

The Greene County Republican.

FIRMNESS IN THE RIGHT AS GOD GIVES US TO SEE THE RIGHT.—Lincoln.

A Family Paper—Devoted to Politics, Literature, Foreign, Home and Miscellaneous News, &c., &c.

VOL. X

WAYNESBURG, PA., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1866.

NO. 12.

The Republican.

EVERY WEDNESDAY MORNING,
BY
JAS. E. SAYERS

OFFICE IN WILSON'S BUILDING, MAIN STREET.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Two dollars a year, payable in advance. One dollar for six months, payable in advance. One dollar for three months, payable in advance.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

Advertisements inserted at 25 cents per line for the first week, and 15 cents for each additional week. (Ten lines or less counted as one.)

Local advertising and Special Notices, 10 cents per line for one insertion, with 50% liberal discount made to yearly advertisers.

Advertisements not marked with the number of insertions desired, charged for until ordered out.

Special notices and tributes of respect inserted as advertisements. They must be paid for in advance.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK, Waynesburg.

D. DORR, Pres. J. C. FLETCHER, Cashier.
DISCOUNT DAY—TUESDAYS.
May 16, '66-17.

W. E. GAPEN.

ATTORNEY AT LAW,
WAYNESBURG, PA.

Office in N. Clark's building,
6th Street.

A. STONESTRILL, J. J. BETHMAN.

MICHELL & HOFFMAN
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law
Waynesburg, Pa.

Office in the "Weight House," East
door—Collectors, &c., will receive prompt
attention.
Waynesburg, Pa., Oct. 26, 1862-1864.

R. W. DOWNEY.

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW

Office in Lyell's building, opposite
the Court House, Waynesburg, Pa.
Nov. 4, 1865-17.

W. S. WYLY & BUCHANAN.

ATTORNEYS & COUNSELLORS AT LAW

Office in the old Bank Building,
Waynesburg, Pa.
February 10, 1866-1867.

LEWIS DAY.

DEALER IN BOOKS, STATIONERY, AND
WRITING MATERIALS. Also, a full
assortment of all kinds of stationery, and
writing materials, at the lowest prices.
Waynesburg, Pa., opposite the Court House.
May 19, '66-17.

T. P. MITCHELL.

Shoemaker!

Main St., nearly opposite Weight House.

IS prepared to do all kinds of repair work,
from the coarsest to the finest; also, puts
up the latest style of Boots and Shoes. Col-
lecting done on reasonable terms. May 22, '66.

W. H. HUFFMAN.

MERCHANT TAILOR.

ROOM IN BLOCHER'S BUILDING, WAYNESBURG.

WORK made to order in shirt and best
style. Cutting and fitting done promptly,
and according to the latest fashion plates.
Stock on hand and on order. May 22, '66.

Wm. Balloy.

WATCHES AND JEWELRY.

MAIN STREET, OPPOSITE WRIGHT HOUSE.

KEEPS ON HAND ALWAYS a choice
and select assortment of watches and
jewelry. Repairing done at the lowest rates.
apt. 17

N. G. HUGHES.

SADDLER AND HARNESS MAKER.

Main St., nearly opposite Weight House.

READY made work on hand, and having
secured the services of two first-class work-
men he is prepared to execute all orders in
the neat and best style. May 22, '66.

THIRST NO MORE!

to

"Joe" Turner's

HE HAS JUST OPENED A

NEW SALOON!!

Keeps Good Beer, Whiskey, Brandy, and
all kinds of Gin, Wine, &c. And has the where-
with to put up Fancy Drinks. Call and see
him in the brick part of the Adams Inn.
apt. 27-66

PEOPLE'S LINE.

STEAMER "CHIEF"
TAIN, R. B. ADAMS,
Commander, Capt. R.
C. Masso, Clerk; leaves
Greensboro, for Pittsburgh every Monday,
Wednesday and Friday, at 9 a. m. Leaves
Pittsburgh for Greensboro every Tuesday,
Thursday and Saturday. Leaves Pitts-
burgh for Greensboro every Monday, Wednes-
day and Friday.

STEAMER "ELECTOR" Romer Pan-
tals, Commanders: R. G. Taylor, Clerk;
leaves Greensboro for Pittsburgh every Tues-
day, Thursday and Saturday. Leaves Pitts-
burgh for Greensboro every Monday, Wednes-
day and Friday.

ADAMS' EXPRESS LINE.

THIS safe line will forward with dispatch all
packages, trunks, &c., to all parts of the
United States. Apply to
JOSEPH COOKE,
Agent.
July 11, '66-4.

