

Bedford Gazette.

VOLUME 57.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

WHOLE NUMBER, 2959.

NEW SERIES.

BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 19, 1861.

VOL. 4. NO. 49.

THE BEDFORD GAZETTE

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING BY

BY D. F. MEYERS,

At the following terms, to wit:

\$1.50 per annum, cash, in advance.

\$2.00 " " if paid within the year.

\$2.50 " " if not paid within the year.

No subscription taken for less than six months.

No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher, it has been decided by the United States Courts, that the stoppage of a newspaper without the payment of arrearages, is prima facie evidence of fraud and is a criminal offense.

The courts have decided that persons are accountable for the subscription price of newspapers, if they take them from the post office, whether they subscribe for them, or not.

RATES OF CHARGES FOR ADVERTISING.

Transient advertisements will be inserted at the rate of \$1.00 per square of ten lines for three insertions or less, but for every subsequent insertion, 25 cents per square will be charged in addition.

Table and figure work double price. Auditors' notices ten lines and under, \$1.00, upwards of ten lines and under fifteen \$1.50. Liberal reductions made to persons advertising by the year.

DUTIES OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN IN THE PRESENT CRISIS.

These duties are many. But at present we shall mention only four, viz:—

1. Sustain the Constitution and Laws, and the Government that administers them.

Men who regard the war as a ruinous error, conceived in wrong on the part of the North, and resulting necessarily in danger if not destruction to the best interests of the country,—are nevertheless American citizens, and as such owe allegiance to the government under which they live. The bitterness of party feeling is doubtless one of the causes of the war. That same bitterness leads to branding as traitors men who adhere to old and tried principles. Let not the same bitterness affect true men who differ from the party in power. Let them seek by all proper means to change the war-spirit of the day, and if it may be, to induce a peace policy on the part of the government; but failing in this, let them be submissive to its decrees, and yield to any lawful demands it may make upon them, or upon their property. Such patriotism is nobler than the froth of men who stand aloof from the battle, shouting the war-cry from a safe distance,—at the same time firing treacherous shots at the President, the Cabinet, General and the whole Government, and lining their own pockets with public plunder.

2. Discountenance every illegal and unconstitutional act, whether committed by men high or low in office, or by the private citizen.—Jealously guard against every attempt to trample on the rights and immunities of individuals.

This principle is the American's as it was the Englishman's birthright. We can never yield it, until we yield our liberties forever. It is a principle that was born in times of war, and was reproduced in our own country among the first of Revolution. It is a good principle in times of peace; it is infinitely more valuable in times like the present, when popular passions may at any moment ruin the liberties of the citizen.—The principle is of little value—nay, of no value at all—if it is only good in calm and quiet times, and in its place the doctrine is adopted that in war times the Constitution, the rights and immunities of citizens, may be overridden by the officers of government for the occasion. Such a doctrine has been laid down in these days, and the fruits of it have already been seen in the desecration of the Habeas Corpus, the seizure and examination of private papers of peaceable citizens without warrant or process of law, the arrest of citizens for circulating petitions to the government, the increase of the regular army without law (and without necessity, since volunteer forces would supply the temporary want), not to name other acts of individual holding offices which are of doubtful legality. These violations of right are conceded on all hands to be unconstitutional and illegal, but are excused as growing out of the necessities of the times; and the popular assent to them not only indicates the danger of permitting them, but has led to the open advocacy by newspapers, of the doctrine that Congress shall pay no attention to the "technicalities of the Constitution," but enact laws for the times, without regard to their limited powers. One step more in the same direction, would bring us to the absolute tyranny of a Revolutionary Committee. Ere we are aware, we may have no Congress, no Executive of the laws, no Constitutional Government, but in its place a Committee of Safety, a Convention of Democrats, Republicans—red or black,—and the real history has once or twice already recorded.

3. To advocate the laying down of arms on both sides, and the negotiation of peace, on such terms as wise and trustworthy representatives of the nation shall advise and conclude upon.

