WASHINGTON.

LIBERTY AND UNION, NOW AND FOREVER, ONE AND INSEPARABLE.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1864.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW.

Mr. Horace Greeley has been making a speech. It was delivered in New York city, before the "Lincoln Campaign Club," on Monday evening last. We always give attention to any thing Mr. Greeley says or writes, not because we consider him the most judicious among American statesmen, but because he is, without dispute and beyond comparison, the foremost man of his party in point of influence at the present time. We have the authority of Mr. Thurlow Weed, than whom there is no better authority, for saying that the first battle of Bull Run was fought against the deliberate judgment of Gen. Scott and of the Administration to pacify the New York Tribune, which represented a power in the land stronger than the Administration itself. At a later day we saw the President recognise the representative character of Mr. Greeley, when, speaking in the name and by the authority of "twenty millions," he called for a more emphatic anti-slavery policy. Responding through our columns to Mr. Greeley's public arraignment of him in the Tribune, Mr. Lincoln mildly referred to the "impatient and dictatorial tone" of that arraignment, but added that he "waived it in deference to an old friend, whose heart he had always supposed to be right." This was on the 22d of August, 1862. Precisely one month afterwards came the preliminary emancipation edict, which drew from Mr Greeley the memorable beatitude of "God bless Abraham Lincoln!" This proclamation, we may say, was not only "demanded" but "*commanded*" by Mr. Greeley. We have the authority of Mr. John W. Forney, the Republican Secretary of the Senate, for saying so, and every body knows that he, pledged as he is to give an "unquestioning support" to the Administration, would not affirm any thing of this kind unless he had personal knowledge of its truth, and supposed that he was acting in conformity with the wish of the Administration by making the fact publicly known. At a still later day we have seen Mr. Greeley employed by the President in the delicate office of ambassador, representing our Government near two gentlemen in Canada who were in the confidential service of "the Confederate States." In a word, Mr. Greeley is "the great champion" of the cause which the present Administration is set to sustain. Mr. ETHAN ALLEN, who is an Assistant District Attorney in New York under the present Administration, and therefore a competent as well as a disinterested witness, so entitled him on the occasion of Mr. Greeley's public appearance on last Monday evening. Mr. Allen said "that he felt honored at appearing on the same platform with the great champion of our cause. He himself was an example of the efficiency of Mr. Greeley's teaching."

What then did Mr. Greeley say on the occasion designated? We quote from the report of his speech as we find it in the New York Tribune:

"Now, all we ask of them is that they shall do what they have sworn to do, instead of what they have forsworn themselves by attempting to do—that is, that they shall sustain the laws of their country instead of attempting to destroy the one and overthrow the other. That is a very simple and easy way of attaining peace. When the subject of capital punishment was discussed in the French Republic, one of the writers on that side, seeing so much said as to the sanctity of life, said: 'Let Messieurs, the assassins, set the example!' Now, all they have to do is to say the same thing. Let them say, 'We are tired of all this,' and we will negotiate. But they say no such thing. That you can see plain enough by Gilmore, or Kirke, and Col. Jaquess going to Richmond. They said to Jefferson Davis: Now, the President wants peace. He is willing to make peace on terms that will be equitable and fair to you, but the Union must stand and the laws be obeyed It is not dishonorable to obey the laws. There stand their oaths. The laws are as good for them as for us. The Constitution was made by their fathers as by ours, and in that Constitution and in those laws are equal rights for them and for us. They have simply to talk across the line of pickets; one picket can whisper to the other, 'We are tired of fighting, we want peace; we propose to go back and be at peace;' and there is not one single rebel, from Jefferson Davis down, who has the least apprehension of personal consequences to himself. None of them fears that there would be any such sanguinary executions as have attended the overthrow of revolutions in other countries. They may every one be assured of most ample protection, not only in life and person, but in estate also, if they will come forward and lay down their arms, and nobody asks that they shall have any less power in the Union than our States. That would be a simple, easy, rapid, and certain termination of the war, and I believe that termination cannot be postponed one month beyond the re-election of the President."

Now, all this fair speech has a very conservative sound. If it had been uttered by an opponent of the present Administration—one who, in the classic phraseology of the times, is called by Mr. Greeley a "copperhead"—it would have been open to the suspicion of treason. What! The President willing to make peace on terms that shall be equitable and fair, provided the Union stand and the laws be obeyed? The Chicago Convention has said no more in the platform which appears to the philosophic mind of Dr. Lieber to be "a well-framed creed of Northern servility to the criminal arrogance of the South—a sanction of highest lawlessness." What! Can it be true that "there is not one single rebel, from Jefferson Davis down, who has the least apprehension of personal consequences to himself?" Did the members of the Baltimore Convention, which re nominated Mr. Lincoln, intend nothing but a delusion and a sham when in their first resolution they declared that "it is the highest duty of American citizens to do every thing in their power to aid the Government in quelling by force of arms the rebellion now raging against its authority, *and in bringing to the punishment due to their crimes the rebels and traitors arrayed against it?*" What! "The termination of the war not to be postponed one month beyond the re-election of the President," a man whose Administration—we have Mr. Greeley's word for it—may be presumed to lack "vigor," "earnestness," and "understanding?" If there be any ground for such a prediction, how much more certain would be the advent of peace as the immediate consequence of Gen. McClellan's election!

