

# Montrose Democrat.

A. J. GERRITSON, Publisher.

MONTROSE, PA., TUESDAY, SEPT. 25, 1866.

VOLUME XXIII, NUMBER 39.

For the Democrat.

## The Great Conflict Between Democracy and Abolitionism—or between Liberty and Despotism.

"The veto of the Civil Rights' Bill by President Johnson, is sweeping and goes to the root of the matter. The civil rights of four million of people are at stake. All within the Union owe submission to the government; by that fact the Government is bound to protect them. But Mr. Johnson steps between Congress and the people and refuses this protection. In seeking to protect our allies, Congress trenches, he argues, upon the power heretofore exercised by the respective States. He is tenderly solicitous of the rights of State Legislatures and of State courts. He casts the freedmen where they were before the war, into the absolute control of their rebel masters. And all out of regard for the abstraction of State rights. This is put forward as part of a policy for taking from the American Congress its supreme privilege. It is an excuse for handing over our loyal allies to their old masters. The appeal is now to the people, and the watch-word is Civil Rights for all men."

A volume might be filled with similar denunciations of President Johnson. The people who thus defame the Chief Magistrate of the nation, in 1866, might just as well use the name of George Washington, the first President of the United States, and cast these slanders against the Father of our country, as to asperse the name of Andrew Johnson. It was not President Johnson who took from the American Congress its supreme privilege of looking after the rights of the Southern negroes, who are now the allies of the Northern Abolitionists, but Washington, whose name is signed to the Constitution, and the other patriots of America, who framed it. These cruel statesmen took away all power from Congress to meddle with the blacks in the South, as the following document, put forth by the very first Congress will show:

"The Committee in Congress, to whom were referred sundry memorials from people called Quakers, and also a memorial from the Pennsylvania Society for promoting the abolition of Slavery, submit the following report:

"That from the nature of the matters contained in these memorials, they were induced to examine the power vested in Congress under the present Constitution, relating to the abolition of slavery, and are clearly of opinion:

"That Congress, by a fair construction of the Constitution, are restrained from interfering in the emancipation of slaves, who already are, or who may be, within the period mentioned, (1808,) imported into, or born within any of the said States:

"That Congress have no authority to interfere in the internal regulations of particular States, relative to the instruction of slaves in the principles of morality and religion; to their comfortable clothing, and subsistence; to the regulation of their marriages, and the prevention of the rights thereof; or to the separation of children from their parents; for comfortable provision in cases of sickness, age or infirmity; or to the seizure, transportation, or sale of free negroes; but have the fullest confidence in the wisdom and humanity of the Legislatures of the several States, that they will revise their laws from time to time, when necessary, and promote the objects mentioned in the Memorials, and every other measure that may tend to the happiness of the slaves."

That report received the sanction of Congress as early as 1790, and the resolutions were inserted in their journals. The report was promulgated to the people of the United States, and they were thus informed that Congress had rigidly examined the powers vested in that body, under the new Constitution, and found that they derived no authority from that instrument, to interfere in the internal affairs of these States, not even to prevent the separation of children from their parents, or the sale of free negroes into slavery, but left them where President Johnson leaves them, in the care of the Southern people themselves through their own Legislatures.

If the framers of the Constitution took away, and withheld all power and authority from the Congress of 1790 to interfere in behalf of the negroes in the Southern States, and Congress itself declined having any power whatever to intermeddle with them, even when they were free, who gave the Congress of 1866 authority and power to take charge of 4,000,000 of the descendants of these same African slaves? That great anti-slavery party which announced its conspiracy to overthrow the Government founded by Washington, in 1833, and which General Jackson warned the nation against in two annual messages. The anti-slavery Standard of June 1865, says: "If the President has really made up his mind to leave the fate of the negro in the hands of the whites of each State, there is no hope either for the negro or the Union. Everywhere let protest and denunciation be heard. Keep out the States this summer and fall. Keep them in military possession till Congress can meet, armed with the indignation of the anti-slavery North,

to check and control the suicidal madness of the Administration. Keep the bars down, lest when once up, it need another revolution to overthrow them and to give again to the General Government the power which it now possesses, to disregard and overrule State rights for the sake of the Nation."

