

The Commonwealth Journal

BY S. J. ROW.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1864.

VOL. 10.—NO. 41.

THE MODEL SEWING MACHINE!

THE CHEAPEST IN THE WORLD! BECAUSE THE BEST! At Greatly Reduced Prices!

THE WOOD SEWING MACHINE COMPANY, 506 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Manufacture the most perfect Machine for Sewing, of all kinds, ever presented to the American public, and challenge comparison with any Sewing Machine made in the United States. The WOOD Machines, with all their valuable improvements, entirely overcome all imperfections of former makes.

They are Superior to all others, for Family and Manufacturing purposes.

Simple in construction, durable in all their parts, and READILY UNDERSTOOD. They have certainty of stitch on all kinds of fabrics, and are adapted to a wide range of work without change or adjustment. Using all kinds of thread. Will Hem, Fell, Bind, Gather, Braids, Tucks, Quilt, Cord, and in fact do all kinds of work required by Families or Manufacturers. They make the Interlock Shuttle Stitch, which cannot be exceeded for firmness, elasticity, durability and elegance of finish.

They have Received the highest Premiums in every instance, where they have been exhibited in competition with other machines. We invite all persons in search of an instrument to execute any kind of Sewing now done by Machinery, to inspect them, and make sure they select the best, by proving the WOOD before purchasing. The Company being duly licensed, the Machines are protected against infringements or imitation.

Persons at a distance can order by mail with a perfect confidence that the Machine will reach them safely, and that they will be able to manage it to their entire satisfaction, with no other aid than the printed instructions accompanying each Machine. Every explanation will be cheerfully given to all, whether they wish to purchase or not. Descriptions as relative Sewing Machines will be furnished to all who desire them, by mail or otherwise.

Reliable Agents Wanted, in all localities in the United States, Canada, British Provinces, Cuba, Mexico, Central and South America West India Islands and the Bahama Islands, to whom we offer great inducements. Energetic men find it a paying business as reliable Sewing Machines have become a necessity in every family. We manufacture a great variety of styles, from which we give a few prices:—No. 2, Family, \$55; No. 2, Extra, \$65; No. 2, Half case, \$70 and \$80; No. 3 & 4, Manufacturing, \$80 and \$90.

WOOD SEWING MACHINE CO., (Box 2,841 P. O.) 506 Broadway, N. Y., New York, May 25, 1864.

Thomas Mills, Clearfield, Pa., is a regularly authorized agent for the sale of the Wood Sewing Machine. Call and see the Machine.

F. N. S. G. at B. & S's.

READ! READ! READ!!!

BOYNTON & SHOWERS

CLEARFIELD, PA.,

Have received their first supply of Seasonable Goods, which they are now offering for sale at the LOWEST CASH PRICES.

Their stock consists of a general variety of Dry-goods, Groceries, Hardware, Furnishware, Tinware, Willow-ware, Wooden-ware, Provisions, Hats, Caps, Boots, Shoes, and Clothing, &c.

For the Ladies.

They would call especial attention to the large and good assortment of new styles and patterns of LADIES DRESS GOODS.

now opening, consisting of Plain and Fancy Silks, Delaines, Alpaca, Cashmere, Ducais, Prints, Madras, Cashmeres, Plaids, Brilliants, Poplins, Beiges, Lawns, Nankins, Linen, Lace, Edgings, Colerettes, Brails, Belts, Veils, Nets, Corsets, Culottes, Hosiery, Coats, Mantles, Balmoral skirts, Hosiery, Gloves, Bonnets, Flowers, Plumes, Ribbons, Hats, Trimmings, Buttons, Combs, Shawls, Braids, Muslin, Irish Linens, Cambrics, Victoria Lawns, Satins, Robes, Mulls, Linen Handkerchiefs, &c.

Of Men's Wear
They have also received a large and well selected stock, consisting of Coats, Plain and Fancy Cassimeres, Cashmeres, Tweeds, Jeans, Corduroys, Beaver-Ten, Linens, Handkerchiefs, Neckties, Hosiery, Gloves, Hats, Caps, Scarfs, &c., etc.

Ready-Made Clothing

In the latest styles and of the best material, consisting of Coats, Pants, Vests, Shawls, Overcoats, Drawers, Cashmere and Linen Shirts, etc.