It is instructive to see such distinguished Republicans as Mr. Greeley lending their hands to the things which make for peace, while, as against the "Peace Democracy," their "voice is still for war." We are thus left to understand that in their hearts they are quite as sick of war as Mr. Fernando Wood or Mr. Vallandigham. Nor does this suspicion rest on inference. We have the authority of Mr. Dawson, a prominent office-holder of the present Administration, who is at the same time one of the editors of the Albany Evening Journal, for saying that "there is such a yearning for peace, such a weariness of strife and bloodshed, and such a dread of cost and taxation, that it will require immense labor and constant appeals to the national pride and latent patriotism to hold the people up to the sublime work in which the country is now engaged." It might be supposed that he alludes primarily to the opponents of the Administration. But not so. Writing from this city to his journal, under date of last August 5th, he says:

"The question of peace is still one of the leading themes discussed in all circles, and finds among *the weak-kneed and despondent Union men, (so called,) as well as among those whose love for the Union is overridden by their sympathy for the rebellion, a preference for a divided Union rather than a further prosecution of the war.* The latter are for a peace upon such a basis because it is what the rebels desire; and the former hint it on the ground that it would be better to have a Northern Republic without slavery than a reconstructed Union with it. There are, I fear, more who think this thought than utter it, because there are probably more men than we think who have no heart-love of country, and who would be content with any national boundaries which would secure them individual peace and plenty."

The men who are for peace upon the basis of a divided Union "because this is what the rebels desire," and the men who are for peace upon the basis of a divided Union because "it would be better to have a Northern Republic without slavery than a reconstructed Union with it," are men who represent the extremes of public opinion which alike meet in their opposition to Gen. McClellan. The Tribune and the Daily News of New York, the organ of the Republican party and the organ of "peace Democracy," can agree in their opposition to the patriotic soldier who declares that "the Union must be preserved at all hazards," but the Union only as based on the Constitution, which is its bond and symbol.

It would be erroneous to suppose that Mr. Greeley favors any *such* reconstruction of the Union. He looks to the late manifesto of President Lincoln and to the resolutions of the Baltimore Convention for his basis of the Union and his conditions of peace, though he is forbearing enough to say that he will not "prescribe terms to the Government." On this topic he says:

"As to the terms of peace, I do not prescribe terms to the Government. I only know that the desire and purpose of the Government is that the Union shall be restored as speedily as it may be, so that it may be thoroughly done; *and I believe as the President does, that Union based on universal liberty is the only certain, the only true Union.* [Cheers.] We have made compromise after compromise, and daubed with untempered mortar, and patched up contrivances for reconciling slavery with liberty; but when this country shall be a free country, and when no man shall call another man his slave, then the Union will be recognised as a geographical and political necessity—a blessing, and not a burden to the nation; and you could no more get up a party to dissolve the Union than to dissolve and scatter the solar system. To-day such are the grounds on which I desire peace *I prescribe no terms, but I say that of all the ways to peace the way proposed by the Baltimore platform and sanctioned by the President is the true way to peace.*"

It is but a few days ago that we were informed by Mr. Raymond, of the New York Times, who assumes to be an official expositor of the President's views, that Mr. Lincoln was not at all pledged by any thing contained in the "Niagara Manifesto," or by any thing he had ever ordered or declared in his proclamations of freedom, to insist on universal liberty as a condition of peace. And it had been supposed that Mr. Greeley, for the sake of peace, would make concessions to slavery. To this effect Mr. Forney wrote as follows on the 25th of August to the Philadelphia Press:

