

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, JUNE 24, 1863.

VOL. 10--NO. 29.

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 until the termination of the year. No subscription will be received for a shorter period than six months, and no subscriber will be at liberty to discontinue the paper until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the editor. Any person subscribing for six months will be charged ONE DOLLAR, unless the money is paid in advance.

Advertising Rates.
One insert'n. Two do. Three do.
Square, [12 lines] \$ 50 \$ 75 \$1.00
Square, [24 lines] 1 00 1 00 2 00
Square, [36 lines] 1 50 2 00 3 00
3 months, 6 do. 12 do.
Square, [12 lines] \$1.50 \$3.00 \$5.00
Square, [24 lines] 4 00 7 00 12 00
Square, [36 lines] 6 00 9 00 14 00
Half a column, 10 00 12 00 20 00
Full column, 15 00 22 00 35 00

A Sound Speech.

The following speech was made by the Hon. T. A. Hendricks, at the great mass meeting of the Democracy of Indiana on the 20th ultimo. We commend it to the attention of our readers. Mr. Hendricks said:

My Fellow-Citizens:

I did not expect to participate as one of the speakers on this occasion. We had expected, as you are aware, distinguished gentlemen from other States to be present and address the Convention, and of course that event you would not have expected to be addressed by one of your own fellow-citizens of Indiana. But inasmuch as we have been disappointed in this respect, I have thought it was perhaps my duty to consent to address you on this occasion, which I shall do very briefly.

Wherefore, ever since I became a voter, I have thought the Democratic party was right. Within the last year, however, it has not been, as heretofore, an opinion with me. On the contrary, it has ripened into a conviction, and I now know that the Democratic party is right—right as tried by the record of the past, and right in the doctrines and measures which it now advocates.

Let me ask you to-day, my friends, whether, in looking over the record of the past political history of the country, you can put your finger upon a single instance of Democratic policy of which you are ashamed—one which you would alter if you could? Are you not all content to-day with the past policy of the Government so far as it has been influenced by the Democratic party? Then if you are proud of the glorious past—if you are satisfied with the policy which guided the destinies of this country for the sixty years that elapsed between the election of the immortal Jefferson and that of Abraham Lincoln—why should you now think of turning your backs upon the Democratic party? Men have the assurance to stand up and tell us that it is our duty to abandon this organization. I tell you, gentlemen, as I love my country and would wish well for her interests, I would stand by the Democratic party.

Could I look backward over the past and see but a solitary instance in which the operation of Democratic ideas had brought dishonor or misfortune upon my country, I would not advocate its existence for another hour. But if, on the other hand, the past history of the country sustains the principles and measures adhered to by that grand old party, then I have another suggestion to make: What principle or doctrine of the Democratic party, should you now abandon in order that you may become a better citizen or a truer friend to your country?

Upon this subject of slavery the doctrine of the Democracy has uniformly been non-intervention. We have always held that Congress had no right to interfere with it in any manner; but that it should be left to the people of every State to regulate it according to their own pleasure. If the people of a State or Territory wish to have slavery, the Democracy said their will was sovereign in regard to that matter, and that their will was final and conclusive. That has always been the doctrine of the Democratic party; and I tell you, my friends, that if that principle had been recognized in Congress and in the States, our flag to-day would have been unsullied and unblemished, our national banner ornamented with thirty-four glittering stars, and peace and harmony would have reigned over our country. There would be no blood discoloring our streamlets—we would be a united and happy people. Now some of these Republican gentlemen will tell

you that all this is untrue, yet in their heart of hearts they know it is true—they know that if we had all stood firmly by this great principle, it would have preserved the Union of these States, and the peace, prosperity, and happiness of this whole people.