There is no possibility of closing our eyes to the fact that this is now a war of section against section; and every day that it continues, widens the gulf between the two. It is generally admitted that if the States now forming the Southern Confederacy had united in an expression of their desire to separate from the American Union, and to form a government of their own, this wish, properly expressed, would have demanded the respectful consideration of the other States. There is no throne here to claim by divine or hereditary right the government of a certain territory. In place of the divine right of a king, Americanism has set up "the consent of the governed" as the origin of the governing power. The often boasted principle of the rule of the majority, does not exist in our country in that naked simplicity in which many persons are accustomed to regard it, but on

the contrary, the checks which are devised in the shape of State and national Senates, Electors for Presidents, and other anchors and drags to prevent the tempests of popular majorities from carrying away the ship of state, show that there is no more of the principle of majority rule here, than in many nations less celebrated for their principles of freedom. The principle of the majority ruling, is not a principle of liberty. The founders of our Constitution well knew that that naked idea was in fact a principle of tyrannous democracy and resulting anarchy. Hence the government was made one of constitutional checks, a power resulting from the consent of the people of several States to be governed by this Constitution, and the power itself was to be administered by a very simple machinery, in which each division of the people,—that is, each State,—retained a certain part of the moving and the checking power.

The consent to be thus governed, once given, could not be revoked. "The right of secession" is untenable and inadmissible. It receives no countenance from the Constitution. But the original principle that the power originated in consent, would compel all parties, on principle, to look with at least respectful regard on a desire to withdraw the consent. And if it could be permitted without injury to the remainder, it ought, on principle, to be allowed. The manner of asking the consent, which has been adopted by the Southern States, has been made the reason in many minds for refusing the consent. On no subject is there a more general misapprehension than on this. The most common form of expression is, "They should have pursued the constitutional course, and demanded a National Convention, and thus arranged a peaceable secession." But the notion is erroneous. There is no such constitutional method of absolute permission to secede. This principle is absolutely impregnable, that the Constitution of the United States contains no provision by which a State can be allowed to secede. No Convention called in pursuance of, or under it, can grant that consent which a seceding State needs. For a State, desiring to secede, to ask for a National Convention to allow her to go, would therefore be an absurdity.

It would be very easy to say that a Convention could amend the Constitution so as to insert a clause permitting secession in a certain way. But that very necessity of an amendment proves that there is no present method of getting the necessary consent; and certainly no reasonable man would expect a State, desiring to secede from a Constitution, to go to a convention and amend the Constitution, when the very object was to disconnect itself from its obligations.

No person who shall fully examine this political problem, "How can a State secede from the American Union?" can fail to arrive at the conclusion that revolution is the only method. Any State desiring to secede, must do so simply by declaring itself out of the bond, and being ready to sustain itself in its independence.—There is no legal or constitutional way of getting out of the Union, any more than there was a legal way for American colonies to leave English rule.

The Southern States, in their view of the case, adopted the only course to reach the object they were aiming at. They designed an act which was revolutionary, and, proceeding on that principle, they declared their independence of the Union, and sent commissioners to negotiate the terms of good neighborhood, and adjust the property questions involved.

Seizures of property, mints, forts, arsenals and the like, are acts which always accompany a national rebellion or revolution. The abstract right or wrong of these acts relates back to the right or wrong of the rebellion. In the present instance there is no occasion to discuss these acts; for, if the principle should eventually be conceded that we ought to allow these States to erect the Government they prefer, then the adjustment of the national property is a mere trifle.

The course taken by the Seceding States, then, is revolutionary. The right of the Government (having refused its consent to the Secession) to regard the citizens of the States as insurrectionary, seems unquestionable. The law of the United States, which the officers must execute, is co-extensive with the territory of the United States, and resistance to the execution of the law is insurrection. The statutes have furnished the President with power to suppress insurrections, and Congress has power to exalt the movement for suppressing revolt into the dignity of war.

From this view of the case will be at once deduced the duty of the citizen to sustain the Government in carrying on the war, if the Government takes this course. It has the right to suppress the revolt by force of arms. But whether this is an American principle, whether its result will be to reconstruct the American Union; whether a war policy is as likely as a peace policy to bring back the revolting States; whether bringing them in by force will give us any compensation for the lives we shall lay down in the attempt; these are questions which we may well ponder.

We believe that the possible Union to be accomplished by war and conquest, would not be worth one solitary Northern life,—one drop of Northern blood. It is paying a dear price for a worthless thing, a breath, an imagination, a mockery.