"Hon. Henry J. Raymond, the chairman of the National Union Committee, reached Washington this morning, and has been in consultation all day with the President, the different members of his Cabinet, and the other friends of the Administration of the Federal Government. Governor Raymond is a statesman of enlarged comprehension and thorough experience. He has not only been educated in the legislative school, but is a graduate of that most trying of all trials, the editorial chair, and therefore brings to the task of conducting a Presidential campaign in the vortex of an unparalleled civil war the best and most useful qualities. In these days, when independent journalists must take vast responsibilities; when they must be cowards in their own esteem if they fear to speak on great issues, and, doing so, must be assailed by suspicious and ignorant partisans—such a man as Henry J. Raymond is a treasure which the friends of Union and honorable peace cannot too highly prize. And in this allusion I refer to the narrow misconstructions placed in some cases upon the article under the title of 'The Road to Lasting Peace,' which appeared in the Washington Morning Chronicle of the 16th of August and the Philadelphia Press of the 17th of the same month. What every body thinks about, it would be folly to refuse to speak about. North and South the humblest and the highest are discussing the problem of the easiest road to peace. All desire it, and when I wrote the article which appeared in the Chronicle and the Press, above referred to, I did no more than to print something of what the loyal mind was thinking at that very moment. It is so easy to misunderstand a public man who desires to save his country that I was not surprised to see that article misunderstood on the one hand and misinterpreted on the other. Gov. Raymond will be found, I think, on a higher plane and a bolder platform than that which I assumed. Indeed, his articles in the New York Times have been more thoroughly in favor of peace, on the ground of national unity, than any thing I have written. And why? Because he has looked over the whole field, and has perceived that we, the stronger party, and the conquering party, and the party that is sure to win in the end, can afford to offer generous and magnanimous terms to the people of the South, who, however erring, are still our brethren—bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. *Mr. Greeley himself, the great anti-slavery leader, who commanded and demanded the emancipation proclamation, is now, I believe, willing to take any ground consistent with the national dignity to secure a reconciliation between the two contending sections. Nay, it is not a violent presumption that Mr. Greeley would not be willing to ignore that proclamation in order to secure such a reconciliation.* We are not fighting a foreign foe. The blood poured out in this war for liberty mingles with the blood that is poured out, not for slavery, but for an ideal Southern independence, and if we can change this latter sentiment into the belief that Southern independence can be better maintained in the old Union, *why should not all the issues, except that only of national unity, be entrusted to a National Convention?* Southern independence has already bravely asserted itself in the field of battle. So, indeed, has Northern independence. *Each has shown its ability to defend itself*, and yet the South has been unable to tear itself away from the old Union. We may be independent of every thing except God and our country—independent in our counties and in our States, but not independent of the Constitution nor of that great indissoluble bond that holds us forever together. OCCASIONAL."

All this was written before the Chicago Convention assembled. Every body, we are told, was then "discussing the problem of the *easiest* road to peace." The "loyal mind" was full of it. "Gov. Raymond" was on a "high plane"—"thoroughly in favor of peace on the ground of national unity." It was not thought to be a violent presumption, such was his weariness of war, that Mr. Greeley, "the great anti-slavery leader who commanded and demanded the emancipation proclamation," would be willing to ignore that proclamation in order to secure such a reconciliation;" that is, a Union with "the curse of slavery preserved." It was moreover suggested that all "issues" except that only of national unity *should be "entrusted to a National Convention."* Such was the state of the "loyal mind" on the 25th of August, 1864.

Four days afterwards the Democratic Convention met at Chicago. Five days afterwards it passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That in the future, as in the past, *we will adhere with unswerving fidelity to the Union, under the Constitution*, as the only solid foundation of our strength, security, and happiness as a people, and as a frame-work of government equally conducive to the welfare and prosperity of all the States, both Northern and Southern.

Resolved, That this Convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war—during which, under the pretence of a military necessity or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired—justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare *demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, with a view to an ultimate Convention of all the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that, at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States.*

It will be seen that the first of these resolutions is as express and decided as it is possible for words to make it in pledge of "unswerving fidelity to the Union under the Constitution." This point being settled, the Convention proceeded to affirm that, after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, "justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand"—what? An armistice?—a "reconstruction" with slavery spared? No such things. But that "immediate *efforts* be made for a cessation of hostilities *with a view* to an ultimate Convention of the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that"—what? The Union be surrendered? Not so, but to the end that, "at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States."