For the sake of the new consolidated Nation of these Monarchists. Not a single member of Congress who voted for the Freedman's Bureau and Civil Rights bill, believed that the Constitution gave any sanction to these laws. They knew that they were overstepping the laws erected by the founders of the government for the preservation of the rights of the States. In proof of this, we have only to read their own interpretation of the Constitution upon that very point. By their own arguments on the floor of Congress, and in their various publications they have annulled in advance, all their acts for the protection of the freedmen in any of the States. The arguments of Sumner, Wilson, Chase and others will be brought forward, as this history proceeds, to overthrow the whole of their legislation relating to the negroes in the South; we will first introduce the Hon. Anson Burlingame, who, a member of Congress from Massachusetts, just before the war, addressing the Speaker, says:

"Sir, It is charged that Massachusetts has passed a Personal Liberty bill; well, sir, I say that Massachusetts, for her local legislation, is not responsible to this House, nor any member of it. I say, sir, that if her laws were as bad as these atrocious laws of Kansas, you can do nothing for her. I say, if her statute books were filled like these of Alabama, covering the State with whipping posts,—I say, even then you could not do anything here with the local laws of Massachusetts. That State is the guardian of the rights of her citizens, and of the inhabitants within her border lines. If her citizens go beyond that line into distant lands, then they look to the Federal arm for protection. But, old Massachusetts is the State which is to secure to her citizens their rights. These things must come from her and not from the Federal Government."

Where, then, is the authority for the Federal Government to assume the guardianship of the citizens, either white or black, residing in the Southern States? Why is not old South Carolina, as well as old Massachusetts, the State which is to secure to her own citizens their rights? If Congress could do nothing with Massachusetts, if her laws were ever so atrocious, what can she do with Georgia, or Mississippi? Members of Congress from Massachusetts denied the right of Congress to interfere with the local laws of their own State, who gave to Sumner and Wilson, members of Congress from Massachusetts, the right to interfere with the local laws of the Southern States? Did this war give Congress any more power to interfere with the local laws of Massachusetts than it had before? Mr. Burlingame says, "Massachusetts is the guardian of the rights of her citizens within her border line. If her citizens go beyond that line into distant lands, then they look to the Federal arm for protection."

Has Massachusetts surrendered the care of her citizens to the Federal Government? If not, neither have the States of the South. If Massachusetts chooses to abdicate her rights, then it would be a voluntary sacrifice, but if Congress governs the South against its will, it is a usurpation—a robbery—a despotism. It is telling the Southern people: You are no longer your own; you have no longer the right of self-government; you are our subjects, and we shall rule you as our slaves. Was this war waged to put the white people of this nation into the hands of Abolition Despots? That we are to have a despotism, if Congress triumphs, is proven from one of the ablest anti-slavery papers, the National Era. In the discussion upon the powers of the Federal Government, that authority says:

"It has been shown in this decision that we live under two distinct, independent governments—State and National. On which of these two Governments do the people depend to protect their personal liberty? The State Government of course. The people did not establish the Federal Government to protect themselves from the States. They found no fault with their own State Governments, in respect to personal liberty. And when the Union was formed, the protection of individual liberty was left where it was before,—to the State Government. If these are false to their trust, there is no human tribunal to which appeal can be made. This is the condition of all the people, North and South."

"If the Constitution had given the Federal Government power to interfere for the personal liberty of the people, State sovereignty and independence would have been annihilated. The National Government would be clothed with despotic powers, and the State Governments become mere ciphers. The power to protect liberty would become a power to subvert it. That such was the design of the people in framing the Constitution, is contrary to the dictates of common sense, and not to be inferred from that instrument."

The amendment proposed by the Abolition Congress, clothes the National Government with the despotic powers withheld from it by Washington and the founders of our Republic. All who sustain Congress aid in destroying the liberties of the white race, in the vain pursuit of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," for the Negro. These were the sycran words of Robespierre, Danton, and Marat, which lured the people of France into the vortex of death and destruction!

## The Radical Attempt to Blarney the Irish-American Vote.

(From the Boston Pilot.)

