

# Democrat and Sentinel.

THE BLESSINGS OF GOVERNMENT, LIKE THE DEWS OF HEAVEN, SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED ALIKE, UPON THE HIGH AND THE LOW, THE RICH AND THE POOR.

NEW SERIES.

EBENSBURG, PA. WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1863.

VOL. 10--NO. 20.

**"DEMOCRAT & SENTINEL"** is published every Wednesday morning, at ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS per annum, payable in advance: ONE DOLLAR AND SEVENTY FIVE CENTS, if not paid within six months; and TWO DOLLARS, if not paid until the termination of the year. No subscription will be received for a shorter period than six months, and no member will be at liberty to discontinue his paper until all arrears are paid, except at the option of the editor. Any person desiring to subscribe for six months will be charged ONE DOLLAR, unless the money is paid in advance.

**Advertising Rates.**  
One insert in Two do. Three do.  
Squares, (12 lines) \$ 50 \$ 75 \$ 1.00  
Squares, (24 lines) 1 00 1 00 2 00  
Squares, (36 lines) 1 50 2 00 3 00  
3 months. 6 do. 12 do.  
Lines of less, \$1 50 \$3 00 \$5 00  
Squares, (12 lines) 2 50 4 50 9 00  
Squares, (24 lines) 4 00 7 00 12 00  
Squares, (36 lines) 6 00 9 00 14 00  
Half a column, 13 00 12 00 20 00  
Full column, 15 00 22 00 35 00

## A Prayer for Peace.

Oh, cry aloud for Peace!  
Till Heaven's blue arches ring,  
And the Angel of the Covenant  
Brings "healing on his wing."  
Oh, cry aloud for Peace!  
Till stones themselves shall fall,  
And mercy glows from human hearts  
Like sparks from smitten steel.

Look on you strik'n ones,  
Eyes closed in long eclipse—  
Eye-mass arms to heaven upraised—  
And "Peace is on their lips."  
Ah! trumpet-tongued they plead  
Against this cruel war—  
Salvific of a tyrant's will,  
Clad in his bloody cur.

Oh, forth the gory shades  
From many a stranger grave—  
Little they seek the "Stars and Stripes"  
The posely yet they wave.  
No tears from loving eyes,  
No gentle hand was there—  
Around the dying soldier's couch  
No mother-kiss in prayer.

And listen to the cries  
Of wounded hearts that rise  
And darken in their agony  
The sunlight and the skies.

"In Ramah there was heard!"  
A voice that sadness bore,  
Rachel but mourned the innocent,  
Because they were no more.  
But Rachel's grief is tame—  
Wives, sisters, mothers, blend  
Their frenzied cries and broken hearts,  
For each had lost a friend.

Appals it not thy sight—  
This flood of human gore!  
Ah! they leap it greedily and call  
"Six hundred thousand more!"  
Six hundred thousand more,  
Leave "wives and little ones,"  
And start with bleeding hearts to hear  
Their laversack and guns.

For what?—The red deer's path  
To follow where it leads?  
To see the fair of savage foe,  
To see his bloody deeds?  
Great God! this dreadful war  
Cries to high Heaven's gate,  
And wrath and indignation dire  
Its cursed leaders wait.

Oh, FREEMEN! are ye dead?  
THE PEOPLE are there none!  
Do all that made this once proud land  
For ever, ever, gone!  
But PEACE! O, men of nerve!  
No longer stop to think—  
Seize on the hand that Heaven extends,  
Seize it or we sink.

MEMPHIS, March 4, 1863.  
Does this require a signature? Is it not  
passed in tears and blood by thousands and  
thousands, whose voice and agony, still, as  
the dark cloud moves on, is heard far above  
the thunder tones, crying "PEACE! GIVE US  
PEACE!"  
ESTELLE.

## War is Disunion.

### THE GREAT ANTI-WAR SPEECH

#### OF

#### HON. S. A. DOUGLAS,

#### OF ILLINOIS,

#### Delivered in the United States Senate on the

#### 15th of March, 1861, the last one he

#### delivered in the Halls of Congress, and the

#### last official act of his life.

In the state of the case, for the purpose of quieting the apprehension of the country, and demonstrating, first, that the President does not meditate war; and secondly, that he has no means for prosecuting a warfare upon the seceded States, even if he desired, I bring in this resolution. Attempts are made to prevent its consideration. It is suggested that the discussion of it at this time would be, if not improper, at least injurious. What had effect can result from answering the inquiries contained in the resolution? If

the policy of the Administration be peace, and if the answer be such as I anticipate it will be, it will quiet the country; it will relieve these apprehensions; it will restore confidence; it will cause rejoicing throughout the length and breadth of the land. If, on the contrary, the policy be war, it is due to the people of the United States that that fact should be known, and that we be informed whether we are drifting, in order that we may see whether we are willing to be drawn into war irregularly, without the sanction of Congress or the consent of the country.