On the 25th of August the Republican Secretary of the Senate, writing from this city to his journal in Philadelphia, declared that every body "North and South, the humblest and the highest, was discussing the problem of the *easiest* road to peace." We were informed that the people of the North, "as the stronger party, could afford to offer generous and magnanimous terms to the people of the South, who, however erring, are still our brethren." The national unity being premised, all other issues might be "entrusted to a National Convention." These, be it remembered, were the topics of which "the loyal mind was thinking" on the 25th of August, 1864—the very day on which Mr. Raymond had been in consultation "all day" with the President, the different members of the Cabinet, and the other friends of the Administration of the Federal Government," (in which latter category it is fair to presume Mr. Forney was numbered.) Now let the reader compare these thoughts of the "loyal mind" in Washington on the 25th of August, 1864, with the views of the "disunionists and traitors" assembled at Chicago four days afterwards, and mark the correspondence between them. Did the "loyal mind" in Washington profess fidelity to the Union? So did the Chicago Convention. Did the "loyal mind" in Washington declare that "Southern independence" had already bravely asserted itself on the field of battle, and that the South and the North had "each shown its ability to defend itself?" The Chicago Convention was much less reserved in its speech—merely saying, what every body knows to be true, that the experiment of war has thus far failed to restore the Union. It did not say that the South equally with the North had shown its "ability to defend itself." This is the opinion of the "loyal mind" for which Mr. Forney is authorized to speak. Was Mr. Greeley supposed on the 25th of August to be "willing to take any ground consistent with the national dignity to secure a reconciliation between the contending sections, and to see the slaves embraced in the emancipation edict left in bondage? Was the "loyal mind" in Washington ready to remit all issues except that of national unity to the decision of a National Convention? The "loyal mind" represented at Chicago merely asked that "*efforts* be made *with a view* to an ultimate Convention of all the States, or other peaceable means," to the end of restoring peace "on the basis of the Federal Union of the States."

Now, from this comparative view of opinions in Washington, and of opinions in Chicago, who does not perceive that there was a substantial identity between them? The only difference between them is to the disadvantage of the "loyal mind" of Washington, if a squinting towards peace on the "easiest" terms be held to prove the presence of treason. And now that Gen. McClellan has visibly placed himself on a platform which, in being true to his own character, rises to a "higher plane" than that of partisans belonging either to the Republican organization or to the "Peace Democracy," who wonders that the adherents of both should agree in opposing his election? But who does not see, at the same time, in the double-headed opposition he is thus called to encounter, the evidence of a loyal patriotism which, because it rises above the level of any mere party, is worthy of the confidence and support of all who are devoted with a single eye to the restoration and maintenance of the Union under the Constitution?

Those who contrast the avowed state of the Republican mind on the 25th of August last, as reflected by its representatives and leaders, with the professed mood of the same mind at the present day, will be able to draw for themselves the useful inference that the Republican party has two very distinct sets of ideas, according to the aspects of the military situation. In a period of military depression its thoughts are turned on peace. In a period of military success its voice is still for war. Its courage rises or falls inversely as there is occasion for it. In a time of depression it is full of submission. In a time of rejoicing it is full of defiance. A few weeks ago it was willing to talk of peace with "bated breath," and, in the persons of those who most assumed to speak for the President, it was even willing to explain away the *Niagara Manifesto*. To-day, unduly elated by the victories of Farragut and Sherman, it indulges in visions of a speedy overthrow of the rebellion as unfounded as its former dejection. Intelligent observers on the other side of our military lines take note of this inconstancy, springing from a want of steadfast adhesion to any well-defined and clearly perceived system of constitutional ideas. "I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me," wrote the President to Col. Hodges, of Kentucky, in the month of April last. And, as in the past, so in the future, we may expect to see the President controlled by events rather than controlling them. It is in such changeful moods, inspired by the good or ill fortune of war, that the enemy sees grounds of hope for the eventual recognition of Southern independence. And hence we can readily perceive why, for this and for many other reasons, the Richmond Enquirer, the organ of Gen. Jefferson Davis, should express a wish, as it does, for the success of Mr. Lincoln in the impending election rather than of Gen. McClellan. It may well fear that the steadfast mind of the latter will know no change in its fixed loyalty to the Union and the Constitution. But the fluctuations of Republican thought justify the expectation and the hope in Richmond that the day will come when, on some sudden and unexpected ebb of our military fortunes, the present Administration, allowing itself to be controlled by events, will agree to peace on terms of disunion. That we do not speak according to mere human probabilities, but that such is the animating prospect held out to the enemy by the infirmity of purpose which he believes to exist in the present Administration, may be clearly read in the following suggestive observations of the Richmond Enquirer in its number of the 8th instant:

"The 'national unity' of an empire or kingdom may be preserved by conquest, but force belongs not to constitutional governments. Compromise is the only principle by which popular governments can perpetuate their existence. When the appeal to arms was made the peaceable remedy of compromise was impossible; and now four years of war has so widened and deepened the gulf that separates the two sections that they can never be again united in peace. Intoxicated by sudden and partial success, Mr. Lincoln may imagine that our conquest is within his power and means. No word of ours can be more convincing than four years of war, but in the interest of humanity will the sober thought ever dispel the delusion that by conquest, by arms, by war, a 'lasting peace' can be made be ween the parties in this disgraceful conflict? *We regard this 'explanation' by the editor of the Washington organ, referring as it does to the example of Mr Raymond for its justification before the party, as a step toward a 'lasting peace.'* It abandons the negro entirely, and points to Mr. Greeley as ready to forego philanthropy and 'freedom' for 'national unity' When partisan phrenzy and fanaticism thus reduce their extraordinary demands, the more reasonable and sensible mass of the people, who are bearing all the burdens, enduring all the sufferings, and making all the sacrifices, will not long continue the war for the shadow of 'national unity.' That people, as well as our own, will soon see the folly of attempting to live together after such a war. They will soon learn that in an offensive and defensive alliance of the two nationalities against the world, with separate governments for domestic affairs, lies their true and real interests, as well as the 'road to lasting peace.'"