Of Boots and Shoes,

They have a large assortment for Ladies and Gentlemen, consisting of Top Boots, Brogans, Pump, Gaiters, Balmoral Boots, Slippers, Monroes, etc.

Groceries and Provisions

Such as Coffee, Syrup, Sugar, Rice, Crackers, Vinegar, Candles, Cheese, Flour, Meal, Bacon, Fish, coarse and fine Salt, Teas, Mustard, etc.

Coal Oil Lamps,

Coal Oil, Lamp chimneys, Tinware a great variety, Japanware, Egg beaters, Spice boxes, Wire Ladders, Sieves, Dusting pans, Lanterns, etc. etc.

Carpets, Oil-cloth,

Brooms, Brushes, Baskets, Washboards, Buckets, Tubs, Churns Wall-paper, Candlewick, Cotton Yarn and Batting, Work baskets, Umbrellas, etc.

Rafting Files,

Augers, Axes, Chisels, Saws, Files, Hammers, Hatchets, Nails, Spikes, Gird stones, Stoneware, Trunks, Carpet bags, Powder, Shot, Lead, etc.

School Books,

Writing and Letter paper, Fancy note and commercial paper, pens, pencils and ink, copy books, slate, ink stands, fans and common envelopes.

Carriage Trimmings,

Shoe Findings, Glass and Putty, Flat irons and Coffee mills, Bed cords and Bed screws, Matches, Store blacking, Washing soda and Soap, etc.

Flavoring Extracts,

Patent Medicines, Perfumery of various kinds, Fancy soaps (Old, Peppermint, Vanilla, and in fact every thing usually kept in a first class Store.

They invite all persons to call and examine their stock, and hope to give entire satisfaction.
BOYNTON & SHOWERS, Clearfield, Pa., May 18th, 1864.

RODDER CUTTERS

of a superior make— for sale at reasonable prices, at MERRELL and BILLYER'S, Clearfield, Pa.

A LARGE STOCK OF GLASS, paints, oils,

White lead, &c. at
E. A. IRVIN'S

EXECUTOR'S NOTICE

—Letters Testamentary on the Estate of Jeremiah Small late of Boggs Tp., deceased having been granted to the undersigned; all persons indebted to said estate are requested to make immediate payment, and those having claims against the same will present their duly authenticated for settlement.

NANCY Smeal Ex'x.
GIBBEON Smeal, Ex'r.
April 27, 1864.

DENTISTRY! DENTISTRY!

—Dr. F. M. McKiernan having located at Smith's Mills, (Janesville,) Clearfield Co., Pa., informs the citizens of that place and vicinity, that he will endeavor to render satisfaction to all who may favor him with their patronage. Professional calls to any part of the country promptly attended to. Work done on Vulcanite, Terms moderate.

May 11, 1864.—Jm. Dr. F. M. McKiernan.

CLEARFIELD ACADEMY

—The next quarterly meeting will open on Monday the 4th of April, 1864.

TERMS OF TUITION AS FOLLOWS:—
Common English, Comprising those branches not higher than Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography, English Grammar and History, per quarter, \$ 5 00
Higher English branches, 7 50
Languages, 10 00

CARPETINGS

—Now in store, a large stock of Velvet, Brussels, Three-Ply & Logran Carpetings, Oil cloths, Window Shades, etc., etc., all of the latest patterns and best quality; which will be sold at the lowest prices for cash.

N. B. Some patterns of my old stock still on hand; will be sold at a bargain.

J. T. DELLACROIX
No. 37 South Second Street, above Chestnut,
March 9, 1864. Philadelphia.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE

—Letters of Administration on the estate of Leason Root, late of Woodward Twp., Clearfield county, Penna., dec'd., having been granted to the undersigned, all persons indebted to said estate are requested to make immediate payment, and those having claims against the same will present their duly authenticated for settlement.

ISAAC McNEAL, Administrator.
May 11, 1864.

\$100 REWARD!

—Some unknown person or persons having feloniously broke into the house of the undersigned about the 25th of April, 1864, and stolen therefrom three webs of muslin, several blankets, pillow cases, table cloth, two coats, one bonnet, a lot of sugar, soap, and other articles, the above reward will be paid for the apprehension and conviction of the thief or thieves, or for such information that will lead to their conviction.