I believe that the answer to this resolution will quiet the country, and restore good will and good feeling among the people of the different sections. I repeat the conviction that Mr. Lincoln does not meditate war. Certain I am that, under the laws as they now exist, he cannot, consistent with his oath, do any act that will produce collision between the seceded States and the Federal Government. In the first place he has no power, under the existing laws, to collect the revenue on shipboard, as is suggested by the partisan press. By the laws of the land, the revenue must be collected at the ports of entry, and in the custom houses designated by law, and cannot be collected anywhere else; except in specific cases provided in the law itself. By reference to the act to the act of the 2nd of March, 1859, it will be seen that South Carolina is divided in three collection districts; that three ports of entry are established; one at Georgetown, one at Charleston, and one at Beaufort; and a collector, surveyor, and naval officer, are to be appointed "to reside at Charleston." The custom house officers are required to reside at the ports of entry designated by law. So it is with all the collection districts in all the other States.

Another section—section eighteen—of the law makes it unlawful to enter goods or collect revenue elsewhere than the "ports of entry" designated in the law. It expressly prohibits the collection of revenue or the entry of goods at any other place. Then a subsequent section—section eighty-five of the same law—makes one exception to this rule; and that is, in case a vessel is prevented by ice from approaching the pier or wharf at the port of entry, the captain, on application to the collector, may receive a permit to land the goods, and pay the duties at any place in the district designated in the permit. The only case, then, where revenue can lawfully be collected, or goods lawfully entered, at any other point than the port of entry designated in the law, is where the vessel is obstructed by ice from approaching the wharf at such port.

It has been suggested, and the people of the country, North and South, have been led to believe, that it is the purpose of this Administration, without authority of law, to order revenue cutters down to those Southern ports, and to collect revenue on board of them. I wish to call the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that the law forbids the collection of revenue on shipboard or anywhere else, except at Charleston, at Savannah, at New Orleans, and at each one of the ports designated in the law. The President of the United States would subject himself justly and lawfully to impeachment if he should attempt to collect the revenue on shipboard, or in any other manner, or at any other place, than that authorized by law. The law in this respect stands now just as it did when Gen. Jackson, in 1832, called on Congress for additional legislation to enable him to collect revenue at the port of Charleston. Then Gen. Jackson had no power to remove the custom-house from the city of Charleston to shipboard in the harbor. He had no power to order the collection of revenue anywhere else than at the place designated by law. Because of the absence of legal authority to do this, he called on Congress to pass a law which authorized him to collect revenue on the land or shipboard, anywhere within the harbor other than at the place designated at the port of entry. Congress passed the law known to the country now as the "force bill." The force bill was passed March 2, 1833; and the first and fifth section which gave authority to collect the revenue at any place in the harbor, and the power to use military force, expired at the end of the next session of Congress by the express limitation of that act. Hence the law stands now just as it did before the force bill was passed; there is no more authority to collect revenue on shipboard now than there was before the passage of the act of 1833. You cannot, under law, collect the revenue anywhere else, either on shipboard or on land. Then, what danger is there of any collision between this Government and the seceded States upon the question of

collecting revenue? There is none, unless Senators suppose that the President of the United States is going to violate the law and his oath of office by using force to do that which the law forbids him to do. I do not believe Mr. Lincoln is going to do any such thing.

But we are told that the country is to be precipitated into war by blockading all the Southern ports; blockading ports within the United States; blockading our own ports with our own army and navy! Where is the authority for that? What law authorizes the President of the United States to blockade Federal ports at discretion? He has no more authority to blockade New Orleans or Charleston than he has to blockade New York or Boston; and no more legal right to blockade Mobile than Chicago. Sir, I cannot consent that the President of the United States may at his discretion blockade the ports of the United States or any other country. He can do only what the Constitution and laws authorize him to do. He dare not attempt to obstruct the navigation at the mouth of the Mississippi river, or at any other port in the seceded States, or even those that remained loyal to the Constitution and the Union. The intimation that he is to do this implies a want of respect for the integrity of the President, or an ignorance of the laws of the land on the part of those who are disturbing the harmony and quiet of the country by threats of illegal violence.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question in relation to this matter? Is it not the duty of the President to prevent smuggling in all the ports of the Union?