SLATER OENBAUGH.

DEALER IN DRUGS, MEDICINES, LI-
quors and every thing pertaining to a first
class Drug Store. Prescriptions carefully com-
pounded. "Creigh's Old Stand." Waynes-
burg, Pa. May 29, '66-17.

Gov. Morton's SPEECH:

At New Albany, Ind., July
18th 1866.

HE REVIEWS THE DECLARATION
THAT "THE WAR WAS JUST AND
NECESSARY."

DWELLS ON THE EQUALIZATION
OF REPRESENTATION.

Advocates the Constitutional
Amendment.

AND DENOUNCES THE DEMOCRATIC
POLICY.

New Albany, Ind., July 18
The Union Congressional Convention
for this District was held at the Fair
grounds to-day; five counties were rep-
resented; six thousand persons were
present.

At 2 P. M., Governor Morton ap-
peared, accompanied by Genl. Gresham and
others. The Governor seemed weak,
and was assisted to the stand, where,
taking a seat, he delivered an eloquent
address of nearly three hours, during
which he was frequently greeted with
volleys of applause.

Some three or four weeks ago a Demo-
cratic convention was held in this city at
which a candidate for Congress was
nominated, speeches were made by Messrs.
Voorhees and McDonald, and a series of
resolutions adopted.

The resolutions were evidently intend-
ed to inaugurate a new policy in the
Democratic party, and to enable the
party, if possible, to relieve itself of the
odium with which it is now loaded down
and by which it is most being car-
ried to the bottom.

The second of these resolutions de-
clares that the war was just and neces-
sary to prevent the disruption of the
Union and the overthrow of the Consti-
tution; and thanks the soldiers for their
valor in preserving the nation.

Sixteen months after the war was
over, the men composing the convention
discovers for the first time that the war
was "just and necessary" on our part
—a truth which had been arrived at by
the great body of the people of the
United States more than five years be-
fore.

How it happened that this discovery
was first made at New Albany, or by
what means the truth broke in upon
minds so politically prejudiced and so far
behind the age, does not appear.

Nevertheless, New Albany was select-
ed as the place of revelation, and the poli-
ticians there assembled the humble in-
struments for the dissemination of the
new truth.

This resolution is a complete and un-
reserved confession of the disloyal and
treasonable course pursued by the so-
called Democratic party throughout the
war, and a full admission that their prin-
ciples and practices were hostile to the
Union. The whole country will regard
it as a dying repentance, issued from a
convicted criminal who is standing in
full view of the scaffold, but will regard
it as a confession, springing not from
penitence of the heart, but from hopes of
pardon and renewed life. The men
making this confession ask the country
to receive it as an evidence that they
have from the first been in favor of the
war, and denounce that they shall be
received as good Union men, who have
protested and preserved the country,
and not as friends, aiders and abettors
of rebellion.

Allow me to say to them, their request
will not be granted. They will be held
to the record, and cannot be relieved
from their great responsibilities by the
cheap discovery that the war was "just
and necessary," sixteen months after it
was ended.

It is true, our Savior, in his parable,
described those who came in at the eleventh
hour, as having received as much
pay as those who had worked all day;
but still it must be remembered that they
came in one hour before the work was
done, and helped to finish it, but these
Democratic politicians did not come in
until sixteen months after the work was
all over.

If the war was "just and necessary,"
as these men now say, why did the

Democratic party throughout the war
denounce it as unnecessary, unjust and
unconstitutional? and assert that it was
based upon our Southern brethren by a
wicked invasion of their rights? If the
war was "just and necessary," why did
Democratic members of Congress
vote against all supplies of men and mo-
ney—against all appropriations and
measures necessary to carry on the war,
and do all in their power, by their
speeches, to discourage the loyal people
of the North, and encourage the disloyal
people of the South? If the war was
"just and necessary," why did Demo-
cratic politicians throughout Indiana dis-
courage enlistments, labor to keep Demo-
crats from going into the army, and
exhort the people to resist the draft? If
the war was "just and necessary," why
did Democratic politicians argue that the
Government could not exercise a State?
and that each State had a right to judge
of the infraction of the Constitution, as
well as the remedy? and peacefully to
withdraw from the Union, according to
the determination of its own will?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

If the war was "just and necessary,"
why did the Democracy of Washington
county, in a meeting held at Salem, in
February, 1861, resolve that if a separa-
tion took place between the North and
South, the line of separation must run
North of Washington county; and that
if they were compelled to fight on either
side, they would be found fighting in the
armies of the South?

the Senate, while it is intended that the
people shall be equitably and equally
represented in the House.