The Radical anti-Union, anti-Constitutional party, which goes before the country and the world under the false but thin guise of the "Union party," has been, from the beginning, under all the many names by which it has been known, the constant, bitter, venomous, and persistent foe of Irishmen, and the Irish character. Hatred of the Irish is the one distinctive feature that characterizes it from all other political parties. Its usual mode of expression is an outspoken enmity which is made manifest through false charges, through vile insinuations, through degrading comparisons, through contemptuous and insulting allusions, and through every species of mean and malicious opposition that their ever active hate and opposition prompts them to bring into exercise. That this is a correct exhibit of the attitude of that party towards the Irish American, any man who has watched the course of events will readily admit. It is, therefore, with feelings of intense disgust that we have noticed the recent mean but characteristic attempt of the political adventurers, who give tone to the party, to cajole the Irish vote in their favor against President Johnson, because of the course which the Administration pursued in reference to the Fenian invasion of Canada and the enforcement of the neutrality laws. With regard to that course it is only necessary to say that any Administration that might be in power in such a juncture as the recent movement, would be bound, in obedience to our own laws and in respect to treaty obligations, to pursue precisely similar measures.—Not to have done so now, would have been the most fatal mistake the President could have committed—fatal, alike for the honor of the country, for the advantageous position we now stand in as regards England, for the Irish cause itself, and would have yielded, ingloriously, and to no purpose, the strong hold we still have upon England for her piracies, the violation of her treaty obligations, and for the manner of holding her neutrality. All these things are yet to be settled for, and the bill is to be paid with interest. Had President Johnson suffered our laws to be broken in the same way, our treaties to be broken in the same shameful manner, we would have been just like Great Britain, and could have henceforth nothing to say against her. All this the Radical Republican leaders know as well as any one. But they think they see an opportunity to pander to the feelings of some disappointment and some anger which they hope to fan into decided animosity and antagonism, which feelings they propose to take advantage of for themselves at the polls. The daring to make such an attempt is, in our judgment, the best evidence that could be adduced to show the low and contemptuous opinion they entertain of the Irish character.

To suppose that they could successfully cajole the Irish-American voters, is to suppose that the voters of that class, like mean curs and whipped spaniels, can be made to lick the hand that smites them, and to fawn upon the wretch whose disposition is to degrade and outrage them; it is to suppose that a long series of offences and omitties against our people, as a mass, can be atoned for and wiped out by a condescending smile which is bestowed upon them for a selfish, if not treasonable, purpose. Such men as have disgraced themselves by condescending to turn a little natural feeling of disappointment in a time of excitement, against the Administration, for the ignoble purpose of cajoling votes by false pretences, must surely suppose that the Irish-Americans are all fools to forget so soon the scandalous utterance of Radical newspapers against them—not once only, but constantly and through months and years. It is not so that we repay the insulting comparisons of the New York Tribune, the defamatory speeches of such men as Bontwell, the undisguised sneers of the whole pack of smaller papers and smaller men, who take their cue from such venomous leaders. We don't disguise from ourselves that there was a moment when considerable numbers felt and expressed an opposition to the Administration for what it had done. But the sober second thought has come, and that feeling has subsided. The truth is, the Irishmen who have come here to plant their homes here, who have been naturalized here, are true to the country of their adoption, its Constitution and its laws. They have fought for the Union, they love it, and they will defend it and its defenders against all comers. The attempt to manufacture political capital out of temporary and not wide-spread alienation from President Johnson and the principles he represents, is worthy only of the party

that made the attempt. No other would have had the unblushing impudence to do so. The Irish-American vote for the Radical traducers of Ireland and Irish-Americans, would be like throwing one's self bodily into the jaws of a hyena. It would be a sacrifice the most infatuated that sane men ever were guilty of. The Radicals and principles they represent, are the national enemies to everything that is called Irish. They hold up the negro as our superior. They put us against him in comparison, that they may justify their course of high laudation of the negro, and they have heretofore omitted no opportunity to load us with opprobrium and scorn. We know where our true interests lay; we know who represent the principles we hold dear, and we recognize Andrew Johnson as the exponent of those principles, and so long as he is true to himself and his emphatic declarations, so long will the great body of Irish-Americans abide by and sustain him.

## How the Word White is to be got out of the Constitution.

THE RUMP AMENDMENT TO SUPERCEDE A DIRECT VOTE OF THE PEOPLE.

"The question of negro suffrage does not and cannot enter into this campaign for Governor. It is not before the people in any shape. The members of the Legislature to be elected this year cannot act on this subject. Gen. Geary, as Governor, will have no duty to perform in the premises during his first term. The people themselves must first act before the Governor can do anything on the subject. Here, then, are the facts. Negro suffrage is not an issue in this contest. The law forbids the question being an issue."—*Harrisburg Telegraph.*

The above tissue of falsehoods shows how anxious the Gearyites are to avoid the real issue in the present contest.

The question of negro suffrage can and does enter into this campaign for Governor, first, because it can be made an issue at any time, and second, because it has been made an issue, by every speaker now on the stump for Geary; by every newspaper in Geary's interest in Pennsylvania; by fully one-half of the Disunion nominating conventions; by the mixed Brown-low-Donglass convention now in session in Philadelphia; and by the rump amendment to the Constitution, which proposes to grant full political "privileges and immunities" to all men born in the United States, without regard to color or race.