MR. DOUGLAS. I am not talking about smuggling. It is his duty to enforce the laws of the land in respect to smuggling.

But, sir, it is not his duty to prevent smuggling in any other mode or by any other means than those provided by law. Will the Senator from New York intimate to the Senate and to the country that, under the pretext of preventing smuggling, the President can close a port created by law, and stop all commerce connected with it? Will he intimate that, under suspicion that if the revenue cutter allows a vessel to enter the port of New Orleans, she will not pay any duties, therefore the President will prevent her going there? The law gives him no such power, no such discretion. The suggestion, therefore, of the Senator from New York, that these ports of the United States are to be blockaded by the Navy at the discretion of the President, under pretense of preventing smuggling, only shows how loosely even Senators talk about the powers and duties of the President. There is no law that authorizes it. To do the act, or attempt it, would be one of those high crimes and usurpations that would justly subject the President of the United States to impeachment.

But we are told the President is going to enforce the laws in the seceded States. How? By calling out the militia and using the army and navy! These terms are used as freely and as flippantly as if we were a military government where martial law was the only rule of action, and the will of the monarch was the only law on the subject. Sir, the President cannot use the army, or the navy, or the militia, for any purpose not authorized by law. What is law? If there be an insurrection in any State against the laws and authorities thereof the President can use the military to put it down only when called upon by the State Legislatures, if it be in session, or, if it cannot be convened, by the Governor. He cannot interfere except when requested. If on the contrary, the insurrection be against the laws of the United States instead of a State, then the President can use the military only as a posse comitatus in aid of the marshal in such cases as are so extreme that judicial authority and the powers of the marshal cannot put down the obstruction. The military cannot be used in any case whatever except as the aid of civil process to assist the marshal to execute a writ. I shall not quote the laws upon this subject, but if gentlemen will refer to the acts of 1795 and 1807, they will find that by the act of 1795 the militia only could be called out to aid in the enforcement of the laws when resisted to such an extent that the marshal could not overcome the obstruction. By the act of 1808, the President is authorized to use the army and navy to aid in enforcing the laws in all cases where it was before lawful to use the militia. Hence the military power, no matter whether navy, regulars, volunteers, or militia, can be used only in aid of the civil authorities.

Now, sir, how are you going to create a case in one of those seceded States where the President would be authorized to call out the military? You must first procure a writ from the judge describing the crime; you must place that in the hands of the marshal, and must meet such obstructions as render it impossible for him to execute it; and then, and not till then, can you call upon the military. Where is your judge in the seceded States? Where is your marshal? You have no civil authorities there, and the President, in his inaugural, tells you he does not intend to appoint any. He said he intended to use the power confided to him, to hold, and possess the forts, and collect the revenue; but beyond this he did not intend to go. You are told, therefore, in the inaugural, that he is going to appoint no judges, no marshals, no civil officers, in the seceded States, that can execute the law, and hence we are told that he does not intend to use the army, the navy, or the militia for any such purposes.

Is it your purpose to rush this country blindly into war at a cost of \$300,000,000 per annum; to levy \$2,000,000 of direct taxes upon the people, and then call upon them to pay it because you have involved us in civil war? Sir, I expect to stand by my country under all circumstances; and hence I will save her, if I can, from being plunged into a civil war of indefinite duration, that will require a quarter of a million of men and exorbitant taxation, levied on one half of the American people, to subdue the other half. Remember, this extraordinary amount of revenue, these extraordinary numbers of men, are to be called for in eighteen States to fight fifteen; for it is useless to disguise the fact, that whenever you make the question one of peace or of war, the slaveholding States will be a unit, and will be eighteen against fifteen. Are we prepared for civil war, with all its horrors and calamities?

I repeat, it is time that the line of policy was adopted, and that the country knew it. In my opinion, we must choose, and that promptly, between one of the three lines of policy:

1. The restoration and preservation of the Union by such amendments to the Constitution as will insure the domestic tranquility, safety and equality of all the States, and thus restore peace, unity and fraternity to the whole country.

Or, 2. A peaceful dissolution of the Union, by recognizing the independence of such States as refuse to remain in the Union without such constitutional amendment, and the establishment of a liberal system of commercial intercourse with them by treaties of commerce and amity.