MAXIMO STIRK,
New Millport, May 11, 1864, 2m pd.

REGISTER'S NOTICE

—Notice is hereby given, that the following accounts have been examined and passed by me, and remain filed of record in this office for the inspection of heirs, legatees, creditors and all others in any other way interested, and will be presented to the next Orphan's Court of Clearfield county, to be held at the Court House, in the City of Clearfield, commencing on the Third Monday of June, 1864.

The final account of H. D. Ross, Executor of the last Will of John M. Weitzell, late of the township of Bell, in the county of Clearfield, Pa., dec'd.
The final account of F. Wilson, administrator of all and singular the goods and chattels, rights and credits which were of James C. Graham, late of Bradford township, Clearfield county, dec'd.
The partial account of John D. Thompson and John H. Bortner, in the last and final will and testament of Ignatius Thompson, dec'd.
The account of Francis Pearce and Jacob Pearce, Executors of the last Will and testament of Abraham Pearce, of Bradford township, dec'd.
The account of Samuel Seibert, Administrator of all and singular the goods and chattels, rights and credits which were of John Young, late of Bernside township, deceased.
The account of Wm. L. Shaw and Mary Ann Shaw, Executors of all and singular the goods and chattels, rights and credits which were of Robt. U. Shaw, late of Goshen Tp., dec'd.
The account of Jeremiah Smeal and Valentine Flegg, administrators of the estate of David Flegg, late of Bernside township, dec'd.
The account of Josiah Evans, administrator of the estate of Asher Cochran, late of Penn township, deceased.

ISAIAH G. BARGER, Register.
Register's Office, May 18, 1864.

A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, That the following amendments be proposed to the Constitution of the Commonwealth, in accordance with the provisions of the tenth article thereof:

There shall be an additional section to the third article of the Constitution, to be designated as section four, as follows:

"SECTION 4. Whenever any of the qualified electors of this Commonwealth shall be in any actual military service, under a requisition from the President of the United States, or by the authority of this Commonwealth, such electors may exercise the right of suffrage in all elections by the citizens, under such regulations as are, or shall be, prescribed by law, as fully as if they were present at their usual place of election."

SECTION 5. There shall be two additional sections to the seventh article of the Constitution, to be designated as sections eight, and nine, as follows:

"SECTION 8. No bill shall be passed by the Legislature, containing more than one subject, which shall be concisely expressed in the title, except appropriation bills."

"SECTION 9. No bill shall be passed by the Legislature granting any powers, or privileges, in any case, where the authority to grant such powers or privileges, has been, or may hereafter be, conferred upon the Courts of this Commonwealth."

HENRY C. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JOHN P. PENNEY,
Speaker of the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH
HARRISBURG, APRIL 25, 1864.

Pennsylvania, ss: I do hereby certify that the above Resolution is a full, true and correct copy of the original Joint Resolution of the Commonwealth, proposed certain amendments to the Constitution, as the same remains on file in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Secretary's office to be affixed, the day and year above written.

ELI SLIFER,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The above Resolution having been agreed to by a majority of the members of each House, at two successive sessions of the General Assembly of this Commonwealth, the proposed amendments will be submitted to the people, for their adoption or rejection, on the first Tuesday of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, in accordance with the provisions of the tenth article of the Constitution, and the act entitled "An Act prescribing the time and manner of submitting to the people, for their approval and ratification or rejection, the proposed amendments to the Constitution," approved the twenty-third day of April, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four.

ELI SLIFER,
May 4, 1864. Sec'y of the Commonwealth.

Select Poetry.

I KNOW A LITTLE VILLAGE.

I know a little village,
Where a sunny sparkling stream,
Murmurs o'er the shining pebbles,
Like the music of a dream;
With love to see it glisten
In the sun's bright golden ray—
But neither stream nor sunlight
Have brought me here to-day.

And I know a little cottage
Where the summer roses grow,
And star-like scented jessamine,
And petals white as snow;
Where feathered songsters sit at eve,
And soft and melodious lay—
But neither birds nor flowers, I ween,
Have brought me here to-day.

But in that cottage dwelleth now
A maiden fair and bright,
With eyes like dew-drops on violets,
With locks of sunny light;
With soul as pure as yon bright stream,
And heart as light and gay—
And to claim that maiden for my bride,
I come this road to-day.