The members of the Legislature to be elected this year can act on the subject. The Constitution was amended last in 1864, and five years thereafter, (in 1869,) can be amended again. The members to be elected this fall will constitute the Legislature of 1867. They can pass an amendment—the parliamentary requirement. The Legislature to be elected next year for 1868 can ratify it and call a special election in January, 1869, to have it ratified by the people before the assembling of the Legislature of 1869; or they can submit it at a special or general election in 1868, and call an extra session on the first of January, 1869, to count the votes, and if adopted add it to the Constitution. Thus State Senators, to be elected this fall, for three years, can vote for a negro suffrage amendment in 1867, and again in 1868. Even if the matter should not be broached till 1868, the Senators now to be elected would have to act upon the preliminary passage. It is clearly evident, therefore, that the members now to be elected can act upon this subject.

We are willing to grant that "General Geary, as Governor, will have no duty to perform in the premises," because there is no probability whatever of his election. Suppose, however, for illustration, that he should be elected. His term would not expire till after the 7th of January, 1870, so that he could approve such an amendment, whether preliminary proceedings were started in 1867 or 1868.

The statement that the "law forbids the question being an issue," is a very stupid falsehood. Where is there any law forbidding it? It would be a good thing if there were a prohibitory law.

It is true that a negro suffrage amendment to the Constitution of Pennsylvania would have to be submitted to a vote of the people after affirmative action of two successive Legislatures, but such a question should never be allowed to go so far. Men favorable to such a change in the Constitution should not be elected as members and Senators. They are not trustworthy upon other questions, if favorable to that. But, there is another point, of graver importance. It is this:

The Legislature to be elected this fall will be called upon to ratify or reject the amendment to the Federal Constitution proposed by the late Rump Congress.—One of its sections proposes to make citizens of all persons born in the United States; to prohibit any State from abridging the privileges and immunities of the citizens thus created, and to prevent any State from depriving any person of life, liberty, property, or equal protection of the laws. All this is clearly intended for the benefit of the blacks, for all men born in the United States have always enjoyed those natural, civil and political rights, except the negroes. The proposed amend-

ment makes so clear a contradistinction between the natural and civil rights (life, liberty, property and protection), and political "privileges and immunities," (the privileges of voting, holding office, &c.) that there can be no reasonable doubt thrown against the belief that it is a well concocted though covert scheme intended to establish and enforce negro suffrage and equality in all the States without submitting the question to a direct vote of the people! This amendment, when once incorporated into the Federal Constitution will be binding upon all the States. The Federal Constitution says it shall be "the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound there-by, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." Thus the word "white" may be struck from the Constitution without a legislative amendment, and without submitting the question to the people!—When the Rump amendment shall be passed, the question then goes beyond the jurisdiction of our State courts, our Legislature and the people. Salmon P. Chase and his Radical, negro suffrage Court will have exclusive authority to interpret and determine.

These facts show the great importance of electing Representatives and Senators at the coming election, pledged and sworn against the issue of negro suffrage, (or citizenship), which is now before the country in the shape of the Rump amendment. The Geary Disunionists fear to go before the people upon a direct vote to strike out the word "white," and therefore they are laboring to elect men who will ratify the Rump amendment to the Federal Constitution, and thereby override our State Constitution and the will of the people. It is but a modification of the game which the same school of politicians played successfully upon the people of Wisconsin.

People wake up! White men, if you want to preserve the ballot-box pure, and to bequeath to your children the same white man's Government which you received from your ancestors, arouse and defeat the tricksters, who, to subvert their own base purposes, tell their adherents to "throw conscience to the devil," who says that "it is numbers not intelligence we want," and who blasphemously cry—"To hell with the Constitution!" Now is the time to strike at the Rump amendment! The issue is clearly before you, and if you fail to meet it now, and defeat Disunion and Negroism the last hope will be gone forever!

## The Case Well Put.

The President in his speech at Niagara Falls illustrates and demolishes the monstrous position assumed by the Radicals in clamoring for universal suffrage for the negroes, in the following pointed and unanswerable manner:

"The argument is that they, (the freedmen) must have agents, that they must have persons there to see that their contracts are rightly made, that they are incompetent, that they are our wards and we must take care of them. I say free them, give them a fair chance and a start in the race of life. But they make an argument that you must have persons there employed to see that advantage is not taken of them in making their contracts, that they are incompetent to do their business; then they will turn around and tell us that these indigent incompetent persons who are not able to do without agents to make their bargains for them, they will turn round and say that they are "fit to be members of Congress, and to have the ballot at once, and control the elections."

From which appears the glaringly monstrous idea of the Radicals, of giving votes indiscriminately to the negroes and making members of Congress of them, when they have not sense enough to buy a jack knife or make an agreement for a month's labor without the assistance of an agent or guardian.