It is said by some that we should not do anything except what tends to put down the rebellion; nay, more, they say we should scarcely dream except for the purpose of putting down the rebellion. I am willing, for one, to be measured by that standard, but I want to put these Republican gentlemen to the same test. During the continuance of this war, from its commencement to the present time, my heart has continually yearned for the restoration of the Union. This Union does not belong to the Republican party; it does not belong to Mr. Lincoln; it is your Union; it is my Union; it is the glorious inheritance that came down to us from our fathers, and no man or set of men may claim it; it is the Union which gave us a flag, representing on its azure sky a sparkling star for every State. This Union belongs to us all, and I want to see it restored, so that after all the simple questions at issue between myself as an individual, and I have no hesitancy in saying, between the Democratic party and the opposite party is—how can the Union be restored?

I claim that the Democratic party has always been strongly in favor of the restoration of the Union and in favor of that policy which was alone likely to bring it about; while, at the same time, the opposite party, if not in fact opposed to the accomplishment of that object, have at least followed a course of policy not likely to bring it about. How much I would give to see this infamous rebellion put down, I cannot express. I believe that I would cheerfully give up all that I possess; nay, more, I believe I would be willing to give my life itself if I might only have the privilege of seeing my country where it once was.

And now I want to ask the gentlemen of the opposite school, those who tell us that we should do and say nothing that does not tend to put down this rebellion, how the measures adopted by the present Administration at Washington and by Congress have helped to put down this rebellion? And, in the first place, I would like to know how it helps to put down this rebellion to set the negroes free in the District of Columbia, and to compel you and me to pay taxes for that purpose. When the plan is fully carried out—the negroes all set at liberty and sent forth to become worthless vagabonds in our midst—I then would know how that has helped to put down the rebellion.

Another thing: The Republican Congress of the United States saw proper, in its wisdom, to pass a law recognizing the Republics of Hayti and Liberia as independent governments, equal in dignity to the American Government, and equally entitled to the respect of all nations. They provided ministers to reside at the courts of Hayti and Liberia, and made arrangements also to receive, with becoming respect, the ministers who should be sent from those governments to represent them in the court at Washington.

All this costs us a great many thousand dollars, (an important item, one might think, in times like these, but small indeed compared with what contractors make now and then,) and when it is all done—when we have sent some of these Abolition gentlemen to represent the sovereignty of the American people in the stable courts of Hayti and Liberia, and received in return some good looking negroes to represent them in our capital, and for our officers of government to hold social, friendly intercourse with—when all this is done, I want to know how that helps to put down the rebellion?

Another thing: They passed a law that the Southern people should not be allowed to go into the Territories with their slave property. I do not believe in that law, in be in favor of its repeal; for I believe that in the acquisition of that territory the Southern people had the same rights the Northern people had. You recollect how our national Territories were acquired. They were acquired by the common blood and treasure of both sections, the South, as well as the North, furnished men and means for the accomplishment of that object. The blood of the Northern boy and of the Southern boy mingled together on the sands of Mexico, they slept beneath the same tent, fought shoulder to shoulder upon the battle-field, and, when the conflict was over, they were buried side by side in the same grave. And in view of all this, when at the close of the war the North said, we will take all this territory for ourselves,

and the South shall have none, I said that it was the act of a highwayman, and not of the honest, Christian, patriotic man.

Let me bring this matter home to your minds by means of a simple illustration. Three of my neighbors buy a piece of land costing each of them a hundred dollars. They go to work to improve the place and prepare it for cultivation. They clear away the timber, build fences, and erect buildings upon the land, and after three or four years have been employed in this way, two of the men begin to find fault with the third; say they do not like the kind of hands he employs to work on the farm, and they will take the whole thing entirely out of his hands and manage it themselves. What then could happen? This third man, who has thus been summarily and unlawfully dispossessed of his rights, would come into the temple of justice, and would there make his plea to a jury composed of twelve of you, honest men, and he would say to you: "I helped to clear that farm—I helped to build the fences and roll the logs and to prepare the land for cultivation;" and if you twelve jurors did not bring in a verdict restoring that man his just and lawful rights, you would go out of that court-house twelve perjured damned souls.