Speech of the HON. GLENNI W. SCOFFIELD, OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, April 29th, 1864, on the bill of H. Winter Davis, "to guarantee to certain States, whose governments are usurped or overthrown, a Republican form of Government."

MR. SCOFFIELD said—Mr. Speaker: The continuity of constitutional Government in the seceded States has been broken—the regular transmission of political power interrupted. How shall the severed thread be joined? By the unconstrained action of the people themselves, say the gentlemen in opposition. Very good, sir, I most heartily endorse that sentiment. When the people of these States shall voluntarily ground the arms of their rebellion, and unconcerned take upon themselves the easy yoke and light burden of the ever-gentle Federal Government, it will mark a glad day in these uneventful years of our history. For one, I will be ready to hail it. I presume I may speak for my political associates; we will all be ready to hail it. Your care-worn President and weary Army—wearily with, but not of, the battle—will be ready to hail it. The Federal arm, now raised in such terrible power in defense of the life and liberties of the nation, will fall as gently as the tenderest sympathizer will ask upon the heads of repentant and pardoned offenders. But that bright day does not yet dawn. These erring prodigals still prefer the husks of transgression to the fattened calf with which their old political allies would entice them back to grovel to an ox, so long do they tarry in revolt; and I fear they will continue to neglect your feast until our gallant army shall bring them to their stomachs.

In the meanwhile some kind of government ought to be established in those States from which the hostile army has been excluded; and while we wait the return of friendly popular action there, Congress must legislate or leave the people in the rough hand of military law. This bill, designed to discharge that congressional duty, provides a temporary government and a practical mode of State restoration. I will not enter into a criticism of its many details, for I suppose they will be generally acceptable to any one who concedes the propriety of any congressional action. Its three prohibitions, as it strikes me, are the most noticeable and perhaps only debatable points. It prohibits the assumption of rebel debts, prohibits rebel officers from voting, and prohibits involuntary servitude.

The first I will pass by with the single remark that to assume the rebel debt would be to offer a high bounty for future rebellions, and I suppose we will have enough of this one never to want another.

I have but a word for the second prohibition: The ballot is the sovereign of this country, and it you permit these officers to vote you make them, to the extent of their numbers and influence, the rulers of the land. To-day you meet them in battle as outlaws and traitors, conquer them, and ordinary criminals are properly excluded from the polls, upon what principal of comparative justice can these men, guilty, not as subordinates or accessories, but as contrivers and leaders of a crime recognized by all Governments as the highest or deepest that can be committed against human laws, ask the high privilege of the ballot through which they may complete the ruin of the country they were not quite able to destroy in the field? Of the third prohibition I have something more to say.

Mr. Speaker, if God shall give us victory, and enable us to subdue or scatter the army of the enemy, is a voluntary reunion of the States possible? I say voluntary because I suppose nobody desires a Union at ways to be maintained by force; and I use the word *reunion* because nobody proposes a form of Government different from our present system of State brotherhood. I am not now speaking of the several plans of reconstruction for they are designed only as temporary devices, looking to a reunion—a kind of scaffolding for repairs, to be torn away when the repairs are completed. My question looks beyond the battle and beyond reconstruction. When the victory is won, if won it shall be, and the transition over where the insurgent States *willingly stay* where they have been *forcibly put* in their old places in the old Union? It has been said by gentlemen in opposition, and it seems to me with great truth, that as at present constituted or situated, they will not. They disliked the Union three years ago too much to remain in it, and dislike has deepened in the hour of its severity of the war. They tell us that Ireland, Poland, Hungary—suggestive names I admit—after so many years of compulsory alliance, do not fraternize with their political associates. They

still sigh for separation, and impatiently await the opportune hour in which to strike for independence. What then? Shall these States be permitted to depart? No, sir. The great Republic could not survive the amputation. Shall they be retained, then, in the long future, by military force? Then, sir, our own liberties could not survive their permanent subjugation. When the Federal Government becomes strong enough to hold eleven States as colonies, it will be too strong, I fear, for the people's liberties. To repeat my idea, if you allow a single stone to drop from the National edifice, the whole structure may fall; but if that stone must be held in its place by drafts upon its surroundings, supporting nothing itself, the building were stronger without it. This brings us to the paradoxical conclusion that we can neither *allow* these States to depart, nor *force* them to remain. How can the paradox be solved? By making them *willing* to remain, or if this language still sounds paradoxical, I will say by removing all motive to depart. How can that be done?

