

The Ebensburg Alleghanian.

A. BARKER, Editor and Proprietor.
TODD HUTCHINSON, Publisher.

I WOULD RATHER BE RIGHT THAN PRESIDENT.—HENRY CLAY.

TERMS: \$5.00 PER ANNUM.
\$2.00 IN ADVANCE.

VOLUME 7.

EBENSBURG, PA., THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1866.

NUMBER 32.

DIRECTORY.

LIST OF POST OFFICES.

Post Offices.
Post Masters. Districts.
Calloway, Steven L. Evans, Carroll.
Cris Springs, Henry Nutter, Chest.
Cris Springs, A. G. Crooks, Wash'tn.
Cris Springs, R. H. Brown, Wash'tn.
Cris Springs, John Thompson, Wash'tn.
Cris Springs, C. Jeffries, White.
Cris Springs, Peter Garman, Susq'ban.
Cris Springs, J. M. Christy, Gallitzin.
Cris Springs, Wm. Tiley, Jr., Wash'tn.
Cris Springs, E. Roberts, Johnst'wn.
Cris Springs, M. Adlesberger, Loretto.
Cris Springs, A. Durbin, Munster.
Cris Springs, M. J. Platt, Susq'ban.
Cris Springs, Stan. Wharton, Clearfield.
Cris Springs, George Besley, A. Shoenaker, Richland.
Cris Springs, B. F. Slick, Wash'tn.
Cris Springs, Wm. McConnell, Croyle.
Cris Springs, J. K. Shryock, S'merhill.

CHURCHES, MINISTERS, &c.

Methodist.—Rev. T. M. Wilson, Pastor. Preaching every Sabbath morning at 10 o'clock, and in the evening at 7 o'clock. Sabbath School at 9 o'clock. A. M. Prayer meeting every Thursday evening at 6 o'clock.
Episcopal Church.—Rev. A. BARKER, Minister in charge. Rev. J. P. FRANKLIN, Assistant. Preaching every alternate Sabbath morning at 10 o'clock, Thursday and Saturday at 9 o'clock. A. M. Prayer meeting every Wednesday evening at 7 o'clock.
Independent.—Rev. L. R. POWELL, Minister in charge. Preaching every Sabbath morning at 10 o'clock, and in the evening at 6 o'clock. Sabbath School at 1 o'clock. P. M. Prayer meeting on the first Monday evening of each month, and on every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday evening, excepting the first week in each month.
Methodist.—Rev. MORGAN ELLIS, Minister in charge. Preaching every Sabbath evening at 6 o'clock. Sabbath School at 1 o'clock. A. M. Prayer meeting every Friday evening at 7 o'clock. Society every Tuesday evening at 8 o'clock.
Presbyterian.—Rev. W. LLOYD, Pastor. Preaching every Sabbath morning at 10 o'clock. A. M. Prayer meeting every Sabbath evening at 6 o'clock. Sabbath School at 1 o'clock. P. M. Prayer meeting every Friday evening at 7 o'clock. Society every Tuesday evening at 8 o'clock.
Baptist.—Rev. DAVIN EVANS, Pastor. Preaching every Sabbath evening at 6 o'clock. Sabbath School at 1 o'clock. P. M. Prayer meeting every Friday evening at 7 o'clock. Society every Tuesday evening at 8 o'clock.
Evangelical.—Rev. R. C. CHRISTY, Pastor. Preaching every Sabbath morning at 10 o'clock. A. M. Prayer meeting every Thursday evening at 4 o'clock in the evening.

EBENSBURG MAILS.

MAILS ARRIVE.
From the north, daily, at 9:55 o'clock. A. M.
From the south, " " 10:00 o'clock. P. M.
MAILS CLOSE.
For the north, daily, at 8 o'clock. P. M.
For the south, " " 8 o'clock. P. M.
The mails from Grant, Carrolltown, arrive on Monday, Wednesday and Friday of each week, at 3 o'clock. P. M.
Leave Ebensburg on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, at 9 o'clock. A. M.

RAILROAD SCHEDULE.