Now, gentlemen, if that is your verdict in a case like that, why, upon the highest principle of honor and conscience, would it not be the same in regard to the rights of the thirty-four great States of this Republic, all equal and sovereign? You know it would. I do not believe, therefore, in the justice of that law which prohibits any portion of the people from going into the Territories and taking their property along with them. But waving all that after that law is passed, how in the name of reason and common sense does that help to put down the rebellion? We, as Democrats, are willing to be tried by the standard the Republicans have set up, but we wish to put them to the same test and see if everything that they have done has helped "to put down the rebellion."

The plain truth is that these unjust laws of which I have been speaking, this one-sided policy of the Administration, has helped to strengthen the rebellion. Mr. Lincoln, in his regular message to Congress, said that, in his opinion, in all the Southern States except South Carolina there was a Union majority. Now, if that was so, was it not plainly the duty of the Administration to endeavor to strengthen the hands of the Union men in the South, and thus enable them to bring the erring States back into the Union again? The Administration, however, in its wisdom, saw fit to adopt a contrary line of policy, and what has been the result? Two years ago, if the Union man of the South and the hot-blooded secessionist had happened to meet, they would in all probability have had a lively dispute if not serious controversy on the subject of the Union, and the Union man would have had the chances of success largely in his favor.

But now let the same argument come up between the same two men, and the weapon in the hands of the secessionist would be, "Why, don't you see that this Administration has done all it possibly could do to take away our rights of property?" Two years ago, at the call of the President, five hundred thousand men leaped up as suddenly as did the clan warriors on the Scottish hills, as sung by the immortal poet; and taking their lives in their hands, went to the South to fight, as they supposed, under the Crittenden resolution. At that time Jefferson Davis commanded an army not exceeding, at the utmost, three hundred thousand men, and he had done his best. Our army went onward toward the South, and penetrated to the very centre of some of the cotton States, and how were they received? They, themselves, tell us that at almost every other house they were met by a friend and treated in the kindest possible manner. Why was this? It was because at that time almost every other man in the South was a Union man. Now all is changed. The Administration adopted a policy that united the South. And, to-day, instead of an army of three hundred thousand, at every step we take we are confronted by Jeff. Davis, with an army of more than six hundred thousand men. What do you think of this policy? I do not like it. I find fault with it because it weakens the arm of my Government.

Now if there is any man in this assembly who thinks the Democratic party is not right, he should not go with that party; but if there is any man who thinks that the policy of the Democracy is the best adapted to restore the Union, then we say it is his duty, as an Ameri-

can citizen and an honest man, to labor for the success of Democratic principles and measures, no matter what his former political associations may have been.

What means must we make use of in order to secure the success of the principles? We must have a free ballot-box; and, if we are allowed to have that, then we must have, in addition, a free press and freedom of the speech in order to make it effective; and if we can only have these, I can tell you what you may expect to see. You may expect to see ere long the return of all those men who really love their country to the ranks of the Democratic party. We shall see a Democrat in the Presidential chair, a Democratic Congress in Washington, and a Democratic Legislature in Indiana.

How soon we may hope to gain such a victory, we do not propose to discuss at this time. We hope it will not be long. In the meantime, let us be true and firm; true to the Constitution, cheerfully obedient to all laws in pursuance of it, and give the Administration a cordial support in all its acts that really tend to the maintenance of the Constitution; but when your rights are invaded, by public speeches and by your ballots, send up a voice which the Administration cannot choose but hear.

Interesting Letter from Judge Duer.

OSWEGO, May, 29, 1863.

GENTLEMEN: I received some time ago your letter inviting me to attend the public meeting called to vindicate the right of the people to express their sentiments on political questions. It was not in my power to be present at the meeting, and illness has prevented me until the present moment from answering your letter. I answer it now, though late, both to explain my apparent incivility, and also because I think that in the present crisis no loyal citizen ought to shrink from the expression of his opinion.

The action that has taken place since your meeting was held, convinces me that it is the intention of the President and his advisers to crush opposition to their acts by means of force and terror. For this purpose they have established and do now actually enforce martial law in several loyal States, and they will doubtless do the same in New York and everywhere else, unless they are made to know that the people will not submit to it.