The question whether the remaining States will be injured by allowing the seceders to go, is not only as fairly and simply before us as it would be in the case of a peaceable request, but there is now added to it the argument that war is a part of the alternatives. Shall we suffer most, will the country suffer most, will the records of history suffer most, by letting them go, or by compelling them to come back, by a civil war? Will the great principles of American liberty and government, the principle that governments derive their power from the consent

of the governed, be subserved best by admitting their secession, or by conquering them back into the Union they hate?

Never was there a case in which a peace party stood stronger on moral grounds than now and here. If Ireland were unanimous for freedom, and England sent her hosts into the green island, there might be some old notions of hereditary rights, of kingly prerogative, to which the war party would appeal. When Francis of Naples made his last stand at Gaeta, there was even in peace-loving minds a sort of justification of a king fighting for the last inch of his father's kingdom, tyrant through he and his father before him were.

But in a nation whose principle is government by consent of the governed, where the inhabitants of an immense territory desire to form a new government,—where they count themselves by millions, and are ready to take their place at once among nations,—and where the alternative is to permit it, or to enter on a civil war whose horrors the world has never seen equalled,—for Christians and men of peace to accept the alternative of war, indicates that underneath the questions of right, good, policy and duty, there is a bitterness of hatred that renders men for the time unfit to adjudicate the great issues before them.

When cooler hours come, the voice of Christianity, of human love, will make itself heard for peace.

We hold it to be the duty of every American and every Christian to advocate the laying down of arms, and the restoration of peace. Civil war will not bless the world with any good results; it will not restore a union of hearts, without which a union of States is worthless.

4. Inasmuch as the alternative of a dissolution of the Union may not be forced upon us, but Union men in the Southern States may be rallied to the Union again, by evidence of an intent to do justice on the part of the party in power, and inasmuch also as the principles we have always advocated remain unchanged in right, and the citizens of loyal or disloyal States are entitled to their rights now as always, we advocate the equal interests of all the States in the common territories, and especially that it is better to allow slavery in the territories than to have civil war in the States.

There is no occasion to discuss the proposition. The only answer made to it in these days is, "no compromise with traitors," and the reply to that is, that Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware and West Virginia, they always had, and every Union man, if one exists, in other slaveholding States, would be strengthened and made tenfold more influential by such a yielding.

The idea that a nation effected by a compromise will be weaker than one resulting from conquest, is essentially erroneous, and contrary to all experience. A conquering nation can never be a valuable component part of the conquering power. A revolt crushed by force of arms, is never so thoroughly eradicated as one that shall be ended by mutual concession and good will. The rule prevails in small and in large matters in private and in public affairs. There is not a shadow of truth or reason in the very common assertions that a compromise will leave us where we were before, and liable to another revolt, and that a conquest will not.

We venture the prophecy that if the present rebellion of the Southern States be ended by their subjection, through military success, the Union will not last twenty-five years thereafter. The next rebellion may not come from the Southern States, but it will be quite as likely to be an attempt of a majority to exceed and cut off a portion of the Union. Some State which by its domestic law authorizes polygamy, or adultery, or other crimes, hitherto in the eyes of the citizens of the old States, will be wiped out by a breath of the people. For, this present experiment "whether we have a present government," has already been tried to that point, that men freely and loudly acknowledge that the government we thought we had, to wit, the Constitution is no government in such times, and that a great exigency demands that the President and officers of government for the time being, shall override law and Constitution for the salvation of the country.

This principle, if any, is established by this war, and this, and this only, can survive its successful prosecution. It is vain to hope that we shall relapse from war excitement into the old calm of constitutional government. Exigencies will arise very often. The danger to American free principles is about the same, therefore, whether the rebels succeed in overthrowing the Constitution on their own territories, or whether we conquer them on the ground that force is necessary, Constitution or no Constitution, and thus establish a Union which (the Constitution having been overridden and disregarded) is theologically weakened in the eyes of the people. If we prosecute the war to victory, it will leave us a very different nation from what we have hitherto been, and the voice of the people will demand a stronger Constitution—one that is good for civil war times—one that will authorize coercion—one that will centralize power.