Mr. Speaker, similarity of ideas is the bond of nationality. Contiguity of territory is nothing, natural boundaries are nothing, except as they are tributary to unity of thought. Ireland is indeed restless, but her restlessness is not owing to numbing animosities of civil wars. Such wars have been more frequent and more severe between different parts of England and between England and Scotland than they ever were between England and Ireland; and yet the people of these sections of the British Empire cordially fraternize. Nor is it owing to English subjugation, for Ireland is no more subjugated to England than Massachusetts is to New York. She is a part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, possessing the same rights as any other part, with a proportionate representation in Parliament and all departments of Government. English people and Irish people do not think alike. That is the trouble. They differ in religion—a difference that more than anything else has been the cause of popular estrangement throughout the world. They have each a long independent national history, full of glorious traditions; and national thoughts and feelings, long flowing in a particular direction, cut their channels rudely, but deep, and do not readily follow new though better channels of political science. These differences of sentiment are only removed by years, perhaps centuries, of political and social intercourse. But in the case of Ireland this necessary intercourse was cut off by an intervening sea, a sea that under the old system of navigation was as wide, almost as an ocean in our day. The same or similar things may be said of Poland and Hungary. They had even a greater difference in language, and in the case of Poland there was a wide difference in the form of Government. Having been accustomed to a kind of republic, she was placed under the control of a solid, silent, cast-iron, absolute monarchy. There is no analogy between these countries and ours. All our States prefer a government republican in form. Even the insurgent States adopted a constitution almost exactly like the one they attempted to abandon. We have the same national history. Whatever there may be in the past, either of suffering or achievement, worthy to be remembered or cherished, is the common property and pride of all the States. We follow the same fashions, speak the same language, and worship at the same altar. No mountains, no seas divide us. On the contrary, the shape of our territory and the course of our rivers are of themselves a revelation that the Union of the States is an ordinance of God.

We have but one cause of estrangement, the difference of opinion upon the subject of slavery. Upon that subject can the North and the South be induced to think alike? Can the North be induced to sanction slavery and think with the South, or can the South be induced to abandon slavery and think with the North? Either course would accomplish the purpose. Is either practical, and if so, which is most practical? For I will not now ask which is most just. Many persons will not consider these questions because they think there is an easier and better way. Let the North and South, say they, agree to disagree about slavery, each section retaining and acting upon its own opinions unmolested by the other. This theory is plausible; it involves no expensive and troublesome change, I blame no one for adopting it, for I am myself one of its foremost believers. I never could bring my mind to doubt its practicability until I actually saw the dissatisfied States go out. Even when warned in advance that these States would secede unless the North suppressed their own views of slavery and adopted or silently acquiesced in the views of the South, I confess I was incredulous. I still believed we could hold the Union together and each section retain and utter its own sentiments. But the moment the people decided that a man holding the sentiments of the North was not thereby disqualified to hold a Federal office, secession followed. Experience, that high-priced school in which it is said the dumbest learn, has taught its lesson. The theory has failed upon trial. Each section, I know, charges the failure to the other. "You wrote and spoke and agitated against slavery," says the South, "and thus irritated and maddened our people into rebellion;" and you," says the North, "annexed Texas and tried to annex Cuba for the sake of slavery, and insisted upon extending it to California and Kansas, and thus forced us to discuss its merits." Blame whom you please, the slave-holders, the abolitionists, or both; the fault was in the theory. It was not possible to ignore a great subject like slavery, connected, as it was, with all our business and all our politics, in this busy, thinking, many-tongued Republic.