To many persons the words "martial law" do not convey any very definite idea. They know that it is something very harsh and rigorous, and summary, but they suppose that it bears some resemblance to all other laws of which they have ever heard or read, in this respect at least; that it defines offenses and fixes their punishment. And I cannot but suppose that many of those who clamor for its establishment are ignorant that it is nothing in the world but the absolute and unrestrained will of a military chieftain. Permit me, then, to give a description of martial law upon the authority of the highest judicial tribunal of our country. The language is that of Judge Woodbury in delivering the opinion of the court in a case determined by the Supreme Court of the United States: "By it," says the Court, "every citizen, instead of reposing under the shield of known and fixed laws as to his liberty, property, and life, exists with a rope around his neck, subject to be hung up by a military despot at the next lumpy-post, under the sentence of some drum-head court martial."

It is true that Republicans have reason to believe that they will be safe from the horrors of this law under a Republican Administration. No Republican or Abolitionist has yet been arrested, imprisoned, or banished, and they may reasonably calculate that none ever will be. Such persons are permitted to stigmatize the Constitution as a league with hell, and insist that the war shall be prosecuted, not to restore the Union, but to destroy it, without being regarded as guilty of any "disloyal practices." The only sufferers, so far, have been Democrats. Indeed, the very purpose for which the establishment of martial law is sought by the managers of the clubs and leagues, is to destroy the Democratic party. And we find it declared in an official document emanating from the War Department, that to support the cause of the rebels. This terrible engine, then is to be set in motion by one political party for the persecution of another, arming neighbor against neighbor, and setting issues in every household. The machinery is prepared. Already the secret societies are in motion, bound by what oaths I know not. That they who design these things design all their dreadful consequences I do not believe; but they know little of

human nature and little of history who cannot discern them. Under a single despot there is equality; from a single despot there may be hope of escape. But the worst form that despotism can assume is that of the tyranny of party over party; and if anything can add to its horrors it is when the dominant faction is inflamed by fanaticism and led by priests.

What matters it that these men are conscientious; that they act under a sense of duty, of religious duty? I do not impeach their motives. The more conscientious they are, the worse. All fanatics are conscientious, and it is this that makes their tyranny, or all tyrannies, the most insufferable.

What we can and ought to do, beyond the mere expression of our sympathy, in aid of our oppressed countrymen in Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana, is a subject upon which it may be as well at present to say nothing. Let us wait the course of events. We have an immediate question to determine for ourselves, and that is whether we will permit the establishment of the same species of government in our own State—a government which not only no Englishman and no Frenchman would endure, but against which the very Lazaroni of Naples would revolt. I do not speak of exceptional cases of an extreme public necessity, such as we may imagine, though their occurrence is not at all probable; but I speak of systematic acts, done under claim of right, without necessity, upon false pretences, acts which are not only flagrantly unconstitutional, but utterly subversive of liberty and of law, and of which the manifest tendency, if not the purpose, is not to maintain the Union, but to destroy it. I am sure that we will not submit to this, and we ought to say so plainly. I have no faith in any petitions, protests or remonstrances that fall short of this. There is danger in leaving the President ignorant of our purpose. I am not sanguine enough to hope for anything from his sense of justice or respect for the law. The powers that control him, whether spiritual or terrestrial, will do to us whatever we will suffer, but are not likely to attempt that which they know we will not suffer.

At the same time I deprecate all resistance that is not strictly constitutional. Let us not only submit to, but support all proper authority. The President claims the constitutional power to establish martial law over the body of the loyal people of the loyal States. We deny it. Let the courts determine the question. The judicial authority is vested in the courts, and not in the President, the Congress, or the army. It is as much the duty of the President, as of any private citizen, to submit to that authority. If he resists it, he becomes an usurper, and may himself be lawfully resisted. And, on the other hand, if any court or judge, acting under the forms of law, shall sanction his monstrous assumptions, let us in turn submit; not because there may not be judicial as well as executive usurpation, and the same right in extreme cases to resist the one as the other, but, on account of the condition of the country, and the double dangers that assail us. In this way there may be occasional acts of tyranny, as has been already, but upon the whole the judiciary will be found adequate to our protection, if the President himself will respect it.