Or, 3. War, with a view to subjugation and military occupation of those States which have seceded or may secede from the Union.

I repeat that, in my opinion, you must adopt and pursue one of these three lines of policy. The sooner you choose between them and proclaim your choice to the country, the better for you, the better for us, the better for every friend of liberty and constitutional government throughout the world. In my opinion, the first proposition is the best, and the last the worst.

I am in favor of such amendments to the Constitution as will take that question out of Congress, and restore peace to the country. That may be done by non-intervention—by popular sovereignty, as it is called; or by the Crittenden amendment, making an equitable partition of the Territory between the two sections, with a self-executing clause prohibiting it on one side and protecting it on the other. It may be done in various ways. I prefer such an amicable settlement to peaceable disunion; and I prefer it a thousand times to civil war. If we can adopt such amendments as will be satisfactory to Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and the border States, the same plan of pacification which will satisfy them will create a Union party in the cotton States which will soon embrace a large majority of the people in those States, and bring them back of their own free will and accord; and thus restore, strengthen and perpetuate the glorious old Union forever. I repeat, whatever guarantees will satisfy Maryland and the border States (the States now in the Union) will create a Union party in the seceded States that will bring them back by the voluntary action of their own people. You can restore and preserve the Union in that mode. You can do it in no other.

War is disunion. War is final, eternal separation. Hence, disguise it as you may, every Union man in America must advocate such amendments to the Constitution as will preserve peace and restore the Union; while every disunionist, whether openly or secretly plotting its destruction, is the advocate of peaceful se-

cession, or of war, as the surest means of rendering reunion and reconstruction impossible. I have to much respect for any man that has standing enough to be elected a Senator, to believe that he is for war, as a means for preserving the Union, I have too much respect for his intellect to believe, for one moment, that there is a man for war who is not a disunionist *per se*. Hence I do not mean, if I can prevent it, that the enemies of the Union—men plotting to destroy it—shall drag this country into war under the pretext of protecting the public property, and enforcing the laws, and collecting revenue, when their object is disunion, and war the means of accomplishing a cherished purpose.

The disunionists, therefore, are divided in two classes: the one open, the other secret disunionists. The one in favor of peaceful secession and a recognition of independence; the other in favor of war, as the surest means of accomplishing the object, and of making the separation final, eternal. I am a Union man, and hence against war. But we are told, and we hear it repeated everywhere, that we must find out if we have got a government. "Have we a government?" is the question; and we are told we must test that question by using the military power to put down all discontented spirits. Sir, this question, "have we a government?" has been pronounced by every tyrant who has tried to keep his feet on the necks of the people since the world began. When the Barons demanded *Magna Charta* from King John at Runnymede, he exclaimed, "have we a government?" and called for his army to put down the discontented barons. When Charles I attempted to collect the ship money in violation of the Constitution of England, and in disregard of the rights of the people, and was resisted by them, he exclaimed, "have we a government?" We cannot treat with rebels; but down with the traitors; we must show that we have a government." When James II was driven from throne of England for trampling on the liberties of the people, he called for his army, and exclaimed, "let us show that we have a government!" When George III called upon his army to put down the rebellion in America, Lord North cried lustily, "no compromise with traitors; let us demonstrate that we have a government." When, in 1848, the people rose upon their tyrants all over Europe, and demanded guarantees for their rights, every crowned head exclaimed, "have we a government?" and appealed to the army to vindicate his authority and to enforce the law.

Sir, the history of the world does not fail to condemn the folly, weakness, and wickedness of that government which drew its sword upon its own people when they demanded guarantees for their rights. This cry, that we must have a government, is merely following the example of the besotted Bourbon, who never learned anything by misfortune, never forgot an injury, never forgave an affront. Must we demonstrate that we have got a government, and coerce obedience without reference to the justice of the complaints? Sir, whenever ten million of people proclaim to you, with one unanimous voice, that they apprehend their rights, their families, and their family altars are in danger, it becomes a wise government to listen to the appeal, and to remove the apprehension. History does not record an example where any human government has been strong enough to crush ten million people into subjection when they believed their rights and liberties imperiled without first covering the government itself into a despotism, and destroying the last vestige of freedom.

