msa_sc2901_scm1621-0121 copyright Maryland State Archives

The Kent News.

A Family Newspaper: Devoted to Literature, Agriculture, Politics, General News, and Advertising.

VOL. 22.—No. 8. CHESTERTOWN, SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1861. WHOLE NO. 1100.

THE BRIDGE BURNING.

Letter of Governor Hicks in Reply to Mayor Brown.

To the People of Maryland:

I have heretofore asked a suspension of your judgment in regard to a communication, with accompanying certificates, from the Mayor of Baltimore to the House of Delegates of Maryland, in which is asserted a complicity on my part to the unlawful destruction of the bridges on the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore, and the Northern Central Railroads, on the night of the 19th of April.

A desire to obtain expected information from the telegraphic despatches recently seized by the Government—but which I have not yet received—added to the pressing nature of my official duties, has prevented me from making this publication at an earlier period. The Mayor says:

"About 12 o'clock P.M. the Hon. E. Louis Lowe and Marshal George P. Kane called at my house, where Gov. Hicks was passing the night, and Marshal Kane informed me that a despatch had been received that other troops were to come to Baltimore over the Northern Central Railroad. There was also a report that troops were on their way, who, it was thought might even then be at Perryville on their route to Baltimore. Mr. Lowe, Marshal Kane, my brother, John Cumming Brown and myself, went immediately to the chamber of Gov. Hicks and laid the matter before him.—The point was pressed that if troops were suddenly to come to Baltimore with a determination to to pass through a terrible collision and bloodshed would take place, and the consequences to Baltimore would be fearful, and that the only way to avert the calamity was the destruction of the bridges. To this the Governor replied, 'it seems to be necessary,' or words that effect. He was then asked by me whether he gave his consent to the destruction of the bridges and he distinctly, although apparently with great reluctance, replied in the affirmative. I do not assert that I have given the precise language used by Gov. Hicks, but I am very clear that I have stated it with substantial correctness, and that his assent was unequivocal, and in answer to a question by me which elicited a distinct affirmative reply."

Mr. J. Cumming Brown, the Mayor's brother, in his published certificate, says:

"When asked by my brother whether or not he gave his consent to the measure, the Governor expressed a desire for time for reflection—Being reminded by those present of the lateness of the hour, and the necessity for prompt action my brother again earnestly appealed to Gov. Hicks, and asked him for his consent. Gov. Hicks' answer was, in substance, although I may not use his exact words, 'I see nothing else to be done.' 'But, sir,' said my brother, 'I cannot act without your consent, do you give it?' The Governor's reply was distinctly given in the affirmative."

George P. Kane, in his published certificate, says:

"The conversation resulted in the Governor's distinctly and unequivocally consenting, in response to the direct question put to him by the Mayor, that the bridges on the roads by which the troops were expected to come should be destroyed, as the only means of averting the consequences referred to, of their coming at that time."

E. Louis Lowe, in his certificate, says:

"Governor Hicks replied that it was a serious affair to undertake to destroy the bridges, and he expressed some doubt as to his authority to give such an order. It was urged, in reply, that it was a case of absolute self-preservation; that in three or four hours' time a large body of troops would probably be in the city, inflamed with passionate resentment against the people of Baltimore for the assault made on their comrades in the Pratt street encounter; and that, as the city was filled with hundreds of excited men, armed to the teeth, and determined to resist the passage of troops, a fearful slaughter must necessarily ensue, and the safety of the city itself be put in peril, unless, by the destruction of the bridges, time could be gained to avoid the difficulty by peaceable arrangement of some sort. Governor Hicks fully and most distinctly assented to this and said, "well, I suppose it must be done." or words of precisely that import, to which the Mayor replied, substantially, "Governor, I have no authority to act beyond the city limits, and can do nothing in this matter except by your direction; shall the bridges be destroyed?' Governor Hicks emphatically and distinctly replied in the affirmative. It is absolutely impossible for any misapprehension to exist on this point."