In the original formation of the Con-
stitution, Representatives were ap-
portioned among the several States by adding
to the whole number of free persons,
excluding Indians, not taxed, three-
fifths of all other persons." These three-
fifths of all other persons were slaves,
and, in effect, every five slaves were
counted as three free persons, in making
up the ratio of representation. This was
a very liberal provision for the people of
the free States, but it was demanded by
the slaveholders, and cancelled by our
fathers in compromise, they believing
that slavery was fast passing away, and
could not endure a quarter of a century,
and it became fairly an almost intoler-
able burden and injustice, as it gave to
the South a representation of twenty-
two votes in the House of Representatives
and in the Electoral College for
President and Vice President, on ac-
count of their property.

According to the census of 1850, the
eleven rebel States not including in their
number Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware
and Missouri, had a white population of
5,922,951, and had a negro population
of 3,750,031. By the last apportion-
ment, which allowed one Representative
for every 125,000 people, the white
population of these rebel States would
entitle them to forty-two Representa-
tives, and the colored population, now
that slavery is abolished, and each negro
counts as one person, would entitle them
to thirty Representatives more, making
seventy-two in all.

By the same count the seven North-
western States had a negro population of
95,000, 12,000 of whom lived in Indi-
ana, and altogether making but half
enough for one Representative. And
now in these eleven rebel States the ne-
groes enjoy no political rights or con-
sideration whatever. They have no
more voice in making the laws by which
they are governed, or in choosing their
rulers, than the beasts of the field, and
yet as the Constitution now stands, their
late masters will have thirty votes in
Congress and in the Electoral College
on their account—just equal to the un-
ited vote of Indiana and Ohio. In other
words, the white men of these rebel
States, nineteen-twentieths of whom
are rebels, and were engaged in the late
rebellion, can vote down Ohio and In-
diana, by representing the negroes, who
are stripped of all political rights what-
ever.

The negro, for himself, amounts to
nothing, counts for nothing, and his ex-
istence is utterly ignored, but he amounts
to a man and counts for a man, for the
benefit of white rebels, by whom he is
surrounded. The white people of the
rebel States have fifty-two votes for
themselves, and there will have thirty
votes more for the negroes.

Democratic politicians appeal to the
vulgar prejudices of the people, by claim-
ing that this is a white man's Govern-
ment, and that which has thirty votes in
Congress and thirty votes in the Electoral
College, based on negro representation?
This advantage which the rebel States
now have is monstrous, and is not to be
quietly endured. No Northern man,
who has the least respect for himself,
can for a moment consent that they shall
retain it. Even if they were loyal—if
they had tried to sustain the Government
instead of destroying it—they could have
no possible claim to it.

They have thirty votes in Congress
that have no constituency; thirty votes
a from thirty rotten boroughs under the
English system. And these thirty votes
just balance and set off the thirty votes
sent up by three millions six hundred
and forty-two thousand white people
from Ohio and Indiana.

These eleven rebel States have other
advantages in the Government, which it
seems to me ought to satisfy the most
avid Democratic politician. They have
twenty-two votes in the Senate, while
Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, with a
joint population exceeding theirs by a
quarter of a million, have but six votes.

This is a gross inequality, and would
seem to have but little foundation in
reason, yet it was part of the original
theory of the Government, that the
States, without regard to the population,
should have equal representation in the
Senate, and we are not seeking to change
it.

In order to correct the shameful abuse
and injustice I have been describing,

Congress has passed a joint resolution
amending the Constitution of the United
States, the second clause of which pro-
vides that whenever the right to vote
is denied in any State to any of the male
inhabitants of such State, twenty-one
years of age, and a citizen of the United
States, or is in any way abridged, ex-
cept for participation in the rebellion, or
other crime, the basis of representation
therein shall be reduced, in the propor-
tion such male citizens shall bear to the
whole number of male citizens twenty-
one years of age in such State.

The effect of this amendment will be
to exclude the negro population from
being counted in making up the basis of
representation in any State in which ne-
groes over twenty-one years of age bear
the same proportion to the whole negro
population that white males over twenty-
one years of age bear to the whole white
population, and deducts the negro popu-
lation by that proportion from the whole
number for which representation is to
be given. This will have the effect to
deduct the whole negro population of
the rebel States from the aggregate
number for which representation is to
be given, and will deprive them of thirty
votes in Congress, and in the Electoral
College. It also deducts the twelve
thousand in Indiana, from the aggregate
population for which she is entitled to
representation, and so in every other
State. This amendment, in effect, leaves
the question of negro suffrage to each
State, to be determined by and within
itself. If South Carolina wants repre-
sentation for her negroes, she has but to
confer the right of suffrage upon her
male negroes over twenty-one years of
age, and she will have it. And the mat-
ter is referred entirely to her own de-
termination, and so with every other
State.