And, as if their own sagacity might not be enough to induce the insurgents to place reliance on the fickleness of Northern opinion under the alterations of military fortune, the New York Times, one of the leading organs of the Administration, fully endorses this view of the Richmond sheet. Only a day or two ago it said:

"There is not one thing under the sun that this Northern people needs so much as courage. We do not refer to our armies; they have plenty of it. We mean the millions who are here at home, looking out upon the war, and never for an instant coming within cannon range of it. We say, precisely, they lack courage Why? Because they don't go to the front? Not at all They are not all wanted there. Their true place, speaking in general, is at home, just where they are They lack courage, because they lack that which is its first element, *firmness of spirit*. Who dares deny this? Is not every man a witness that one month ago the majority of our people were chilled, benumbed, almost paralyzed with a fear that the war never would end? Does not every man see that the majority are now half intoxicated with the fancy that it will end within three months probably, and six months sure? That is not firmness of spirit. It is just the opposite. We have no disposition to undervalue our recent successes. They are truly valuable; but not a whit more so than others which have occurred, and which yet did not end the war."

In thus speaking of the "Northern people" the Times should be understood, of course, to speak only of that portion of the Northern people for whom it is entitled to speak—the portion with whom it is most familiar, as being embraced in the ranks of its own party. It might not be safe for the Richmond Enquirer to count too confidently on the ascendancy of a party which has so disheartened the people that, in the judgment of the Times, they now lack the first element of courage—firmness of spirit.

POLITICAL MOSAICS.

The following is one of the planks of the Baltimore Convention which nominated Mr. Lincoln:

"*Resolved*, That we deem it essential to the general welfare that harmony shall prevail in the national councils, and we regard as worthy of public confidence *and official trust those only who cordially endorse the principles proclaimed in these resolutions, and which should characterize the administration of the Government*"

In his letter accepting the nomination Mr. Lincoln wrote:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, June 27, 1864.

Hon. WILLIAM DENNISON, and others, a Committee of the late Union Convention.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter of the fourteenth instant, formally notifying me that I have been nominated by the Convention you represent for the Presidency of the United States, for four years from the fourth of March next, has been received. The nomination is gratefully accepted, *as the resolutions of the Convention, called the platform, are heartily approved.*

On the first day of July, only three days after the President wrote as above, the Washington Chronicle reminded him that the aforesaid Republican platform which he had "heartily approved" contained a protest against the retention of certain members of the present Cabinet. It said:

"That there should be a reorganization of the Cabinet *the National Convention has virtually declared, and the almost unanimous sentiment of the country avouches;* and if such reorganization takes place *the radical anti-slavery sentiment of the country is entitled to emphatic recognition.*"

The Cabinet not having yet been reorganized according to the "virtual declaration" of the Baltimore Republican Convention, any more than in accordance with "the almost unanimous sentiment of the country" calling for "a more emphatic recognition" of "the radical anti-slavery sentiment," the Chronicle of yesterday gives prominence to a letter of "Occasional" in which, with a profuse expenditure of capital letters, he makes the following satirical allusion to this violated pledge of the President:

"When the resolutions of the Baltimore Convention were presented to Abraham Lincoln, he said, in a single sentence: 'THE NOMINATION IS GRATEFULLY ACCEPTED, AS THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONVENTION, CALLED THE PLATFORM, ARE HEARTILY APPROVED.' No qualification here; no false and dishonest front, but an earnest and emphatic endorsement of the work of the men who had put him before the people for re-election."

HEALTH OF GOV. ANDREW.

We regret to learn from an intimation contained in his speech delivered at Faneuil Hall, in Boston, on Tuesday evening last, that Gov. Andrew is in delicate health—suffering from what he calls "cannon fever in the heart." This distressing malady has been very fatal, as our readers know, in Virginia, especially in the neighborhood of Petersburg, but we have not heard of any deaths from it in Massachusetts.

MAINE ELECTION.