This is the sum of the charges brought against me by Mayor Brown and his witnesses. It is due to the Mayor to say, unequivocally, that I do not believe he had any knowledge of the plot of which the destruction of the bridges was a part. I had little acquaintance with him at the time referred to, but I had formed a high estimate of his character as a faithful public servant, and as a high-toned gentleman; and I believe that the proceedings which he countenanced, and in which he seems to have been a participant, were inaugurated by others. His apparent complicity was only what might have attached to any other man in the trying and delicate and painful circumstances in which he found himself. The evil men who surrounded him, and who clouded his better judgment, had designs which could be consummated only by his official aid; and they spared no efforts to entangle him in the snares they had prepared.

It is alleged by the Mayor and his witnesses that I gave my consent *verbally*. I am sure the public will agree with me in thinking it strange, under all the circumstances, that an act of so great importance, requiring, as is alleged, my authority to make it valid, should have been consummated under a pretended verbal assent, admitted to have been unwillingly given by a person who "expressed some doubt as to his authority to give such an order." None but bold conspirators would have proceeded to perpetrate such an unlawful act without authority *in writing* from whomsoever they believed competent to give the necessary order. According to their showing, a written order from me would have absolved the Mayor and his associates from all responsibility in the premises. But they confess they had no such authority, and attempt to justify their unlawful acts by a pretended verbal assent by me, certified to by witnesses interested very materially in sustaining the position assumed by the Mayor. It seems to me that in this respect may accusers find themselves in a difficulty from which they cannot extricate themselves.

The Mayor's communication does not profess to quote the language used by me on the occasion referred to. It is admitted that I alleged want of authority to order the destruction of the bridges. The Mayor's witnesses admit that I desired time for reflection. But time for reflection would have materially damaged the plot, inasmuch as men were already on the way to do what they desired me to endorse. Accordingly they jumped to the desired conclusion that I consented, because I contended that I had no power to consent to, and no power to prevent the outrage contemplated, and which was then in process of execution. The visit of Messrs. Brown, Kane and Lowe to my bed-chamber was at a late hour of the night. The Mayor's companions were men in whom I have no confidence. Indeed, it was only on account of the official nature of the visit that, under the circumstances, I consented to any communication with such people. No man of intelligence can fail to see that it was impossible for me to consent unequivocally to the unlawful act which was proposed to me by such men as Kane and Lowe, no matter how necessary it might have appeared to be in the emergency. Consequently, I unhesitatingly assert that I refused my consent, and gave as my reason therefor that "I had no authority in the premises—that the bridges were private property—that the proposed act was unlawful—that I was a lover of law and order—that the Mayor could act as he pleased—and that I had no power to interfere with his designs." If this be consent to the destruction of the bridges, then I consented. If this be complicity in an unlawful act, then I was accessory.

I do not deny that the proposed act, unlawful though it was, *seemed* to be the only means of averting threatened bloodshed. But it would have little become me, as Governor of the State, to interfere with the province of the Mayor of Baltimore to prevent a riot. Still less did it become me to forget my oath of office, and consent to an infraction of the laws which I had sworn to enforce. I am sure no unprejudiced man can conclude it to be within the range of probability that I could have acted in the manner ascribed to me.

As a matter of course, it is not easy to adduce proof of my position. Those who were near me throughout that trying day can bear but little accurate testimony as to what was said or done by me. Every one was full of excitement, and men whose judgment had always challenged my respect urged me to do many things which they now regret to remember. I was, perhaps, no cooler than those who surrounded me, but it was not possible for me to forget what was due to my position and to my oath of office. I did not do either. I strenuously resisted all propositions which I deemed inconsistent with law and order, and I did nothing on that eventful day which I have any reason to regret.

My accusers seem to forget that long before nightfall I positively and persistently refused my assent to the scuttling or even removal of the steam ferry boat Maryland, at Perryville, which was proposed to me by so many persons, and which, if consummated, would have prevented any necessity for the destruction of the bridges. The following letter from Col. R. S. Mercer, of Anne Arundel county, is evidence that I did refuse my assent to this proposition:

PARKHURST, May 16, 1861.

To His Excellency Governor Hicks:

Dear Sir—I have just read your card in the *American* denying the charge made by the Mayor of Baltimore, Marshal Kane and others, that you had given your consent and approbation to the burning of the various railroad bridges leading from Baltimore to Pennsylvania.