Let us take warning from the examples of the past. Wherever a government has refused to listen to the complaints of the people, and attempt to put down their murmurs by the bayonet, they have paid the penalty. Of all those who listened to the people in 1848, and granted charters of liberty, and took an oath to support them, only one has been faithful; and he has been rewarded for his fidelity; the others will pay the penalty of their perfidy. The King of Sardinia granted a constitution, took an oath to support it and to-day he is King of Italy. If George III had listened to the murmurs of our fathers, and granted their just demands, the war of the Revolution would have been averted, and the blood that was spilled would have been saved.

If we consider this question calmly, and make such amendments as will convince the people of the Southern States that they are safe and secure in their persons, in their property, and in their family relations, within the Union, we can restore and preserve it. If we cannot satisfy the people of the border States

that they may remain in the Union with safety, dissolution is inevitable. Then the simple question comes back, what shall be the policy of the Union men of this country? Shall it be peace or shall it be war? What man in all America, with a heart in his bosom, who knows the facts connected with Fort Sumpter, can hesitate in saying that duty, honor, patriotism, humanity, require that Anderson and his gallant band should be instantly withdrawn? Sir, I am not afraid to say so. I would scorn to take a party advantage or manufacture partisan capital out of an act of patriotism.

Peace is the only policy that can save the country. Let peace be proclaimed as the policy, and you will find that a thrill of joy will animate the heart of every patriot in the land; confidence will be restored; business will be revived; joy will gladden every heart; bond fires will blaze upon the hill-tops and in the valleys, and the church bells will proclaim the glad tidings in every city, town and village in America, and the applause of a grateful people will greet you everywhere. Proclaim the policy of war, and there will be gloom and sadness and despair pictured upon the face of every patriot in the land. A war of kindred, family and friends; father against son, mother against daughter, brother against brother, to subjugate one-half of this country into obedience to the other half; if you do not mean this, if you mean peace, let this be adopted, and give the President the opportunity, through the Secretary of War, to speak the word "peace;" and thirty million of people will bless him with their prayers, and honor him with their shouts of joy.

## Attack on Charleston.

Official despatches from Admiral Dupont—The plan of attack—Accident to the Ironsides—The Keokuk sunk—The Nahant disabled.

WASHINGTON, April 12.—The steamer Flambeau, arrived here this afternoon, with Lieut. Commander Rhind, as bearer of despatches from Admiral Dupont, to the Government.

The reports from the several commanders had not been received up to the time of the departure of the Flambeau, namely Wednesday night.

From other than official sources, it is ascertained that the vessels comprising the fleet, advanced upon Charleston on the 7th, in the following order:

The Weehawken, Capt. John Rodgers; the Passaic, Capt. Droyton; the Montauk, Capt. Worden; the Patasco, Capt. Ammen, the Ironsides, the flag ship, Commander Turner, with Admiral Dupont and his staff on board. Next followed the Catskill, Capt. Geo. Rodgers; Nantucket, Capt. Fairfax; Nahant, Capt. Dowse; Keokuk, Capt. Rhind.

In this order they proceeded up the main channel, arriving within seventeen hundred yards of the main forts. The Ironsides became unmanageable, owing to the tide and the narrowness of the channel, and she was, therefore, obliged to drop anchor, to prevent drifting ashore. Owing to these circumstances, she signalled her consorts to disregard her motions.

The remainder of the squadron continued at its course, and soon came within the range of the rebel fire from all points. The obstructions in the channel, from Sumter to Fort Moultrie, interfered with the progress of our ships. In consequence of this, and the position of the Ironsides, as above stated, the plan of operations for the battle was deranged, and the space for maneuvering being only from five hundred to one thousand yards, the vessels were obliged to prepare, and at once engage the forts and the adjacent batteries.

The signal had been made for action at half-past three o'clock in the afternoon, by the Ironsides, but the rebels had previously opened fire upon the leading vessels. The contest is represented as in the highest degree exciting, presenting a fearful scene of fire belching from all points on the water and the land—a continuous roar of cannon.

In the course of thirty or forty minutes, the Keokuk was in a sinking condition, and was obliged to withdraw from the fire, and seek anchorage below the range of the enemy's fire. A few minutes afterwards, all the vessels withdrew on a signal from the flag-ship, it being deemed impracticable to continue further hostilities. The Keokuk was within five or six hundred yards of Sumter, and was completely riddled, being struck from all the batteries within range at least ninety times in thirty minutes. The shot went from rified cannon of the heaviest calibre. Capt. Rhind, her commander, received a contusion on the leg from a flying fragment of his vessel, which only

satisfied the people of the border States. [CONTINUED ON FOURTH PAGE.]