As was expected, the Republicans carried the election in the State of Maine on Monday last. Their majority at the last Presidential election over all other candidates was 24 500, and their majority at the Gubernatorial election of last year was 17,500. It is too early to have complete returns of the votes taken last Monday. Some reports state that the Republican majority is increased, and others that it will be about the same as last year. The New York Tribune says:

"The result is better than we had expected. The Union party carries the State, of course, and by just about the majority of last year, re-electing Gov Cony by some 17 000 majority, and putting John Lynch (Union) in the place of Lorenzo D. M. Sweat (Dem.) in the next House of Representatives by about 1,000 majority. Mr. Sweat carried the District in 1862 by 127 majority, but that was a blunder not to be repeated. The whole delegation in the next Congress will be Unionist, including a Senator in place of Mr. Fessenden. The Representatives will stand as follows: John Lynch, Sidney Perham, James G. Blaine, John H. Rice, Frederick A. Pike. The Legislature is of course Unionist 'all hollow.'"

GEN. McCLELLAN'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

We have the satisfaction of placing before our readers to-day the admirable and patriotic letter in which Gen. McCLELLAN has signified his acceptance of the nomination conferred upon him by the Democratic Convention which recently assembled at Chicago. It there be any one who can read this letter without admiration for the pure and elevated patriotism which it breathes, or without respect for the writer, it must be one in whom the spirit of party has quenched all generous sensibility to private worth or public virtue outside of his own political circle. Certain it is that no lover of the Union and no friend of the Constitution can find aught against which to object in this clear, calm, and frank exposition, and it is only as the minds of men may be warped by their addiction to some policy or purpose lying outside of the Union and Constitution that they can find ground for even the pretext of exception to this compend of political doctrine In our view it covers the whole duty of true patriots at this crisis, and, coming as it does from a man who, both in public and in private life, as well by the dignity of the one as by the purity of the other, has given full guarantee for the honesty and steadfastness with which he holds his opinions, this manly confession of political faith will go to the hearts of the people as it obviously comes from the heart of the writer.

We are not of those who, in this hour of the nation's need, would seek to repose an undue reliance in the hand of man. But as men placed in high command over the interests and welfare of the people are the instruments, under Providence, of those counsels, purposes, and policies on which the weal or woe of the nation mainly depends, we do feel that, in this juncture, the American people, more than at any former period of their history, are called to weigh candidly and deliberately the character of the man in whose hands they shall confide the tremendous issues of the next four years, so far as those issues can be determined by the action of the Chief Magistrate of the country.

The critical times in which we live call for a man in the Presidential chair who shall look with a single eye to the restoration and preservation of the Union under the Constitution, without having his attention diverted by extraneous objects which command a paramount adhesion to the detriment of the Union and the violation of the Constitution. The revolutionary times in which we live call for a man who has faith in the fundamental principles of the Government, and who, when the foundations of the Republic are rocking to their very base, will not suffer himself to be misled by the false lights of a radical fanaticism. The changeful times in which we live call for a man who is just and tenacious of his purposes, one not to be moved from his deliberate resolve or from his conscientious convictions by any outside pressure of faction. The solemn times in which we live call for a man who, understanding his epoch, shall address himself to the momentous tasks he is called to perform with a gravity and sobriety which shall be at the farthest remove from trifling and levity. The difficult times in which we live call for a man of vigorous intellect, expanded by ripe culture, and at the same time sharpened by contact with men, and raised to the height of great emergencies by the discipline of active life. Such, all will agree, are the demands of our age and land. Two men are set before the people as the candidates named by their respective adherents to meet these requirements. On the one hand is Abraham Lincoln; on the other is George B. McClellan. Each has made up for himself the issues and the record on which he challenges the popular ordeal. It is for the people to choose between them, and in choosing to decide whether the Union is the paramount object of the nation's aspiration in the present struggle, or whether the destinies of the Union are to be complicated with pledges and commitments which we verily believe must be as fatal to its practical restoration as in theory they are alien to the spirit and letter of the Constitution.

FROM THE SHENANDOAH VALLEY.

The correspondent of the Baltimore American with Gen. Sheridan's army says that although the military situation in that quarter is unchanged, he is of the opinion that there will shortly be a resumption of active operations Gen. Averill now has possession of Martinsburg.

The following official despatch from Gen. Sheridan, received at the War Department yesterday morning, informs us of a successful encounter on Tuesday between a portion of his command and Kershaw's division of the enemy:

NEAR BERRYVILLE, SEPTEMBER 13—7 P. M.

This morning I sent Gen. Getty's division, of the Sixth Corps, with two brigades of cavalry, to the crossing of the Summit Point and Winchester road, over the Opequan creek.

Rhodes's, Ramseur's, Gordon's, and Wharton's divisions were found on the west bank. At the same time Gens. Wilson and Mackintosh's brigade of cavalry dashed up the Winchester pike, drove the rebel cavalry at a run, came in contact with Kershaw's division, charged it, and captured the Eighth South Carolina regiment, sixteen officers and one hundred and forty-five men, and its battle-flag, and Col. Hennegan, commanding brigade, with a loss of only two men killed and two wounded. Great credit is due to Gens Wilson and Mackintosh, Third New Jersey and Second Ohio. The charge was a gallant one.