Having, on the 19th of April, acted as your Aid-de-Camp, I was present at all your consultations and interviews with the city officials and other prominent citizens, until the violent excitement which marked that day had subsided. I conceive it to be my duty to make the following statement, which suggests itself to me, as a simple act of justice to you.

I heard the request made you by Mr. McLean and others, in which His Honor the Mayor, acquiesced, that you should order the scuttling or removal of the steam ferry boat Maryland, so as to cut off all means for the transmission of troops through Baltimore over the Philadelphia Railroad. You peremptorily refused even to remove the boat, and explicitly gave as your reason for such refusal that you had no right to interfere with the passage of troops of the United States through Maryland to the National Capital; but in view of the wild excitement then prevailing, which overwhelmed and defied the restraints of civil authority, as a measure of humanity and regard for the loyal citizens of Baltimore, you agreed to unite with the Mayor in a telegraphic despatch to the President, and to the Governors of the Northern States, invoking them to send no more troops through Baltimore while the laws were set at defiance.

It is alleged that your consent to the destruction of the bridges was given at the residence of the Mayor. Of this, of course, I cannot speak, not having accompanied you there. But if such be the fact, you have committed a most monstrous and improbable inconsistency. If you acquiesced in this work of destruction, you departed (in the Mayor's house) from a principle which in his office, during the trying events of the day, you had consistently and manfully insisted upon: the right of the Government to pass troops through Maryland to the Capital. This sentiment you reiterated on the next day, on board of the steamer Pioneer, as I accompanied you to Annapolis.

You can use this statement as you think best. I could make it more full if you wish it. I could allude to the liability of every one in Baltimore on the 19th confused by the excitement, to be mistaken. Indeed I remember an instance of this. General Egerton was ordered by you *to drive back the mob* who were pressing upon the Pennsylvania troops. *He drove back the troops.* I heard you give the order to Egerton, and I heard him report to you. You disapproved of his act, and he pleaded misapprehension of your order.

I remain, sir, respectfully, yours, &c.

R. S. MERCER,
Col. Third Regiment M. C.

I had not retired to my bed when the scuttling of the ferry boat was proposed to me. It was not proposed by men in whom I had no confidence. Highly respectable gentlemen urged it as the easiest and most lawful means of effecting the desired object. Yet I unhesitatingly refused my consent to the step. But the people of Maryland are asked to believe that, after this, in the still watches of the night, when requested by Enoch Louis Lowe and George P. Kane to consent to the destruction of the bridges, I gave an "unequivocal, and decided, and distinct reply in the affirmative." I leave my vindication from such an absurd charge to the good sense of the people, in the full confidence that justice will be done me.

It will readily occur to the reader that the *time* when the bridges were destroyed is a material point of this subject. The Mayor and his witnesses concur in their statement of the hour when they went to my bed-chamber to solicit my consent to the destruction of the bridges. They say it was 12 o'clock at night. The bridges destroyed on the Northern Central Railroad were at Ashland and Monkton, 16 and 18 miles from Baltimore. The parties who destroyed them left Baltimore in omnibuses. The bridges were fired a little after one o'clock. It being impossible for the men to have left Baltimore *after* it was alleged my consent was given, they must have started before my consent was asked. Thus showing that the destruction of the bridges was determined upon, and would have been consummated, no matter what might have been my opinion in the premises. As evidence of this, I offer the following letter from a highly respectable citizen, who has been kind enough to ascertain the particulars for me:

TOWSONTOWN, May 29, 1861.

His Excellency, Governor Hicks:

My Dear Sir—Yours of this date was handed me by our mutual friend, Mr. Bryson, and I at once started to Cockeysville in company with Mr. Bryson and our friend Edward Rider, Jr., and after getting such facts in connection with the burning of the bridges as we could obtain, I hasten to answer your inquiries.

