

The Democrat.



HARVEY SICKLER, Editor.
TUNKHANNOCK, PA.

Wednesday, Mar. 17, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE.

In obedience to the desire of a majority thereof, the Democratic State Committee are requested to meet at Bolton's Hotel, Harrisburg, on Tuesday, the 20th day of March, 1869, at 7 1/2 o'clock, P. M., to fix the time of holding the Democratic State Convention.

WILLIAM A. WALLACE, Chairman.
DAVID CALDWELL, Secretary,
Feb. 12, 1869.

Sympathy with Rebels.

The distinguished rebel, General James Longstreet, has received from General Grant the appointment to the lucrative office of surveyor of the port of New Orleans.

In this place he will not be long in recovering some of the loss his private fortune suffered in the war. If no Southern negro nor Northern carpet-bagger could be found qualified for this position it might be imagined that Grant could have selected some wounded Union soldier instead of this rebel chief.

It seems that Grant fully understood what Longstreet meant when he supported the infamous reconstruction policy, and has acted accordingly.

Longstreet has his reward. But this handsome recognition of the party services of the rebel general has been made so suddenly as to take the truly loyal slightly aback.

With the exception of General Lee, the Union cause no more able enemy than Longstreet.

In the persistence and malignancy of his hostility, no rebel, not even Jefferson Davis, surpassed him.

His treason to his country is made singularly odious by this appointment.

When Wade Hampton and Forrest took a modest and becoming part in the National Democratic Convention in New York last July what a howl all the truly loyal did set up over them!

How they will receive this appointment of Longstreet remains to be seen.

If he be fit to take an office under a loyal administration, would it be wrong to let a battered Union soldier like Joe Knipe, keep the place which he holds?

Sublimated loyalty will doubtless repudiate General Joseph F. Knipe, whose body is covered with wounds received in the service of his country, and take to its bosom General Longstreet, who is guilty of the blood of thousands of Union men slain in the war.

Of such stuff is loyalty made! General Breckenridge a little while ago a fugitive under indictment for treason, and General Longstreet courted and appointed to lucrative office! Would there be any harm now in Breckenridge becoming the democratic governor of Kentucky, since Longstreet has been made surveyor of the port of New Orleans? Can no one but Grant take the stain of treason away? Patriot.

Forney Broad.

This gentleman, of "my two papers, both daily," is trying to turn an honest penny in North Carolina.

He has bought land in the rebel State, and wants Northern men to come down and buy it at enhanced prices.

He writes letters to Northern papers that even make old Greeley glad.

He has been in North Carolina, and has not heard the slightest disturbance of any kind.

Of course not. We have no idea that there ever was a drunken man in the State, or that any Ku-Klux or rebel outrage was ever perpetrated there from the beginning of time.

Forney, in "my two papers," has very often published accounts of very diabolical transactions in the Old North State, perpetrated invariably by long-bearded rebels upon saintly negroes, but this was before he bought land down there. It is all right now, and Northern men can just come along and buy the Forney lands and sit down literally beneath their own fig trees and Schuppermann vines, with none to molest or make them afraid.

Oh! Forney, Forney, you are a dirty creature, to be sure, but we can't say that you are any worse than any of your brother Radical editors.

For hire they have all represented the South as a land accursed of God, a home of devils, and for hire, they will represent it as a paradise.

—Lexington Kentucky Reporter.

Mrs. Grant.

The Washington correspondent of a western journal has this to say of Mrs. General Grant:

"Few women ever bore the perilous test of snuffing fame and fortune with a more hearty happiness or more unassuming grace."

Is she pretty? No. She is a roly-poly of a little woman, with beautiful neck, hands and feet.

Her features are well cut, but her eyes were crossed. Some of her friends wished to have them straightened.

"No," she said. "Mr. Grant had loved her ever since she was a little girl with her eyes crossed. He said that she would not be herself to him if they were straight. Crooked they should remain. If he was satisfied, what mattered it to other people?"

When Judge Sharswood rendered a decision in the Borie vs. Trot case, to the effect that coin contracts were valid, there was a tremendous howl from Radical journals.