CRENSON STATION.
Balt. Express leaves at 8:55 A. M.
Phila. Express " 9:55 A. M.
Fast Line " 10:33 P. M.
Mail Train " 9:02 P. M.
Altoona Accom. " 4:32 P. M.
Phila. Express " 8:40 P. M.
Fast Line " 2:20 A. M.
Day Express " 6:41 A. M.
Cincinnati Ex. " 1:55 P. M.
Altoona Accom. " 1:21 P. M.
COUNTY OFFICERS.
Judges of the Courts—President Hob. Geo. For, Huntington; Associates, George W. Key, Henry C. Devine.
Prothonotary—Geo. C. K. Zahm.
Register and Recorder—James Griffin.
Sheriff—James Myers.
District Attorney—John F. Barnes.
County Commissioners—John Campbell, Ed. Glass, E. R. Dunnegan.
Supt. of Commissioners—William H. Sechler.
Supt. of Schools—Barnabas M'Dermitt.
Supt. of Public Works—John Lloyd.
House Directors—George M'Callough, Ed. Orris, Joseph Dailey.
House Treasurer—George C. K. Zahm.
Supt. of Public Works—Fran. P. Tierney, Jno. A. Kennerly, Emanuel Beallier.
Supt. of Public Works—Henry Scanlan.
Supt. of Public Works—William Flattery.
Supt. of Public Works—John Cox.
Supt. of Public Works—J. F. Condon.
EBENSBURG BOR. OFFICERS.
AT LARGE.
Burgess—James A. Moore.
Justices of the Peace—Harrison Kinkead, Samuel J. Waters.
Directors—D. W. Evans, J. A. Moore, Charles J. Davis, David J. Jones, William M. Jones, R. Jones, Jr.
Treasurer—Geo. W. Oatman.
Supt. of Public Works—Saml. Singleton.
Street Commissioners—David Davis.
EAST WARD.
Town Council—A. Y. Jones, John O. Evans, Daniel Davis, Charles Owens, R. Jones, Jr., George—Thomas Todd.
Supt. of Election—Wm. D. Davis.
Supt. of Public Works—David E. Evans, Danl. J. Davis.
Supt. of Public Works—Thomas J. Davis.
WEST WARD.
Town Council—John Lloyd, Samuel Stiles, Harrison Kinkead, John E. Scanlan, George Key.
Supt. of Election—Barnabas M'Dermitt.
Supt. of Public Works—John D. Thomas.
Supt. of Public Works—William H. Sechler, George W. Oatman.
Supt. of Public Works—Joshua D. Parrish.
SOCIETIES, &c.
Y. M. C. A.—Summit Lodge No. 312 A. Y. M. C. A. in Masonic Hall, Ebensburg, on the second Tuesday of each month, at 7 o'clock.
O. O. F.—Highland Lodge No. 428 L. O. M. E. in Odd Fellows' Hall, Ebensburg, on Wednesday evening.
W. T. U.—Highland Division No. 84 Sons of Temperance meets in Temperance Hall, Ebensburg, every Saturday evening.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

TO THE ALLEGHANIAN.
\$2.00 IN ADVANCE.
\$5.00 IF NOT PAID IN ADVANCE.

Reconstruction.

SPEECH OF HON. GLENNI W. SCOFIELD, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, APRIL 28th, 1866.

[Concluded.]

I do not wish to disguise the fact that while he approves the two amendments and believes the power exists to require their adoption as conditions of return, he thinks it unnecessary to insist upon any terms additional to those imposed by himself. It is in this opinion that his old persecutors, the defeated enemies of the Union, the foiled plotters of his assassination, have taken heart, and with cruel malice conspired with northern sympathizers to pursue him with their unrelenting friendship. Their last hope for the destruction of this country lies in the seduction of its friends. War failed them, they resort to diplomacy. The President was not much moved by their threats, will be seduced by their flattery? If so, let me assure those of our friends who are disposed to suppress their own convictions in hope to detain him and his patronage in a little select court party, that they might as well exercise a reasonable liberty of opinion. For if he ever determines to trust his political future to anybody besides the great, earnest, triumphant Union organization that elected him, he will have sense enough to put them aside as mere nobodies in popular strength, heartless friends and harmless enemies, as courtiers always are, and push straight for the "southern brothered" rebelled opponents of a permanent and peaceful Union. In that event his children and friends may well rejoice that the past, at least, is secure. His patriotic thoughts of the past five years will still live, although only to reprove him.

Again, it is said by way of excuse, "why not admit such Union men as Fowler, Stokes, and Maynard, of Tennessee?" Because it is not a question about men. Shall a disloyal district, while it is still in a disloyal spirit, be declared entitled to representation with only half as many represented people in it as we require for a district in the North? That is the question. Captain Semmes ran up the Union flag when he wished to decoy an unarmed merchant vessel under the power of his guns, but replaced it with the pirate emblem when he had secured his victim. The names of these patriots are hung out to-day to secure representation to a rebel constituency behind them, but they will be hauled down at the first election and rebels put up in their stead. You may think you are only recognizing the Union flag, but when it is too late you will find yourselves alongside the Alabama and in the power of its pirate crew.