On the night of the 19th ultimo I left Baltimore at precisely ten minutes past ten o'clock, and in about ten minutes more reached a point about one hundred yards nearer the city than the cemetery entrance, at which place I saw an omnibus with four horses, heads turned northward, or up the road; and about one hundred yards nearer the city I had passed previously two groups of men, about fifteen each; and when we passed the omnibus I remarked to a friend who was with me, "There is some devilment connected with that omnibus." Well, after I was home in bed, at about a quarter past eleven o'clock, the same omnibus, full of men, passed here, and a lady informed me she saw it pass her house at precisely twelve o'clock, nine miles and a half from the city. The watchman at the bridge, whom I saw to day, states positively that when they arrived at the bridge, and penned him in his shanty, it was about ten minutes past one o'clock; and that after cutting the telegraph wires, which took but a few minutes, they fired the bridges at about twenty or twenty five minutes after one o'clock.

As to who the party were, I cannot say; but a gentleman at Cockeysville said that a man named Philip Fendall (I think of the firm of Duvall, Keighler & Co.) was one of the party, but I am not prepared to say so positively. He is a cousin of the wife of John Merryman, now under arrest.

Anything further that I can do for you, I will do with great pleasure. Please excuse this hurried account of the affair, as Mr. Bryson is writing. Your obedient servant,

JOHN H. LONGNECKER.

I have not the slightest doubt that the destruction of the bridges referred to was an important part of the Secession programme. The necessity of such a step, in furtherance of the evident designs of the Secession leaders, must be apparent to all. It little becomes me, however, except for my own vindication, and incidentally, to enter upon an exposition of that plot.—Time will fully unveil the plans of the traitors. Already has sufficient been disclosed to satisfy any unprejudiced mind that all the details were matured which were designed to precipitate Maryland into rebellion against the General Government, and thus render our State the theatre of war. The following letter will show that the burning of the bridges was a foregone conclusion before my consent was asked:

FREDERICK CITY, Md.

His Excellency, T. H. Hicks, Governor of Md.

Dear Sir—We have received yours of the 23d instant, and, in reply, state that during the night of the 19th of April, ultimo, about one o'clock, Bradley T. Johnson sought and had an interview with us relative to a telegraphic despatch which he had received an hour before from George P. Kane, Marshal of Police of Baltimore city, and which has since appeared in the public prints. In the course of that interview, Mr. Johnson, in unfolding the plans of those with whom he was co-operating, stated that they were determined to resist the passage of Federal troops through Maryland; and, as one of the means to accomplish that end, that the bridges on the railroads leading into Baltimore would be burned or destroyed. Some of us are clear in our recollection that he said the bridges would be destroyed that night. Others are not so clear in our recollection on that point.

Very respectfully, your ob't servants,

EDWARD T. SHRIVER,
WILLIAM P. MAULSBY,
GRAYSON EICHELBERGER,
ULYSSES HODGE.

The annexed copy of a handbill circulated throughout Western Maryland by Bradley T. Johnson is evidence that Marshal Kane and his allies made all the necessary provisions in anticipation of the pre-arranged attack upon the Massachusetts troops:

LATEST NEWS.

Marylanders, Arouse!

Frederick, Saturday, 7 o'clock A.M., 1861.

At 12 o'clock last night I received the following despatch from Marshal Kane, of Baltimore, by telegraph to the Junction, and express to Frederick:

"Thank you for your offer. Bring your men by the first train, and we will arrange with the railroad afterwards. *Streets red with Maryland blood!* Send expresses over the mountains and valleys of Maryland and Virginia for their riflemen to come without delay. Fresh hordes will be down upon us to-morrow (the 20th.) We will fight them, and whip them, or die.

"GEO. P. KANE."

All men who will go with me will report themselves as soon as possible, providing themselves with such arms and accoutrements as they can: double-barrelled shot guns and buck shot are efficient. They will assemble, after reporting themselves, at 10½ o'clock, so as to go down in the 11½ train.

BRADLEY T. JOHNSON.

Add to this the undeniable fact that many of the volunteer companies in Maryland were eagerly looking for an outbreak, and the subsequent attempt of the Legislature to pass the "Public Safety bill" in secret session, and I think that no one can fail to see that the conspiracy, of which an attempt has been made to make me a participant, was fully and deliberately planned, and might have accomplished its diabolical designs had not the people frustrated it by an unmistakable expression of their determination to crush it at the point of the bayonet.