Now that the Supreme Court of the United States has confirmed the views of this distinguished Judge, these same journals accept it as sound law, and see no lurking treason in the decision.

Thus does time vindicate, one after another, the great principles laid down by the Democracy. The time is coming when the people will confess the superiority and wisdom of Democratic statesmen, and entrust power to their hands.

Suffrage Constitutional Amendment.

SPEECH OF HON. GEORGE W. WOODWARD,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

In the House of Representatives,

February 20, 1869.

On the joint resolution (S. R. No. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

MR. WOODWARD. I wish to say a few words to-day in behalf of the people of Pennsylvania. The Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania of 1790 was silent on the subject of negro suffrage.

A diversity of opinion and practice to a limited extent grew up under that Constitution. In some sporadic instances colored men were allowed to vote; but at length the question came before the highest judicial tribunal of the State, and it was decided that the constitution of 1790 rightly understood, never permitted negro suffrage.

That decision was based upon this ground, that the negro race never had become a part of the social compact of this country, a conclusion that was deduced from the history of the negro race, and their introduction into this country as slaves.

It resulted very logically out of the great principle of the Declaration of Independence, that all just Governments should be founded in the consent of the governed.

A subject, inferior, ignorant, and idolatrous race, introduced into a country against their will to be slaves, would be greatly wronged in being treated as having consented to the government of that country.

The African race has never consented to the government of this country. They are exotic, they are alien, they are strangers to the Commonwealth. They were brought here in violation of the laws of nature; they were thrust upon us without their consent and without their being treated as having consented to the government of that country.

The people of Pennsylvania, penetrated with these truths, which their judiciary had thus recognized, amended in 1837 their constitution of 1790, and in defining the qualifications of electors inserted the word "white" before the word "freeman."

This was not only agreed to in their constitutional convention after great deliberation, but amendment was submitted, with other amendments, to a vote of the people of Pennsylvania.

And, sir, it is a part of the history of the times that those who were opposed to the reform of the constitution were especially opposed to this amendment, because of the popularity which it gave to the other amendments.

I point the House to the fact that the people of Pennsylvania, through their judicial tribunals and by their own popular elections, decided as solemnly as it is possible for freemen to decide that the negro race was no party to the social compact and should not be admitted to the suffrage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that decree has never been reversed.

On the contrary, all political parties have recognized it and submitted to it.

The republican party, as often as they have been charged with intending to take out of the foundations of our State Government that corner-stone, have asserted that they were slandered; that they intended nothing of the sort.

They have pointed to the Chicago platform in confirmation of their assertions.

In consequence of this disavowal they enjoyed in the last election, and in all the late elections in our State, a very large Welsh vote, which, I tell them, they will lose from the day that they force negro suffrage upon the people.

They have enjoyed that Welsh vote by reason of their persistent and apparently consistent denial that they were for negro suffrage.

The Welsh do not like the Irish; there is a lack of congeniality between the two classes on account of religion and other causes.

The republican party, while they cannot carry the great body of the Irish population, can carry a large proportion of Welsh so long as, and only so long as, they can persuade that people that they are honest in their professions against negro suffrage.

The effect of the proposition now before us is to change the fundamental law of Pennsylvania, to reverse the historic and traditional policy of the State, to introduce into the politics of that great Commonwealth this alien, foreign, unnatural element, which down to the present time the republican party have told the people never was to be a part of their policy.

I ask of the gentleman from Massachusetts and of this House that before this change of policy be adopted the whole people of Pennsylvania be allowed to pass upon the question.

What answer does the gentleman give to this request? He has answered, sir, in your hearing, that he cannot allow the offering of an amendment looking to that end because the Constitution forbids him.

I stand here asking the gentleman from Massachusetts to do an unconstitutional thing, when I beg him to submit his amendment to a vote of the people!

Well, sir, if the gentleman from Massachusetts had never done any unconstitutional thing it would undoubtedly be a very great sin in me to tempt him into transgression.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the gentleman from Massachusetts that I asked him to violate no constitutional provisions when I asked him to submit this amendment to the people of Pennsylvania.

And, sir, within five minutes after he refused to entertain my proposition, he stood in his place and declared, as the report in the Globe will show to-morrow, that this constitutional amendment was to be submitted to the people of this country.