The Democratic party North that clung to this theory so long, and sacrificed to it so much

of party ascendancy, acting quite likely from patriotic motives, are very slow to comprehend and accept its fallacy now so clearly demonstrated, although they were the prophets of its failure. They cannot see, they say, why slavery and freedom cannot co-exist in the same country. Why, sir, they can co-exist, but not in a country of unlicensed presses and uncensored debates without provoking discussions on many questions of conflicting interest, and this discussion they concede, may, they charge, provoke rebellion. The revolted States, knowing that discussion was irrepressible, and fearing that it was inimical to their institution, gathered up their slave investments and walked out of the Union, leaving their old allies doubly amazed—amazed to see the theory in which they had so long believed they never did believe, fulfilled. A witty Democrat, in speaking of this prophecy by one party and its denial by the other, said to me the other day there was this difference between us: "You lied when you thought you were speaking the truth; and we spoke the truth when we thought we were lying." They are still bewildered. I can think of no apter comparison than a hen with a double brood of chickens and ducks. Sometimes they try by tender clucking to call back to the peaceful shore the brood of secessionists, hatched by their false theories of State sovereignty and concessions to the slave power, and again they flutter to the water's edge and contemplate embarking with them upon the chill waves of revolution. The wild ducks of the South took readily to this dangerous element, but so far their twin-hatched chickens have been content to cackle on land.

But to come back to the point. Our fathers, say the advocates of this theory, lived in peace upon the same principle. A precedent is always good with a lawyer and if our fathers lived in peace if only for half a century upon this compromise, we can certainly follow their example. But those who cite the precedent mistake the facts in the case. The compromise of our fathers was, that slavery should be gradually relinquished. They did not expect both ideas, slavery and freedom, to go hand in hand throughout the whole life of the Republic. Slavery was to recede slowly and freedom follow steadily. Upon that basis they did get a long very well, and so could we. Territorial acquisitions and certain discoveries in the material arts, as it is said, changed the attitude of slavery altogether. Instead of consenting to go out, it demanded expansion and perpetuity. Instead of remaining subordinate, it claimed to be the national idea and denounced freedom as sectional. This was just reversing the compromise of our fathers, and of course it had to be dissolved, and at this the slave interest took umbrage and resorted to secession and war. If, then, these two systems cannot co-exist without causing discussion, and slavery will not brook discussion, it is clear we cannot have a voluntary reunion unless one sentiment or the other becomes predominant. The North and the South must learn to think alike upon this subject, or agree to submit their differences to general and free debate, taking no appeal from popular legislative, and judicial action and decision, except according to the forms of the Constitution, or, upon a rehearing, to ask the second sober thought of the people upon any point supposed to be settled wrong. But the slave interest, anticipating unfavorable action and therefore refusing to abide by the decisions of this constitutional umpire, leaves us no alternative. To live in peace together we must embrace slavery or they must abandon it.

Montgomery, I said Jeff. Davis at very poor authority with this House, but I believe he has thought more profoundly upon this subject than any middle-brained advocate of mixture in the country. His head is clear though his heart is cold. Just the reverse is true of those well meaning and perhaps patriotic gentlemen with us who still believe in the union of opposites and the harmony of extremes; their hearts are tender and so are their heads.

If, then, likeness of sentiment is the surest bond of a permanent and peaceful Union, which can be most easily adopted as the national standard, slavery or freedom? To adopt slavery involves a change of opinion on the part of a great many people, twenty millions in the free States alone; for slavery never had any real friends in the free States. Those who are sometimes considered were only its apologists. How can you change the opinions of twenty or thirty millions of people? Remember, sir, that opinions are not voluntary things, to be taken up and laid down at pleasure. The mind deals in proofs. Belief follows evidence. But if three years ago slavery could find no real admirers in the free States, who will be its champions now, since it has crowded its many alleged offences against the rights of man with this bloody treason against the mildest and most beneficent Government in the world? Many, I am sure, who took its dark hand then, not in friendship, but only in token of constitutional obligation, will recoil from it now in horror when they see it extended reddened with the blood of our thousands slain. On the other hand, to adopt freedom as the national idea, involves a change of investment. That may not be easy, it will be attended with loss, trouble, and sacrifice; but still it is possible, while a change of opinion without new proofs is not. It is from this view of the case that thousands of men, formerly pro-slavery from principle and practice, have become anti-slavery from Union policy. Living in slave States, they did not regard the institution as immoral, and therefore sanctioned it. But when they saw it used by anti-republicans, and disguised monarchists, for the subversion of popular liberty and the division of this Government—a Government weak, indeed, when in conflict with the feelings of its honest citizens, but always majestically strong when

its flag was assailed—into two insignificant, wrangling, and hostile nationalities, they rose above local prejudices and State policy and personal interests, and said to anti-slavery men and patriotic men everywhere, we will join you to save our country, to overthrow the rebellion, and to break into fragments the stone upon which it is built. For the present extinguish the great conflagration; for the future remove the inflammable material from which it was kindled. For the present seize the mad revolutionists of the South; for the future destroy the virus that poisoned their blood.