But it is said in reply: "We will not admit disloyal men even if elected."—How can you help yourselves? If a whole delegation from South Carolina, for instance, present themselves to the Clerk of the last House and ask to be placed on the roll, prior to organization, and tender him the certificate of their election signed by the Governor and sealed with the great seal of that most sovereign State, shall the Clerk say which is loyal and which not? I suppose not. After the organization, in which all have participated, and all have been qualified and taken their seats, will you get up an inquisitorial committee to explore the secret recesses of their consciences and be father confessor to their sins? "No, but the iron-bladed oath will exclude them." Do you not know, sir, that almost every man who is in favor of admitting these States without conditions is also in favor of repealing that oath? They already denounce it as an odious and unconstitutional test. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, backed up by a message from the President, ask its repeal so far as regards their Departments, thus making rebels as eligible as Union soldiers to appointments here, and under such lead I expect to see it swept away, and so do most of the gentlemen who are now urging us to lay aside a real safeguard and trust to this cobweb of a moratorium.

But suppose we could in this way contrive to dictate to these people who they should and who they should not elect, what kind of representation would that be? We say to them, "you are free to select your representatives, but mind that you select such as suit us, not yourselves." You call that representation? I call it obedience. We propose to extract the envenomed fang of the serpent before he is uncaged, and you to bind him with test oaths afterward. Suppose, again, you could manage to exclude in this way those who had been engaged in the rebellion, do you not know that a rebel constituency could find a fit representation outside that list, and all the more dangerous & that account? If they had none at home they could colonize from the North. Again, magnanimity is invoked as a shield of desertion. A great nation, it is said, can afford to be magnanimous. Of course it can; but let us see how this is. For four years these people made war upon us without cause or even plausible excuse. Before they began it, we begged them in great humility to withhold from the country this terrible desolation. In tears we warned them of the punishment

that must follow. Our entreaties and warnings were received in the rebel capital, so their telegraph informed us, "with peals of laughter." They fired upon us while we were yet upon our knees begging for peace and union. The contest once begun, was conducted on our part with great forbearance and within the strictest military law. We even returned for awhile their fugitive slaves. On their part it was conducted not only within the condemned system of cruel guerrilla and piratical warfare, but with fire, poison, yellow fever, and assassination. The estates of Union men within their power were confiscated, and have never yet been restored, and Union men were hung for treason to their pretended government.

You tell us they have suffered. So have we. Peace has come at last; business prosperity will return; the insignia of mourning will be laid aside; but in the heart of every family there is an unspoken sorrow that will sadden life even to the grave. Now, we are admonished to be magnanimous to the authors of all this suffering. I accept the admonition, but I submit that we are so already. The law condemned them to death, and we have pardoned them. Their estates were forfeited, and we have restored them. Not a traitor has been hung; not one convicted; not one tried; not a dozen arrested; but many have been honored as rulers in States they only failed to ruin. The high-sounding eloquence of the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Raymond), calling upon us to admire the "courage and devotion" with which these bad men prosecuted a cruel war against our kindred, our homes, and our country for four years, has scarcely subsided when our tears are invoked over their self-inflicted sufferings. Thus at this end of the avenue we are alternately called upon to admire and pity them, while at the other the green seal is kept hot with its work of clemency; clemency often unsolicited, sometimes contemned. We have even ordered historic inscriptions to be erased from captured cannon at West Point, that the boys educated at the expense of a government that their fathers could not quite destroy might not be irritated. What more can we do? What more can gentlemen ask in the name of magnanimity? "Give to this one-seventh of your population more than one-third of your political power?" Is that what you ask, and call it only magnanimity to the false men of the country? Call it rather treachery to the faithful, or if that sounds too harsh, call it submission, surrender, what you like, but for the sake of truth let no one call betrayal of country and friend magnanimity to enemies.

Again, sir, the effort to cut off the excess of this unpatriotic and sectional representation is ascribed to party motives. Is not the Opposition exposed to the same charge? Is not the Democratic party as anxious to secure friends as we are to avoid enemies? For the last five years they have been beaten everywhere. Every election has proven to them that they were growing small by large degrees. "Would to God that night or the rebels would come" has been their daily prayer. Does their haste to embrace the misguided brethren come solely from pure love and affection? Is it not possible that their passion is somewhat like that of—

"The immortal Captain Wattle,
Who was all for love and a little for the bottle?"