I deny that.

Its submission to the people, in the fair sense of the term, is exactly what I demand.

The present legislature of Pennsylvania was elected last October. It was elected while the republicans were complaining that the democrats were slandering them in charging them with intending to introduce negro suffrage.

That charge was declared to be a defamation upon the fair fame of the

republican party. And yet it is to this present legislature the gentleman insists submitting the amendment.

A legislature not only not elected to consider any such subject, but elected in the midst of profuse denials that such a subject was to come before them.

On this question they do not represent the people—were never chosen to represent them.

If this legislature was elected to consider this or any similar amendment I will give up the discussion.

Nay, I will give him anything I have to give if he will hazard that statement.

But he will not, and the fact must remain unchallenged that you are about to call upon a body of representatives to ratify your amendment who do not represent the people upon this question.

The ratification just as well be submitted to any other body of men—it might just as well not be submitted at all.

What I propose is, that the amendment should be submitted to a legislature, the most popular branch of which shall be chosen after this date, with this question before the eyes of the people.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says that it is unconstitutional. Why? Because we cannot select the legislature to which to submit our amendment.

I deny his premises. I say that the Constitution devolves upon us the duty of selecting the representative body to which we shall submit amendments.

When I read the words of the Constitution you will see I am right. It is as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress."

There, sir, is the constitutional devotion of the duty to exercise our discretion as between the legislature and a convention to pass upon amendments.

The duty involves the power. If we must choose between the legislature and a convention, we may choose a legislature or a convention elected last year, or to be elected this year.

The constitution does not shut us up to legislatures now in session.

We may take any legislature that shall fairly and reasonably represent the people.

And the ground on which I maintain that our discretion should be exercised in favor of a future instead of the existing legislature is, that the people may have a chance to choose representatives with a view to this question.

What right had the gentleman to say that the amendment was to be submitted to the people? It cannot be submitted to the people by being submitted to the present legislature.

Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Massachusetts.

When you have matured the form of your proposition, throw it before the legislature to be chosen next fall, and let the people understand that when we democrats charged you republicans with plotting for negro suffrage we did not slander you, but spoke only the truth.

Put your amendment before the representatives of the people chosen after you have shown your hands, and if they ratify it I will agree never to raise my voice again in opposition to negro suffrage.

Having said this much in behalf of an amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts will not let me offer, I improve the opportunity to add a few more thoughts on the general subject of negro suffrage.

I have shown the House what has been the fixed position of Pennsylvania in all times on this subject.

For more than thirty years all parties have acquiesced in the rule of white suffrage.

So far as I remember no public man in Pennsylvania has proposed a repeal of the rule.

Even the late Mr. Stevens, whose opinions were extreme on all subjects, never brought forward any measure to alter our constitution in this regard.

He would not sign the constitution, as a member of the convention, and no doubt he would have voted to his dying breath to expunge the word "white."

So also, had he been spared; would he have lifted up his eloquent voice to persuade the people of Pennsylvania to change their fundamental law and give the ballot to the negro; but, sir, I persuade myself that he would not have been guilty of the insincerity and duplicity that have characterized the conduct of the republican party on this question.

Having denied again and again that this issue was in last fall's election, Mr. Stevens would have said with characteristic candor, the representatives then chosen do not necessarily represent the people on this question, let it go to the next representatives they may choose.

Not only have all white men in Pennsylvania acquiesced for thirty-two years in the rule of white suffrage, but so also have the black men. I cannot recall a single instance in which any representatives of that class of our citizens have asked for a change.

The colored people of Pennsylvania are a quiet, orderly, and respectable population. They enjoy full protection of all civil rights.

Pennsylvania abolished slavery in 1780 by an act whose preamble is often quoted to attest her abhorrence of the institution, but whose substantive provisions show that she was no more unmindful of the rights of sister States than she was of the rights of the negro race.

With us the negro is esteemed according to his individual merits. If he is industrious, sober and honest, he is respected and patronized. I have many friends among them, and cherishing only the kindest feelings for them. I am incapable of doing anything in my representative capacity to their prejudice.