A portion of the Second Massachusetts Reserve brigade made a charge on the right of line, and captured an officer and eleven men of Gordon's division of infantry.

Our loss in the reconnoissance is very light.

P. H. SHERIDAN, Maj. Gen.

THE CALIFORNIA WINE CROP OF 1864.

Although this is a year of unexampled drought in California, that is at least without a parallel during the last twenty years, although the wheat crop has failed completely in three-fourths of the State, and although the cattle have died by the tens of thousands—with all this the wine crop is not only as good as the average, but promises to be considerably better. From all the grape-growing counties favorable reports are received.

The vineyards are less dependent upon the rain than the wheatfields. Most of our vines are now six or eight years old, and their roots go down three or four feet—far enough to find a considerable stock of moisture. At Los Angeles and Anaheim there are large ditches which bring water from the Los Angeles and Santa Ana rivers; in Santa Clara county the artesian wells furnish a supply, and in Sonoma the rain has been sufficient for the grapes. In other counties the vineyards are not so numerous, and most of them are within reach of irrigation. If there is moisture enough during a wet year to enable vines to flourish during the first and second years, they will be pretty sure to live afterwards through the driest season.

While the vineyards promise the largest crop ever yet gathered in the State—that is, the largest absolutely as well as very large comparatively—the prospect for the wine-grower on the score of prices is also very encouraging. It is almost certain that the Californian wine crop of this year will be more than a million gallons, and probably a million and a half. The numerous vineyards which are now approaching the time for bearing a full crop promise a very rapid increase in yield of wine, and if we make 1,500 000 gallons in 1864, we may make 2,500,000 gallons in 1865, or even more if the market offers sufficient encouragement.—*Alta California of Aug. 9.*

THE ADMINISTRATION GIVING EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF GEN. McCLELLAN.

In view of the attempts of the Republican party to circulate slanders against Gen. McCLELLAN, we give the following testimony respecting his abilities and services from various members of the Administration.—*World.*

WASHINGTON, JULY 2, 1862.

Major General GEORGE B. McCLELLAN:

I am satisfied that yourself, officers, and men have done the best you could. All accounts say better fighting was never done. Ten thousand thanks for it.

A. LINCOLN.

Two days afterwards, when Mr LINCOLN had fuller information, Gen. McClellan received the following:

WASHINGTON, JULY 5, 1862.

Major General GEORGE B McCLELLAN,
Commanding Army of the Potomac:

A thousand thanks for the relief your two despatches of 12 and 1 P. M yesterday gave me. Be assured the heroism of yourself, officers, and men is and forever will be appreciated.

A. LINCOLN.

In August, 1862, Mr. LINCOLN made a speech at the White House, in which he said:

"There has been a very wide-spread attempt to have a quarrel between Gen McClellan and the Secretary of War. . . . Gen. McClellan's attitude is such that in the very selfishness of his nature he cannot but wish to be successful, and I hope he will. . . . I know Gen. McClellan wishes to be successful. . . . *Gen McClellan is not to blame for asking what he wanted and needed.* . . . I believe he is a brave and able man and I stand here, as justice requires me to do, to take upon myself what has been charged on the Secretary of War as withholding from him."

Here is Gen. HALLECK'S testimony:

WASHINGTON, AUGUST 31, 1862.

Major General GEORGE B. McCLELLAN:

I beg you to assist me in this crisis with your ability and experience. I am entirely tired out.

H. W. HALLECCK, General in Chief.

WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 30, 1862.

Major General McCLELLAN, Commanding, &c.

GENERAL: Your report of yesterday, giving the results of the battles of South Mountain and Antietam, has been received and submitted to the President. They were not only hard-fought battles, but well-earned and decided victories.

The valor and endurance of your army in the several conflicts which terminated in the expulsion of the enemy from the loyal State of Maryland are creditable alike to the troops and to the officers who commanded them.

A grateful country, while mourning the lamented dead, will not be unmindful of the honors due to the living.

H. W. HALLECK, General-in-Chief.

Says Mr. LINCOLN, referring to Antietam:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 15, 1862.

Your despatch of to-day received. God bless you and all with you! Destroy the rebel army if possible

A. LINCOLN.

To Major General George B. McClellan.

But the Republican Congress also gives its testimony. On the 16th day of July Mr. EDWARDS (Rep.) of New Hampshire offered the following resolution in the House of Representatives, and it was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the thanks of this House be presented to Major General George B McClellan, and the officers and soldiers of his command, for the series of brilliant and decisive victories which by their skill and bravery they have achieved over rebels and traitors in arms on the battle-fields of Western Virginia.