It is vain then to say that compromise will weaken, conquest strengthen us. If the thing be yet possible, we affirm it to be the reasonable, Christian, and American doctrine at the present time, for the North, first of all, to offer to the South all that justice and equity would require it to offer in times of peace and quiet. Without this offer, the voice of American conscience, when once awakened, the voice of a civilized age, the voice of that posterity which is the certain impartial judge on earth, and the voice of God, the unfailing avenger of wrong, will condemn us for entering on this civil war, and the blood of our sons will cry out against us from the very altar on which we sacrifice them.—*Journal of Commerce.*

CORRUPTION! CORRUPTION!

"Four hundred million dollars" is the sum required by the administration to pay the expenses of the war until the regular session of Congress. To this we have no objection if it is only being the war to a speedy and successful end, and again restore to our beloved country peace, prosperity and union. But if we are to judge the future by the present and past, we do not fear that this immense sum will be expended in channels that will become fountains of fraud and corruption. Will this four hundred million of dollars be expended to enhance the interest of the country—or to enhance the pockets of politicians? Is it not to be expended by those who will have nothing to do with the war in the hope of a "deep dip" into the Treasury? Our country is now full of men who cry "still for war," while they are filling fat government contracts. For instance, buying our farmers' horses at \$75 and \$100, which they quietly turn over to the government at \$125, making a snug profit of \$40 or \$50. We hope that love of gain has nothing to do with the zeal and patriotism of those most zealous of the Union, but warn the people to be vigilant, that they are not made to regard the money cunning or genuine love of country. There is only hope for the country now in the purity and patriotism of Mr. Lincoln and his cabinet, and it is to be hoped that they will not suffer themselves to occupy the disgraceful position of our State administration.

In conversation with an intelligent and reliable gentleman, just from Harrisburg, we were enlightened as to the mode in which some of the government contracts are filled. A son of Secretary Cameron's has a contract to buy several thousand horses for the government, at that place. Horses of all kinds—many of a very inferior character are brought in and purchased according to quality from sixty to ninety cents a head. As these horses have to be inspected, and it is necessary for the interest of the contractor that all should pass, the following expedient is resorted to: A large fine horse is brought out and passed upon and returned to his stall without being handed, but in his stead an inferior animal is passed out at the other end of the building, where the branding shop is, and receives the U.S. mark—the good horse after a couple of other examinations, is again led out, and in the great number is not recognized, and passed upon this time to be branded as United States property. And when the inspector comes out his certificate he names the good horse as well as the inferior. We know such cases are not numerous, but too much care cannot be exercised, and the administration should see that they seldom occur, lest in the future the war should be regarded as a speculation of partisans rather than a defence of the Union and the Constitution.—*Washington Review.*

The Peace Resolutions Offered by Governor Seymour.

We publish in another column, the brief Peace Resolution with its preamble, offered in the House of Representatives of this State by Governor T. H. Seymour, on the 3d of July. We ask for them an attentive consideration by our readers.

The Republican papers have assailed this Resolution, as well as the preamble that precedes it; and they are quite profuse in branding it "traitorous." If an effort to save the Union and the Government of the United States by Constitutional measures, in a peaceful way, is traitorous, then this Resolution is traitorous. But if such an effort is patriotic, then Governor Seymour's Resolution is patriotic. Of Governor Seymour's own views, it is not necessary for us to speak, for we publish a sketch of his remarks, submitted to the Legislature when he offered the Resolution. No man entertains more patriotic sentiments than he, but if he believes that a war between the free and slave States of the Union is calculated to break down the Constitution, and sever the Union forever, and so expresses himself, in his love of country and his patriotism to be questioned? Indeed, if he offers a proposition to settle our difficulties, as they have in the earlier days of the Republic been honorably settled, without bloodshed, is he for that act of peace, to preserve the Union, a "Traitor"? Shame upon the men and the presses who make such a charge.

But what is his proposition? The preamble gives briefly the reason why the resolution is submitted. It says a third of the sovereign States have withdrawn from the Union. It is true. Do you say they cannot withdraw?—They have withdrawn—wrongfully, if you please. The fact is so. The effort to compel their return has assumed the proportions of a civil war. We at the North believe they are wrong in seceding; they believe they are right. We believe that they did not have sufficient cause for secession or revolution; they believe they had. Shall two-thirds of the country, then, force the views of the other third up to the precise point of their own ideas upon these questions? This cannot be done. The two-thirds may beat the one-third in battle, and thus make them more submissive. This will not make their views harmonize with the victors. As all, then, have a common interest in the welfare of the country, and all have equal rights, is it not best for all to conciliate, and settle the questions at issue in a peaceable manner? This idea would be carried out practically, by offering the Crittenden Compromise. It is not dishonorable, and it is in no way injurious to the North.