But, sir, the ballot will be no boon to them. The assertion that it is necessary to the protection of their civil rights is false, and so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, is slanderous.

The negro no more needs the ballot in Pennsylvania for his security than the woman do for theirs.

And yet it is to this present legislature the gentleman insists submitting the amendment.

A legislature not only not elected to consider any such subject, but elected in the midst of profuse denials that such a subject was to come before them.

On this question they do not represent the people—were never chosen to represent them.

If this legislature was elected to consider this or any similar amendment I will give up the discussion.

Nay, I will give him anything I have to give if he will hazard that statement.

But he will not, and the fact must remain unchallenged that you are about to call upon a body of representatives to ratify your amendment who do not represent the people upon this question.

The ratification just as well be submitted to any other body of men—it might just as well not be submitted at all.

What I propose is, that the amendment should be submitted to a legislature, the most popular branch of which shall be chosen after this date, with this question before the eyes of the people.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says that it is unconstitutional. Why? Because we cannot select the legislature to which to submit our amendment.

I deny his premises. I say that the Constitution devolves upon us the duty of selecting the representative body to which we shall submit amendments.

When I read the words of the Constitution you will see I am right. It is as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress."

There, sir, is the constitutional devotion of the duty to exercise our discretion as between the legislature and a convention to pass upon amendments.

The duty involves the power. If we must choose between the legislature and a convention, we may choose a legislature or a convention elected last year, or to be elected this year.

The constitution does not shut us up to legislatures now in session.

We may take any legislature that shall fairly and reasonably represent the people.

And the ground on which I maintain that our discretion should be exercised in favor of a future instead of the existing legislature is, that the people may have a chance to choose representatives with a view to this question.

What right had the gentleman to say that the amendment was to be submitted to the people? It cannot be submitted to the people by being submitted to the present legislature.

Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Massachusetts.

When you have matured the form of your proposition, throw it before the legislature to be chosen next fall, and let the people understand that when we democrats charged you republicans with plotting for negro suffrage we did not slander you, but spoke only the truth.

Put your amendment before the representatives of the people chosen after you have shown your hands, and if they ratify it I will agree never to raise my voice again in opposition to negro suffrage.

Having said this much in behalf of an amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts will not let me offer, I improve the opportunity to add a few more thoughts on the general subject of negro suffrage.

I have shown the House what has been the fixed position of Pennsylvania in all times on this subject.

For more than thirty years all parties have acquiesced in the rule of white suffrage.

So far as I remember no public man in Pennsylvania has proposed a repeal of the rule.

Even the late Mr. Stevens, whose opinions were extreme on all subjects, never brought forward any measure to alter our constitution in this regard.

He would not sign the constitution, as a member of the convention, and no doubt he would have voted to his dying breath to expunge the word "white."

So also, had he been spared; would he have lifted up his eloquent voice to persuade the people of Pennsylvania to change their fundamental law and give the ballot to the negro; but, sir, I persuade myself that he would not have been guilty of the insincerity and duplicity that have characterized the conduct of the republican party on this question.

Having denied again and again that this issue was in last fall's election, Mr. Stevens would have said with characteristic candor, the representatives then chosen do not necessarily represent the people on this question, let it go to the next representatives they may choose.

Not only have all white men in Pennsylvania acquiesced for thirty-two years in the rule of white suffrage, but so also have the black men. I cannot recall a single instance in which any representatives of that class of our citizens have asked for a change.

The colored people of Pennsylvania are a quiet, orderly, and respectable population. They enjoy full protection of all civil rights.

Pennsylvania abolished slavery in 1780 by an act whose preamble is often quoted to attest her abhorrence of the institution, but whose substantive provisions show that she was no more unmindful of the rights of sister States than she was of the rights of the negro race.

With us the negro is esteemed according to his individual merits. If he is industrious, sober and honest, he is respected and patronized. I have many friends among them, and cherishing only the kindest feelings for them. I am incapable of doing anything in my representative capacity to their prejudice.

But, sir, the ballot will be no boon to them. The assertion that it is necessary to the protection of their civil rights is false, and so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, is slanderous.