On the 9th of May, 1862, after the victories of Yorktown, Williamsburg, and West Point, OWEN LOVEJOY, the most ultra radical in the House of Representatives, offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That it is with feelings of devout gratitude to Almighty God that the House of Representatives, from time to time, hears of the triumphs of the Union army in the great struggle for the supremacy of the Constitution and the integrity of the Union.

Resolved, That we receive with profound satisfaction intelligence of the recent victories achieved by the armies of the Potomac, associated from their localities with those of the Revolution; and that the sincere thanks of this House are hereby tendered to Major General George B McClellan for the display of those high military qualities which secure important results with but little sacrifice of human life.

FROM THE ARMY OF THE POTOMAC.

Information received in Washington, from before Petersburg, under date of the 8th instant, states that beyond frequent skirmishing and occasional cannonading no movements or changes of position have taken place. Much impatience and some anxiety were manifested for the expected attack of the enemy, but they had made no demonstration, and the reason for their delay could not be divined. Our troops still continued to entrench their position, which, it is said, will become one of great strength. Gen. Grant is receiving large numbers of recruits to replenish his depleted regiments. It is to be hoped he will obtain enough to offset Gen. Lee's reinforcements from the Valley. Gen. Longstreet is defending the Danville railroad. On the evening of the 7th a guard of pickets in front of the Fifth Corps was attacked by a superior force. The officer of the pickets was killed and fifteen or twenty men captured. There was also a little fight on Thursday morning at the Davis House. A small party of rebels attacked our force at the house, which numbered some twenty or thirty men. Three or four rebels were killed; but they captured all of our men save eight. Afterwards our forces attacked the rebels and retook the house, which we now hold.

Mr. F. Creighton, the army correspondent of the New York World, attaches some importance to the "little affair" of Friday night opposite a position of our left centre. He says:

"Our line at this point was rather more irregular than it was deemed necessary that it should be, and it was determined to straighten it up. To accomplish this a portion of the enemy's picket posts must be secured and occupied.

"When I state that the coveted position lay directly at the foot of a low hill, on the crest of which is a strong fort, the great hazard of attacking it will be readily appreciated. Besides, it was really a point of value to the enemy; inasmuch as from it he could command a very fair survey of a goodly stretch of our work toward either flank

"Our works opposite this position were held by General Mott's division of the Second Corps; therefore the responsibility of planning the attack fell on Gen. Hancock. Taking into consideration the almost impossibility of gaining his object in daylight, at least without bringing on a sanguinary engagement, Gen. Hancock determined on venturing a night attack, hoping to surprise the pickets and secure their shelter without serious disaster. Three regiments, the Ninety ninth Pennsylvania, under Colonel Biles, the Twentieth Indiana, Col. Meikels, and the Second U. S. Sharpshooters, all under Gen. De Trobriand, were detailed for the purpose, and ordered to hold themselves in readiness.

"The plan of attack was as follows: The Twentieth Indiana, moving by the right flank, was to attack a point indicated to the left of the hill, filing by the right when they had arrived at the rear of the enemy's pit. They were to move toward and meet the Ninety-ninth Pennsylvania, who, by tactics directly the inverse of those followed by their participants, were to attack from the right. On joining, they were simply to face to the front, which would bring them into line, with the enemy between them and our position. Having the enemy thus surrounded, it was not deemed probable that much resistance would be made.

"At one o'clock in the night of the 9th, according to orders, the troops started noiselessly from their respective positions, and, with bayonets fixed, moved quickly toward the rebel position. As they got nearer to it they moved more quickly, and if possible more silently, and at the rear of the line the junction was formed without any alarm. Fronting they moved on the pits again, and this time as they leaped on their sleeping adversaries one shot was fired by some rebel who awaked just a little too late. Several others were heard toward the right. Then the enemy, who had caught the alarm, fired some artillery. Our gunners replied, while the victorious infantry proceeded immediately to turn the enemy's sheltering works to their own advantage. By degrees the artillery slackened, and finally ceased firing. The surprise was complete

"Because they had lost the position it did'nt necessarily follow that it could'nt be retaken again, thought the rebels. And on this they acted. About three o'clock a force was heard approaching, whereupon a vigorous fire of musketry and artillery was opened on them, and after a few ineffectual charges against our discharges they concluded to leave the account as it was, for the time being, and retired. They asserted their determination to repossess themselves of this point at some future period, and an attack is momentarily expected. By the time this reaches you, however, a strong line of works will have been constructed by our engineers directly under the noses of the enemy. This front, which has for some time back been very quiet, is now about the only place on our line where any vindictiveness is displayed.

"Our entire loss during the whole affair was very slight; one or two killed twelve wounded, and about thirty prisoners."