Is it not possible that they look a little to party, too? That they long not only for the alliance but the leadership of the South? They must remember that this leadership was generally able and always consistent, however unwise. It was not under that lead that they proclaimed both secession and coercion unconstitutional; that the war for the Union was constitutional, but there was no constitutional mode of conducting it; that an army should be raised, but volunteering was impracticable and drafting unconstitutional; that it was right to raise money, but wrong to tax or borrow; that they were opposed to emancipation, but not in favor of slavery. It was not under that lead that Andrew Johnson was denounced as Lincoln's satrap when he consented to be provisional governor of a State from which the old Governor and Legislature had run away; and was cheered as a patriot when he drove out the Governors and Legislatures of half a dozen States and supplied their places with appointees of his own. Is it not probable that, tired of their contradictory and hypocritical position, they crave the undissembling leadership of Breckinridge and Hunter, Davis and Toombs, as much as we can possibly dread it?

As another excuse for opposition to this plan of restoration it is said there are other inequalities in representation that ought to be removed as well as this. An honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania complains that the six Eastern States have each two Senators, while New York and other large States have no more. It is true that some of the eastern States are small; but the Constitution provides that each State, whether large or small, shall have two Senators; and it further provides that while that instrument may be amended in other respects, with the assent of three-fourths of the States, in this respect it shall not be amended without the assent of all the States. But why point only to the eastern States to illustrate the ine-

quality of senatorial representation? The best illustration of it is not to be found there. The population of these States is 3,135,223. In the South you can find a smaller population with a larger representation in the Senate. The population of Arkansas, Texas, Florida, South Carolina, West Virginia, Maryland and Delaware is only 3,032,761. Here are seven States with more than 100,000 less population than the six eastern States, one-third of that being negroes, with fourteen Senators, two more than New England. Why did not the gentleman make his point on these States? Was it because the eastern States are free and loyal, and the others were slaveholding, and in part disloyal? And why, just in this connection, does he complain that bounties are paid for catching fish? He never complained when higher bounties were paid for catching men and women for the Southern market. These are the old complaints of the South, warmed over, in anticipation of its return, groundless, no doubt, but if ever so just, furnishing no good excuse for allowing to the complainants a two-fold representation in this House.

Once more we are reminded that taxation and representation should go together. True, sir, but that would not entitle them to a double representation, nor deprive Congress of a reasonable time for deliberation as to the extent of the right and the best mode of securing it. But if it is meant that they are entitled on the score of taxation to instantaneous, unconditional, and disproportionate representation, I must beg leave to inquire, where are the immense taxes paid by them, upon which to base such extraordinary claims? The loyal people of the country have been paying burdensome taxes, a million per day, imposed by their misconduct, but where and where have they paid taxes? For the last five years they have paid none, and the amount they are just now beginning to pay is too trifling for argument. If the right of representation could be acquired by imposing taxes upon others, or by robbery of the Government, their claim would be indisputable. They robbed the southern post-offices of money, stamps, and mails; the arsenals and military and naval depots of ammunition, arms, and clothing; the custom houses and sub-treasuries of goods, bonds, and money; and the New Orleans mint of \$600,000 in gold, and have never made restitution. But they have paid very few taxes, and long before they will be called upon to do so a fair and adequate representation will be accorded them.

But they have still another argument—the one relied upon when all others fail, their refuge from discomfiture in every other field of debate—and that is what they call the constitutional argument. When they find themselves unable to maintain in discussion the propriety of allowing the disloyal population a twofold representation, the half to represent themselves and the other half to misrepresent the loyal people, white and black, in their midst; when they can no longer screen themselves behind the "President's policy," words of indefinite meaning; when their aspersion upon our motives is repelled by showing that they have as strong party interest in forming an alliance with the rebels as we possibly can have in trying to prevent it; when their taxation theory is demolished by a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, they fall back upon the constitutional rights of States to representation. They will retreat no farther. This is their last ditch in debate. And here,

"In Dixie's land
They take their stand,
To live or die for Dixie."