But if any citizen of this State shall be arrested or imprisoned by military men, or by provost marshals or other officers, acting under the authority of the President, and the court before whom the question shall be brought shall determine that he is entitled to his liberty, then, if in spite of this decision, force shall be used to detain him, there ought to be no hesitation to support the judiciary in opposition to military usurpation, and I should regard it as base and cowardly not to do so, unless in the face of such a force as would make resistance quite hopeless. If it be said that such action would impede the successful prosecution of the war, I answer that it is better that a nation should lose a portion of its territory than its liberty. And if for this cause the rebellious States shall succeed in establishing their independence, the fault will be that of the Administration; and the people, driven to choose between two evils, will have wisely chosen that which, beyond all comparison, is the least.

The times require, in a very high degree, the exercise of the virtues of courage and of prudence. Moderation in our counsels will give us strength and unity in action. Let us accept him as our leader him whom not less merit than position designates, (the Chief Magistrate of our State,) and follow and support

that moderate and patriotic, but not feeble or unmanly, policy which he has recommended and enforced with so much dignity and success, and I shall yet hope that the Union may triumph over both classes of its enemies—the Southern Secessionists and the Northern Abolitionists.

I remain gentlemen,

Very respectfully, your serv't.,

WILLIAM DUER.

To Gideon J. Tucker, John Hardy and Andrew Mathewson, Esq.

The African at the League.

[From the Philadelphia Age.]

For some time past the Chestnut street temple of "unconditional loyalty" has been convulsed with the discussion of several important questions, which almost threatened the disruption of the institution. It is well known that the Jacobin League is composed of heterogeneous parties. Notwithstanding the efforts of shoddy aristocracy to keep out of the corporation those who "are well enough in their sphere, but not amongst the most respectable" in the ranks of the Jacobins, they were compelled to the force of circumstances, to admit within their refined precincts, quite a number of uncongenial spirits. For a time the proposed introduction of "billiards" occasioned serious alarm among the faithful; but they were finally excluded from the "rooms," after much weighty consideration and exciting argument. Then numberless questions of etiquette arose, as to the "cut direct," and the "cut indirect," which the Jacobins were to administer to the wicked and disloyal "Copperheads," which were eventually settled by the adoption of a stringent rule to rebuke, in the most marked and decided manner, all those who came "betwixt the wind and their nobility." Other points of difference, "too numerous to mention," followed in quick succession, and Pandora, with her mysterious box, seemed to have found her way into the stately mansion where the "unconditional loyalists" most do congregate.

But at length their intestine troubles all passed away, and a new light dawned upon the Jacobins. They found at last a real sensation—a rallying point, around which they all gathered in peace and harmony. The African entered the League, and dispelled the clouds which hung around its members. Inspired by the momentous occasion, the poet-laureate invoked the Muse, and in glowing numbers sang the praises of their new found ally. And, in order to remove all doubt upon the subject, on Monday evening last they made a public profession of their faith, and graciously adopted the sentiments of Col. LAFAYETTE BINGHAM, U. S. A., and MORROW B. LOWRY, of Pennsylvania.

The addresses of these two Jacobin orators, which were applauded to the echo by the members of the League, are perhaps the most remarkable utterances that the present time has yet produced. Col. BINGHAM, "who has devoted himself almost exclusively to the organization of colored regiments," thus delivered himself:

"We have existed as a nation about eighty years, and we have told the world that we were a free people, protecting those who came from foreign lands to seek shelter on our shores, and that the flag of our country was the symbol of civil, political and religious liberty, waving for the protection of every man who claimed its shelter, and all this while we have fostered in our midst a national institution which has enclained millions of our fellow beings. For this, God has humiliated us as a nation. The wickedness of the people has gone up and down the land without redress, and now, at the close of more than two years of this present strife, we find that out of one million four hundred thousand men who have gone out to battle for their country, seven hundred thousand have fallen by their country's altars, and scarcely seven hundred thousand men are left in the ranks of the army. In this crisis the nation proposes to organize colored troops to serve in the armies of the Union, to up-

[Continued on Fourth page.]