The principle enunciated by the
amendment is this, that wherever there
is a race of people who are deemed un-
worthy or unfit to receive and enjoy po-
litical rights, they shall not be made the
basis for conferring political rights and
powers upon others.

Against this amendment the Demo-
cratic party has placed itself in direct
opposition. Democratic members of
Congress voted against it, and Demo-
cratic politicians are misrepresenting it
all over the land. They demand that
no constitutional amendment shall be
passed until the eleven rebel States are
fully represented in Congress, when
they know full well no amendment can
be passed abridging the power of the
South, imposing conditions upon rebels,
or existing security for the future.—
They demand that Southern rebels shall
retain the enormous advantage they
now have, whereby each one of them
has sixty percent, more of power in the
Government than has a citizen of Indi-
ana, or any other Northern State, and
they demand it because these rebels
believe, and wish them in getting into
power.

The first section of the amendment is
in these words:

"All persons born or naturalized in the
United States, and subject to the juris-
diction thereof, are citizens of the United
States, and of the States wherein they
reside. No State shall make or enforce
any law which shall abridge the privi-
leges or immunities of citizens of the
United States, nor shall any State deprive
any person of life, liberty or property
without due process of law, nor deny to
any person within its jurisdiction the
equal protection of its laws."

The first clause of the section declares
who shall be citizens of the United States,
but does not add to their privileges or
immunities as citizens. It gives no right,
power or privilege to citizens of the
United States which they have not always
possessed.

The first part of the second clause
prohibits any State from making or en-
forcing a law which shall abridge the
privileges or immunities of citizens of
the United States, as such, though they may
not be the citizens of any State, have
certain great privileges or immunities,
which are not to be abridged or inter-
fered with by the laws of any State.—
This has been done heretofore in many
cases, whereby great wrongs were in-
flicted; and hence the necessity of this
provision.

The second part of the clause declares
that no State shall deprive any person
of life, liberty or property without due
process of law, nor deny to any person

within its jurisdiction the equal protec-
tion of the laws.

By this it is intended to throw the
equal protection of the law around every
person who may be within the jurisdic-
tion of any State, whether citizen or
alien, and without regard to condition
or residence, not only as to life and
liberty, but also as to property. It has
happened in times past that several of
the Southern States discriminated against
the citizens of other States, by with-
holding the protection of the laws for life
and liberty, and denying to them the
ordinary remedies in the Courts for the
vindication of their civil rights, and hence
the adoption of this provision.

But it is now being desperately ar-
gued, to reclaim a desperate cause, that
the first section of the amendment con-
fers the right of suffrage upon negroes in
Indiana and every other State, I confess
my astonishment that any respectable
lawyer who has the slightest regard for
his legal reputation should be willing to
commit himself to such a proposition,
and argue against the clear meaning of
the English language, and the manifest
spirit and purpose of the amendment.—
They might as well try to extract negro
suffrage from the Ninth Commandment,
which says, "Thou shalt not bear false
witness against thy neighbor," and in
fact, I commend these gentlemen to the
particular study of that commandment.

It is one of the most flagrant and im-
pudent attempts to practice a fraud upon
the public mind of which I have any
knowledge, and should be held up to
general execration and contempt. And
so shameless is it that Judge Perkins, in
a communication published only last
week, in referring to this subject uses
the following language:

"McDonald seeks to run the campaign
on the proposition that the proposed
amendment to the Constitution confers
negro suffrage, but that is plainly a false
proposition, and one on which defeat
most of course result. The proposed
amendment does not confer negro suf-
frage."

Whether he correctly represents Mr.
McDonald I am unable to say, as I am
not familiar with his speeches; but it is
very certain that he justly denounces
the shallow pretence that this section
confers negro suffrage.

It is as well settled in any other pro-
position connected with constitutional
law, that a person may be a citizen of
the United States, and yet not a citizen
of any State. The man of foreign birth
may be naturalized by the Courts, and
thus made a citizen of the United States,
although he is not a citizen of any State,
and a native born person may lose his
residence and citizenship in one State,
and for a long time fail to acquire them
in any other; but during that time he is
 unquestionably a citizen of the United
States.

As to what constitutes citizenship in a
State, depends upon its constitution and
laws. The conditions are different in
different States