The negro no more needs the ballot in Pennsylvania for his security than the woman do for theirs.

And yet it is to this present legislature the gentleman insists submitting the amendment.

A legislature not only not elected to consider any such subject, but elected in the midst of profuse denials that such a subject was to come before them.

On this question they do not represent the people—were never chosen to represent them.

If this legislature was elected to consider this or any similar amendment I will give up the discussion.

Nay, I will give him anything I have to give if he will hazard that statement.

But he will not, and the fact must remain unchallenged that you are about to call upon a body of representatives to ratify your amendment who do not represent the people upon this question.

The ratification just as well be submitted to any other body of men—it might just as well not be submitted at all.

What I propose is, that the amendment should be submitted to a legislature, the most popular branch of which shall be chosen after this date, with this question before the eyes of the people.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says that it is unconstitutional. Why? Because we cannot select the legislature to which to submit our amendment.

I deny his premises. I say that the Constitution devolves upon us the duty of selecting the representative body to which we shall submit amendments.

When I read the words of the Constitution you will see I am right. It is as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress."

There, sir, is the constitutional devotion of the duty to exercise our discretion as between the legislature and a convention to pass upon amendments.

The duty involves the power. If we must choose between the legislature and a convention, we may choose a legislature or a convention elected last year, or to be elected this year.

The constitution does not shut us up to legislatures now in session.

We may take any legislature that shall fairly and reasonably represent the people.

And the ground on which I maintain that our discretion should be exercised in favor of a future instead of the existing legislature is, that the people may have a chance to choose representatives with a view to this question.

What right had the gentleman to say that the amendment was to be submitted to the people? It cannot be submitted to the people by being submitted to the present legislature.

Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Massachusetts.

When you have matured the form of your proposition, throw it before the legislature to be chosen next fall, and let the people understand that when we democrats charged you republicans with plotting for negro suffrage we did not slander you, but spoke only the truth.

Put your amendment before the representatives of the people chosen after you have shown your hands, and if they ratify it I will agree never to raise my voice again in opposition to negro suffrage.

Having said this much in behalf of an amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts will not let me offer, I improve the opportunity to add a few more thoughts on the general subject of negro suffrage.

I have shown the House what has been the fixed position of Pennsylvania in all times on this subject.

For more than thirty years all parties have acquiesced in the rule of white suffrage.

So far as I remember no public man in Pennsylvania has proposed a repeal of the rule.

Even the late Mr. Stevens, whose opinions were extreme on all subjects, never brought forward any measure to alter our constitution in this regard.

He would not sign the constitution, as a member of the convention, and no doubt he would have voted to his dying breath to expunge the word "white."

So also, had he been spared; would he have lifted up his eloquent voice to persuade the people of Pennsylvania to change their fundamental law and give the ballot to the negro; but, sir, I persuade myself that he would not have been guilty of the insincerity and duplicity that have characterized the conduct of the republican party on this question.

Having denied again and again that this issue was in last fall's election, Mr. Stevens would have said with characteristic candor, the representatives then chosen do not necessarily represent the people on this question, let it go to the next representatives they may choose.

Not only have all white men in Pennsylvania acquiesced for thirty-two years in the rule of white suffrage, but so also have the black men. I cannot recall a single instance in which any representatives of that class of our citizens have asked for a change.

The colored people of Pennsylvania are a quiet, orderly, and respectable population. They enjoy full protection of all civil rights.

Pennsylvania abolished slavery in 1780 by an act whose preamble is often quoted to attest her abhorrence of the institution, but whose substantive provisions show that she was no more unmindful of the rights of sister States than she was of the rights of the negro race.

With us the negro is esteemed according to his individual merits. If he is industrious, sober and honest, he is respected and patronized. I have many friends among them, and cherishing only the kindest feelings for them. I am incapable of doing anything in my representative capacity to their prejudice.

But, sir, the ballot will be no boon to them. The assertion that it is necessary to the protection of their civil rights is false, and so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, is slanderous.

The negro no more needs the ballot in Pennsylvania for his security than the woman do for theirs.

Special Notice.

THE LAST CALL.

All persons indebted to the undersigned are hereby notified that accounts unpaid on