Mr. Speaker, we are in an anomalous condition. The Constitution does not especially provide for the difficulties with which we are surrounded. Our fathers could not believe that so large a portion of the American people could be so barbarized by slavery as to undertake such stupendous crime. They did not provide for what they could not foresee. There are no precedents on file to guide us.—This is the first disunion rebellion. Ours will be the first precedent in reconstruction, and the last—only if it is justly and wisely made. There are objections, plausible or otherwise, to every theory that has been or can be advanced as to the status of these States. My colleague [Mr. Stevens] suggested that their present position was very much like that of California after the Mexican war. A score or more of speeches have been made to show that there are objections to this theory. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Shellabarger] suggested that these State governments had perished in the rebellion, and that new ones, republican in form, should be originated by Congress. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Raymond] suggested that new governments must be originated, and proper guarantees and conditions could be imposed, but these things should be done by the Commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy as the terms of surrender. Objections have been raised to that theory also. Others still take the position that inasmuch as new constitutions and new governments have been established in these States, originating in an irregular or revolutionary manner, that it is the duty of Congress, under the fourth article and fourth section

of the Constitution, to see that they are republican in form, and in the discharge of that duty, require such conditions or guarantees as the safety of the Union, in their judgment, demands. This, too, is objected to.

An honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania at the other end of the Capitol, with some self-conceit, as it seems to me, sets down all these reconstruction suggestions or theories as mere whimsies. He has a plan of his own to restore the Union and get rid of traitors. It is simple in theory and cheap in execution. He will execute it himself, with only the aid of a constable. Whenever a rebel shows his head, he and his constable will pounce upon him like a Buchanan marshal on a flying negro. He will put him where no rebel ever went before with his consent—in the old Capitol Prison. If the honorable gentleman really thinks that his plan is practicable, why does he not set about its execution? His intended victims swarm through the Capitol and the White House, and two or three dozen of them are asking admission to Congress. There are objections to this theory. Indeed, it has been tried. It was Buchanan's plan for suppressing the rebellion, but it failed.

Now, sir, the theory of the Opposition, based upon the second and third sections of the first article of the Constitution, under which members from the rebel States are to be admitted to these Halls without our leave, is that the right of a State to representation cannot be forfeited or lost so long as these two sections remain unaltered. Is there no objection to this theory? Why, it concedes the right of representation during the whole war.—Their members could have entered this Capitol at any time and voted as the interest of the confederacy required. If the war had lasted fifty years instead of four, the right would have run through all that time. Nor would it have ceased if our armies had been overpowered and the confederacy left unmolested. After one hundred years of separation, they might still vote for President and send members to Congress. Unless you admit the doctrine of forfeiture, you cannot avoid this conclusion. Aside from this doctrine, nothing but an amendment of the Constitution could deprive them of this right. But the Constitution could not be amended, because these eleven States are more than one-fourth of the whole, and the assent of some of them would be necessary for any amendment; and to deprive them of Senators, the assent of every one would be necessary.

The advocates of this theory, to avoid this result, concede that the right of representation would be forfeited by success. But how? The Constitution is not changed by the result of a battle. There it is, just as it was before. If they lost nothing by defeat, would they by success? They lost nothing by secession and unsuccessful war, you say, because these were unconstitutional. Can they lose anything, then, by victory? Would not that be unconstitutional also? "But we would acquiesce." Well, suppose we should; would not acquiescence be unconstitutional and void? Where in the Constitution are we authorized to acquiesce in a division of the Republic? If their ordinance of secession was void, would not our consent to it be equally void? If the ordinance was void, can it be rendered more so by defeat or less so by victory? Some of the advocates of this theory, to avoid this reasoning, concede that the right of representation is forfeited or suspended during "contumacy." This cruel word to characterize the great rebellion is not original with me. It is the word maliciously chosen by our conservative friends who are determined to make treason odious. I wish the printer to inclose it with inverted commas, that such severity of language may not be ascribed to me.—But who is to decide when the suspension begins and when it ends? The State? If so, that is no suspension at all. A right that can be taken up and laid down at pleasure cannot be said to be suspended. Is Congress the judge? Then I submit that by secession from the United States, by the formation of a new confederacy, by four years of terrible war and five of scornful refusal, these States would become a little contumacious, and Congress would be justified in suspending their rights until the legislation necessary to make representation fair and equal could be agreed upon and passed. And that is all that anybody here proposes to do.

