bill. The third section of the bill authorizes a general and unlimited grant of support to the destitute and suffering refugees and freedmen, their wives and children. Succeeding sections make provisions for the rent or purchase of landed estates for freedmen, and for the erection for their benefit of suitable buildings for asylums and schools, the expenses to be defrayed from the Treasury of the whole people. The Congress of the United States has never heretofore thought itself empowered to establish any laws beyond the limits of the District of Columbia except for the benefit of our disabled soldiers and sailors. It has never founded schools for any class of our own people, not even for the orphans of those who have fallen in the defense of the Union, but has left the care of their education to the much more competent and efficient control of the States, of communities, of private associations and of individuals. It has never deemed itself authorized to expend the public money for the rent or purchase of houses for the thousands, not to say millions, of the white race, who are honestly toiling from day to day for their subsistence. A system for the support of indigent persons in the United States was never contemplated by the authors of the Constitution. Nor can any good reason be advanced why, as a permanent establishment, it should be founded for one class or color of our people more than for another. Pending the war many refugees and freedmen received support from the government, but it was never intended that they should henceforth be fed, clothed, educated and sheltered by the United States. The idea on which the slaves were assisted to freedom was that on becoming free they would be a self-sustaining population, and any legis-

lation that shall imply that they are not expected to attain a self-sustaining condition must have a tendency injurious alike to their character and their prosperity. The appointment of an agent for every county and parish will create an immense patronage, and the expense of the numerous officers and their clerks to be appointed by the President, will be great in the beginning, with a tendency steadily to increase. The appropriations asked by the Freedmen's Bureau as now established for the year 1866, amount to \$11,745,000, and it may be safely estimated that the cost to be incurred under the pending bill will require doubtless that amount, more than the entire sum expended in any one year under the administration of the second Adams.

If the presence of agents in every parish or county is to be considered as a war measure, opposition, or even resistance, might be provoked, so that to give effect to their jurisdiction troops would have to be stationed within reach of every one of them, and thus a large standing force be rendered necessary. Large appropriations would, therefore, be required to sustain and enforce military jurisdiction in every county or parish from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. The condition of our fiscal affairs in encouraging, but in order to sustain the present measure of public confidence, it is necessary that we practice not merely customary economy, but as far as possible, severe retrenchment. In addition to the objections already stated, the fifth section of the bill proposes to take away land from its former owners without any legal proceedings being first had, contrary to that provision of the Constitution which declares that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. It does not appear that a part of the land to which this section refers may not be owned by minors or persons of unsound mind, or by those who have been faithful to all their obligations as citizens of the United States. If any portion of the land is held by such persons, it is not competent for any authority to deprive them of it. If on the other hand it be found that the property is liable to confiscation even then it cannot be appropriated to public purposes, until, by due process of law, it shall have been declared forfeited to the government.

There is still further objection to the bill, as grounds seriously affecting the class of persons to whom it is designed to bring relief. It will tend to keep the minds of freedmen in a state of uncertain expectation and restlessness, while to those among whom he lives it will be a source of constant and vague apprehension.

Undoubtedly the freedman should be protected, but he should be protected by the civil authorities, and especially by the exercise of all the constitutional powers of the courts of the United States and of the States. His condition is not so exposed as may at first be imagined. He is in a portion of the country where his labor cannot well be spared. Competition for his services from planters, from those who are constructing or repairing railroads, and from capitalists in his vicinage or from other States, will enable him to command almost his own terms. He also possesses a perfect right to change his place of abode, and if, therefore, he does not find in one community or State a mode of life suitable to his desires, or proper remuneration for his labor, he can move to another, where that labor is more esteemed and better rewarded.

In truth, however, such State, induced by its own wants and interests will do what is necessary and proper to retain within its borders all the labor that is needed for the development of its resources. The laws that regulate supply and demand will maintain their force, and the wages of the laborer will be regulated thereby. There is no danger that the exceedingly great demand for labor will not operate in favor of the laborer, neither is sufficient consideration given to the avidity of the freedmen to protect and take care of themselves.

It is no more than justice to them to believe, that as they have received their freedom with moderation and forbearance so they will distinguish themselves by their industry and thrift, and soon show the world that in a condition of freedom they are self-sustaining, capable of selecting their own employment and their own places of abode, of insisting for themselves on a proper remuneration, and of establishing and maintaining their own asylums and schools. It is earnestly hoped that instead of wasting away, they will, by their own efforts, establish for themselves a condition of respectability and prosperity. It is certain that they can attain to that condition only through their own merits and actions.

In this connection the query presents itself, whether the system proposed by the bill will not, when put into complete operation, practically transfer the entire care, support and control of four millions of emancipated slaves to agents, overseers or task masters, who, appointed at Washington, are to be located in every county and parish throughout the United States containing freedmen and refugees? Such a system would inevitably tend to a concentration of power in the Executive, which would enable him, if so disposed,