## The True Union Party.

The *Gazette*, an ultra-Radical sheet, published at Pittsburg, declares "it is no longer a secret that in Pennsylvania the Conservatives are co-operating as absolutely with the Democrats as in New York. They will all vote for Clymer, and for the district and county Democratic candidates. This is preliminary to a joint effort to elect a President two years hence." Just so. All true Union men are enlisted for the campaign which is to end only when the Radicals are banished from power both in the State and nation—when the Union is restored, and the people are again prosperous and happy.

THE TWO CONVENTIONS.—After reviewing the proceedings of the Philadelphia Convention—the National Convention of the 14th of August and the Radical Convention which has just closed its proceedings, the *New York Sun* (Rep.) tersely sums up as follows:

"Taking the proceedings of the two Conventions together, and banishing all political prejudices, the only conclusion to which a candid man can come is this: The Conservative Convention ignored party for the sake of the Union; and that the other party ignored the Union for the sake of party."

## Another Gallant Soldier Speaks.

PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 10, 1866:  
Brevet Major-General Custer and Chairman  
Committee, &c.

DEAR SIR: It is impossible for me to leave my business engagements here long enough to accept your invitation to attend the Soldier's Convention at Cleveland next week.

My convictions, however, and my earnest hopes are with you and the objects of the Convention.

The attempt of Southern politicians to destroy our Union in 1861, furnished an opportunity for every loyal man to put himself right on the record, which you and I, and all our brother soldiers, embraced, by enlisting "for the war."

The present attempt of certain Northern politicians to commit certain rebellious acts, by keeping our Union in a condition of hazard and danger, and compelling one portion of our countrymen to submit without voice or representation to the government of another portion—furnishes another opportunity for all loyal Union soldiers to rally for the preservation of the same Union for which we fought as comrades during four long and eventful years.

I wish to be considered as enlisted in the same cause for this war also, and willing to march under the same flag, shoulder to shoulder with any and all who are willing to strike another blow for Peace and Union, whether veteran soldiers or new recruits.

I would even trust a repentant rebel soldier, who fought us on a fair field, but is loyally disposed now, rather than the politicians and contractors, who stayed at home and robbed us and the government throughout the war, and now have the impudence to ask us to share the government we have preserved with negroes, in order that they may continue to grow fat on their verbal patriotism.

Let our old comrades all understand the true issues which the President is taking in our behalf. Let them understand that the Union for which we fought and suffered, after being, as we thought, preserved by our arms, is now being trifled with and endangered by office-seekers and politicians for their own selfish ends, and I have no fear but that those glorious lines of blue, which in the cause and under the flag of "the Union," swept triumphantly over the enemies' positions, will again rally into another mighty Union army, which will this fall sweep before it all foes to our Union, whether traitors of the North or South, or both together, and thus finish with the ballot the great work only commenced with the bayonet. I am my dear sir, very truly yours,

ISAAC J. WISTAR,  
Late Brigadier-Gen. Volunteers, U. S. A.

## A Soldier on the Issue.

A great effort has been made to create the impression that the men who fought our battles are sustaining Congress against the President. In the midst of the contest it was a common thing for the soldiers of the two armies to say, "We could settle this thing in five minutes. It is the infernal politicians who have ruined the country." They would have shaken hands, agreed that each should respect the laws and the Constitution, and should be secure in his rights under that instrument, and then gone their several ways, and you would never have heard the fighting men pelting their old antagonists with epithets.

Many of them feel that way as it is.—We received a letter from a gallant colonel yesterday, ordering this paper. He says: "I am a Republican; I have been once since my majority; cast my first vote for Lincoln; and as long as the politics of the party were administered with honesty and justice, I proposed remaining one; but latterly the course that some of its leaders have pursued has become so intolerable that I can no longer support it as a party and have the consciousness of doing right."

I have served in the army four years; from a private I have come up through all the different grades to the command of a regiment; have been severely wounded in one of our bloodiest battles. I think I have discharged my duty with credit to myself and honor to the cause and country, and I cannot bear to see my efforts, with thousands of others, frittered away for the sake of political advancement—in short, usurpation. I think for myself. I allow no person to control me politically or dictate my politics. I lay some claims to ordinary intelligence. In a word, I am an American.—*National Intelligencer*, September 10.

Durant, a New Orleans fellow, who has been imported into Philadelphia to help put Geary stock up to average in the market, declared at a speech in the League House, on the 31st, that "until the negroes are allowed to vote there can be no peace in the country."—*Age.*

Thaddeus Stevens has taken the stump in Pennsylvania for "General Geary and negro equality." He recently spoke at Bedford, and in reference to impartial suffrage he said that "popular or unpopular, he would stand by it, until relieved of the unprofitable labors of earth."