In the debate here a few days ago, the consistency of some gentlemen from the loyal slave States who were said to be moderate emancipationists many years ago, and are only moderately so now, was contrasted with the alleged changes of their more radical colleagues. Gentlemen who boast of their consistency seem often to forget that there is such a thing as being upon different sides of the same question at different times and in different places. The question itself often changes sides. I can very well understand how a citizen of a slave State many years ago, giving little attention to the morality of the institution, might fall in with the settled policy of his section and decline to disturb the harmony of his neighborhood by the unnecessary or untimely introduction of abolition agitation, and yet now become an earnest and honest emancipationist in the belief that emancipation alone could preserve the unity of the country. There is such a thing as being right in the wrong time and wrong in the right time. I do not say that those who introduced emancipation in the slave States many years ago were right in the wrong time, but sure I am that all such gentlemen who retard emancipation now are wrong in the right time. But this plan of Union does not necessarily involve immediate emancipation, and I therefore hail all whose labors tend, however slow, to the general result as co-workers, for a voluntary and peaceful reunion of all the States.

In these remarks I have confined myself to a single point, the presentation of slavery as an element of discord and disunion, and as such asked its removal. I have waived its inhumanity to the slave, its corruption of the master, its injustice to white labor, its impoverishment of the soil, its intolerance in politics, its despotism in government, its inconsistency in all things. Advocating State sovereignty, it blots out all divisions of its empire, molds all its States into a single power, and calls the "South." Professing liberty, it yet proscribes from the lowest offices the most exalted patriotism, the most brilliant abilities, the highest learning, and the purest integrity, if found blended with the slightest compassion for the slave. Claiming to be law-abiding, it bows the bow-knife and the biddoon are its chief ministers of justice. Professing to be constitutional, it suspends the great writ of *habeas corpus* in time of peace, tramples down the trial by jury when found in its way, contracts freedom of speech to the right to advocate its unchristian cause, revives constructive treason, and in Philadelphia, Boston, and Kansas inflicts that high crime respectable citizens who spoke too rudely of its traffic in men. All this, and much more, I have omitted because they were not in the line of my present purpose.

And now I call upon those gentlemen who think there are some concessions within the range of possibility which if made would conciliate the slave power, and restore the Union without the necessity of resorting to emancipation, to point out what they are. Name the items. Of course you will not mention the proclamation, confiscation, and what you call the unconstitutional acts of the Administration, for the rebellion preceded all these. On the territorial question there was nothing left to concede. The Wilmot proviso had been voted down, the Missouri compromise repealed, and the Dred Scott opinion ordered and obtained. Even James Buchanan, so gifted in absence of theory to give nothing more in the shape of theory to give nothing more in the shape of theory to give nothing more in the shape of theory, the act of 1850, with its slave-hunting officers, the *pro se comitatus* conclusive affidavit of the master, *habeas corpus* and trial by jury abolished, and the United States to foot the bill, left nothing more to be conceded here.

Concession exhausted and conciliation still a failure! Hereafter let all concession be in favor of freedom; and in all our legislation let us approximate, as rapidly as the interests of the two races will permit, the homogeneity of universal emancipation, and upon that basis make the Union perpetual.

An Irish guide told Dr. James Johnson, who wished for a reason why Echo was always of the feminine gender, that "may be it was because she always had the last word."

An Irishman, illustrating the horrors of solitary confinement, stated that out of one hundred persons sentenced to endure this punishment for life, only fifteen survived it.

"I am surprised, wife, at your ignorance," said a pompous fellow. "Have you never seen any books at all?" "Oh, yes," she replied; "in a number of cases."

A husband telegraphed to his wife, "What have you for breakfast, and how is the baby?" The answer came: "Poached eggs and measles."

"Who was the first Haronut?" asked a Cockney; but as no one seemed to know, "Hesau," continued he, "he was an 'airy man.'"

"Don't thaloot till you're out of the wood," as the ale-bottle said when he heard the strong malt liquor singing in the cask.

Why is a rowdy tenement-house like the war correspondence of a daily paper? Because it is full of horrible roomers.