This appeal to the Constitution for authority to hand the Government over to the unrepentant plotters of its destruction is but a continuation of the policy pursued by the Opposition for the last five years. During that period, they have raised a cry about the Constitution many times, but always in opposition to good measures or in advocacy of bad ones. When it was first proposed to coerce the rebellion and save the Union, and at every following step toward apparent success, they cried, "unconstitutional." It was unconstitutional to raise an army or march it into the sacred soil of the South. It was unconstitutional to issue bills of credit to meet the expenses. It was unconstitutional to close a rebel port or arrest a rebel spy, to proclaim martial law in a rebel country, or to appoint a provisional governor for conquered Louisiana or abandoned Tennessee. Look back through

the debates of the Opposition; there is nothing constitutional but slavery and rebellion, nothing so unconstitutional as coercion and emancipation. Judging from these debates, the Constitution was especially framed to repress liberty, punish fidelity to the Union, shield oppression, and honor treachery and great crime.—These war measures are all constitutional now. Great light is thrown upon the Constitution by the surrender of Lee. The gleam of successful bayonets illumines the dark understanding of pro-slavery quibblers. But alas! the light of success shines only on the past. All the future is still unconstitutional. The "unconstitutional, disunion, abolition war" is rendered constitutional by the victory of our soldiers, but the effort to secure to the country the fruits of that victory by appropriate legislation is as unconstitutional as ever.

Here I close my defense of the Republican policy of restoration. Shall that policy be adopted? Not by this Congress, it is said, because enough conservative Republicans will unite with the Opposition to defeat it. Then, by falsely charging upon the Union party non-action and lack of purpose, it is hoped that a Congress can be elected next fall which will repeal the test oath and admit the rebel States without guarantees or conditions of any kind, and with a representation always excessive and now enlarged by emancipation. Without the enlargement (which will not be attained until after the next census), the eleven Confederate States will have eighty votes in the Electoral College, controlled entirely by the late insurgents, namely:

Alabama.....	8
Mississippi.....	7
Arkansas.....	5
Texas.....	5
Louisiana.....	7
Florida.....	3
Georgia.....	3
North Carolina.....	9
South Carolina.....	9
Virginia.....	10
Tennessee.....	10

They will need seventy-seven more to elect a President. Kentucky, Missouri, Maryland, and Delaware, States with strong Confederate proclivities, will, it is claimed, furnish thirty-one, while the other forty-six can be made up by the Democrats of New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut. The classification of votes by which the President would thus be elected would stand—confederates 80, semi-confederates 31, Democratic 40.—This Presidential scheme will undoubtedly fail, and yet it is the only one that has the slightest chance of success. If the Union party can be beaten at all, it must be by this or some similar combination. Suppose it successful, then, what would be the character of the new Administration?—Four members of the Cabinet would belong to the eighty confederate votes and the other three to the seventy-seven from the northern and border States. All Presidential appointments at home and abroad must be made on the same line of division.

If, as is alleged, this combination could also carry a majority of Congress, the confederates would have a majority of that majority, and in caucus (giving their allies the Clerk) would demand the Speaker and a majority of all committees, such as the Ways and Means, Claims, and Pensions, to which their peculiar interests might be referred. Pensions must then be surrendered or divided with confederate claimants; service in the Union army would be an impediment to political success, and the Treasury, supplied by the industry and economy of the North, would be steadily absorbed in confederate damages. Then your creditors might count their worthless bonds and learn exactly how much it cost them to reclaim their fugitive masters. Then the pensionless widows and orphans of our valiant dead might bemoan in poverty and neglect the ingratitude of a Republic saved by a husband's and a father's blood. And then our surviving soldiers must conceal their honorable scars to save a humble position in the capital they helped to preserve—for the enemy. Then, sir, we will all see, feel, and realize what the Opposition, in different phraseology, constantly assert, that the object of the war was to force the rebels to become our rulers.

THE COSTUME IN WHICH DAVIS WAS ARRESTED.—The Chicago Republican, edited by Charles A. Dana, who was Assistant Secretary of War at the time Jeff. Davis was captured, says of the tattered worn by the rebel chieftain upon that memorable occasion:

"When caught he was entirely enveloped in a large and ample aqua scutum cloak, belonging to his wife, which fell to his feet, and was buttoned up to his neck in front, having its hood spread over his soft felt hat so as altogether to conceal his face. In external appearance this disguise made him seem to be a woman, and that it was assumed in the hope that he might thus escape, there can be no question.—The garment captured with him is safe, and will, we presume, be produced whenever necessary to prove the circumstances of his capture."

—Fenian James Stevens subscribes himself "C. O. I. R.," which letters, interpreted, mean "Chief Organizer of the Irish Republic."