Gov. Seymour's resolution offers that plan of adjustment. And it protests against any interference by warlike movements with the institution of slavery. It appears to us that no true-hearted Union man, no real conservative free man, who cherishes a regard for the Constitution and the Union, can object to either of these propositions.

We look upon the parrot cry of "traitor," "traitor," raised by a certain class of men, whenever some old and tried friend of the Union slips a word in favor of any other settlement to preserve the Union, save by the sword and through blood, as disgraceful rather than patriotic.

Having already published the resolutions offered by Gov. Seymour in the House of Representatives, we now give a report of the remarks which accompanied their presentation:—

He said, I thank the gentleman from Stratford for his remarks last night. He was right in his position. His speech was a patriotic one. Sir, I am on this floor as the advocate of Peace Measures! I will not sanction this war, except so far as it can be waged on Constitutional grounds. This question now wears a totally different aspect from that which it presented when the President issued his call for volunteers. Then it was for the "protection of the Capital, and the repossession of the forts." I am heartily glad that the Capital is protected. I would protect the Capital and the archives.—But nothing has been done to recapture the forts. But a movement of invasion has been commenced—an invasion of a sovereign State. I think the gentleman from Stratford was right in saying there is a movement—a growing sentiment among the people in favor of a peaceable settlement—of an honorable peace! I go with him, and with all who are for Peace Measures instead of War Measures! There seems to be a radical mistake on the part of many people—they seem to think the South can be conquered. Sir, this is impossible! It can no more be done than the South can conquer the North! There are brave men there as well as here. In Revolutionary days we knew something of them. In the war of 1812 they rallied around our flag and protected our commerce. Now it is not well to underrate the prowess of these enemies—as you call them—though I recognize, even in this state of things, some there whom I know, and who are still our brothers in heart. This mistake cost Braddock a gallant defeat in the old French war; it cost the British many a humiliating defeat in the war of the Revolution. Do you think you can secure their loyalty and affection by force?—Two or three sovereign States have been overrun and trampled under foot already. You have got a kind of foothold, which you call "Peace"—but it is not Peace—it is another War! Maryland is in a volcanic condition today; and the same spirit will rise at all times, and destroy their habitations, devastate their fields, and shed the blood of their people; still, you cannot conquer them. "Even in their ashes live their wonted fires."

I shall vote for these resolutions. I hope Congress will adopt some Peace Measures which shall hold the Border States, and draw back those that have gone out—so that, in some future day, we may have the South again under the banner of the Union.

A ton of perfect pain can be more easily lifted than an ounce of perfect happiness.

Query.—Is Jeff Davis' regard for Cotton in particular as strong as his antipathy to Wool in General?

"What is the reason that your wife and you always disagree?" asked one Irishman of another. "Because we are both of one mind. She wants to be master, and so do I."

"Tintinn!" exclaimed an Irish sergeant to his platoon, "front face, and, tread roll call. As many of ye as is present will say 'Here,' and as many of ye as are not present will say 'Absent!'"

"Budget, I am fascinated with Miss Vermillion, the million's daughter." "With her personal charms?" we inquire. "Yes—pursue, and all charms!"

A boozey fellow was observed one day, driving a porker, holding on to its tail, and when asked what he was doing, replied that he was studying geog-rap-phy.

A red nosed gentleman asked a well-known wit whether he believed in spirits.—"Ah sir!" he replied, looking him full in the face, "I see too much evidence before me to doubt their existence."

A mad princess of the house of Bourbon, on being asked why the reigns of queens were in general more prosperous than the reigns of kings, replied, "Because, under kings, women govern—under queens, men."

A country paper says: "Wanted, at this office, an editor who can please everybody. Also, a faceman who can so arrange the paper that everybody's advertisement shall head the column."

An old Count paid his addresses to one of the richest heiresses of Paris. On asking her hand in marriage, he frankly said to her: "Miss E.—I am very old and you are very young; will you do me the honor to become my widow?"

PROVIDING FOR BROKEN-DOWN HACKS.—Governor Curtin has appointed Gideon J. Ball, Esq. of Erie, Frank Jordan, Esq. of Bedford, and Charles Gilpin, Esq. of Philadelphia, Commissioners, under the act of the last session, to revise and codify all the revenue laws. Ball and Jordan! to codify revenue laws! That is rich.—*Easton Sentinel.*

"If you love others, they will love you. If you speak kindly to them they will speak kindly to you. Love is repaid with love and hatred with hatred. Would you hear a sweet and pleasing echo, speak sweetly and pleasantly yourself."

The expense of our Government, at this time, amounts to one million of dollars a day!

The Schoolmaster Abroad.

SCHOOL ETHICS FOR PARENT AND CHILD. No. 5.

Parents should furnish the Teacher with proper material. A difference of material must necessarily exist in our common schools. We cannot expect a similarity of mind in our schools any more than can a community be supposed to exist, whose minds and whose actions all coincide; yet there is often improper material furnished to the teacher by the parent.

The greatest error committed in this respect, is that of sending children to school at too early an age. Parents should remember that the mind of the child is a very delicate piece of workmanship, and that it may be very easily overtaken and a permanent injury result from too early work. The tender shoot if it receive too much of heaven's dew, becomes injured and remains forever dwarfed. Children may learn at a very early age, but their learning must not be from books, for these are too dull and tedious for them at that time. There are thousands of wonderful things in this world of novelty to which their attention may be called, and from which they may glean much more knowledge than from works. Nature's works are not placed around us merely for our physical comfort. There is spread before us a vast field in which the mind not only of the scholar, but of the child may feed. Let the curiosity of the child be excited in regard to what he sees around him and enough is accomplished for a time when that curiosity is gratified.

A lamentable result of this neglect of duty on the part of the parents is, that the mind of the pupil becomes too violently exercised and, consequently, tired and somewhat weakened, so that when the child arrives at the proper age for thorough study, his mind is no longer active, and a failure is almost inevitable; hence, also, those who are bright and quick at an early age become more or less deficient as they become older. If they attempt to study too early they must learn by rote. Nature is the best text book, add at that time home is the best school, the school-house should not be made a nursery, nor the school-teacher be made to act as nurse. KAPPA.

TEACHERS' CERTIFICATES.

We notice with pleasure that arrangements have been made by the State Superintendent for a regular system of examinations, and a uniform standard in the certificates given by the superintendents of the different counties of the State. We have always looked upon the want of gradation of certificates as an evil that should be remedied, and now that it has been consummated, we think it will work prodigies in bringing about a better state of things in educational matters.

The granting of permanent county certificates, to persons properly qualified, and who come up to the standard laid down by the Department, is, certainly, very right and proper. The want of a proper criterion in granting these certificates, has presented many difficulties to the County Superintendents. In some counties none were issued at all; while in others they were given to scores of persons, who would be wholly incompetent to fill the present requirements. In many instances the County Superintendents were charged with being partial or arbitrary, if they refused to give them to persons who considered themselves qualified to receive them. This will now be different. Persons who are applicants for the highest honors in the county, in the teacher's profession, will have to prepare themselves to stand a thorough examination in the branches indicated by the Department. S. S.

OUR COMMON SCHOOLS.

They give the keys of knowledge to the mass of the people. I think it may with truth be said, that the branches of knowledge taught in our common schools, when taught in a finished, masterly manner,—reading—in which I include the spelling of our language—a firm, sightly, legible hand-writing, and the elemental arts of arithmetic,—are of greater value than all the rest which is taught in school. I am far from saying that nothing else can be taught in our district schools; but the young person who brings these from school can, hitherto, in his winter evenings, range over the entire field of useful knowledge. Our common schools are important in the same way as the common air,—invaluable for their commonness. They are the cornerstone of that municipal organization which is the characteristic feature of our social system; they are the foundation of that wide spread intelligence, which, like a moral life, pervades the community. From the humblest village school there may go forth a teacher, who, like Newton, shall bind his temples with the stars of Orion's belt,—with Herschel, light up his cell with the beams of before undiscovered planets,—with Franklin, grasp the lightning.—*Everett.*