Deeply regretting the necessity which has impelled me to vindicate myself from the charge brought against me, and with the assurance that I have done so only out of regard to the honor and dignity of my official position, I leave the matter to the judgment of a people whom I have endeavored faithfully to serve, and whose interests and safety I have constantly had in view.

THOS. H. HICKS.

KENTUCKY NEUTRALITY.

Thomas H. Clay, one of the sons of Henry Clay, thus declares himself a Union man, and states the position of other Union men in Kentucky:

1st. I am for the Union, and opposed to all its enemies without and within.

2d. I do not believe in the right of one or more States to secede from this Union. I recognize the right of revolution under grievous oppression; but no one can assert with truth that the present revolution was brought about by any such oppression.

3d. The President of the United States has a constitutional right to occupy and hold all the property of the United States, and to pass troops through any of the States or Territories of the Union.

4th. This is my Government as well as Mr. Lincoln's. From all I can learn it is neither the wish nor the intention of this Administration of the General Government to subjugate the Seceded States, but that its object is to put down rebellion.

5th. With three others (Messrs. Houghton, Swift and Tye), I voted in the House of Representatives of Kentucky, against a resolution in approval of Gov. Magoffin's answer to the Secretary of War, on a requisition by the Secretary for four regiments of Kentucky troops, because I thought the answer was couched in such words as ought not to be used by one occupying the high office he held to another high dignitary of the land; and, secondly, I thought he transcended the powers conferred upon him as Governor, in refusing to refer the matter to the people. Unquestionably the President, through his Secretary, had the constitutional right to make the requisition.

6th. I hold to the supremacy of the Constitution of the United States over all State Constitutions.

7th. I recognize the Stars and Stripes, and no other flag, as that of my country.

8th. I believe that strict neutrality is now the only safe position for Kentucky. Any other would be ruinous to her people.

AGES OF THE GENERALS.—Lieut. Gen. Scott is 75 years old; General Wool is 73; Harney 65; Mansfield 60; Totten (head of the Engineer corps) 80; Thayer (Engineers) 80; Craig (head of the Ordnance department) 76; Ripley (Ordnance) 70; Sumner 65; Larned (Paymaster General) 70; Gibson (Commissary Gen'l), Churchill (Inspector General), and Thomas (Adjutant General,) are all old men, having entered the army in the beginning of the present century—Gibson in 1808, and Churchill in 1812. General McClellan is not yet 35; General Fremont is under 48; Lyon is about 44; General Butler is 43; General Banks is 44; General McDowell is about 40.

HUMAN FLOWERS.—Children are human flowers. Cares crush the spirit and labor sobers animal life. Disappointment blights and treachery sours the sympathies of the soul, and mildew and rigidity would gather upon the face of human existence, but for infancy, springing up in all highways and byways, with smiling and bounding step and joyous laugh, carrying the wayworn man back to his own spring time, whence, plucking a boquet for his buttonhole, he forgets what manner of person he is, and jogs on to the smile and tune of other days. —*Mrs. Carpenter.*

Letter of Hon. Edward Everett.

This patriotic letter will amply repay a careful reading. It was written, without thought of publication, to a friend in Virginia. We published the concluding paragraph last week, but for the gratification of many of our readers who desire to see the whole letter, we now give it entire:

BOSTON, May 15, 1861.

MY DEAR MR.——: Your letter of the 9th reached me yesterday. I read it with mingled feelings; gratified that your friendly regard had as yet survived the shock of the times, and deeply grieved at the different view we take of the existing crisis.

It is well known to you that I sustained the South, at the almost total sacrifice of influence and favor at home, as long as I thought she was pursuing Constitutional objects. This I did, although the South had placed the conservative North in a false and indefensible position, by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the persevering attempts to force Slavery into the Territory of Kansas, by surprise, fraud and violence, against the known wish of an overwhelming majority of the People. I pursued this course for the sake of strengthening the hands of patriotic Union men at the South; although I was well aware, partly from facts within my personal knowledge, that leading Southern politicians had for thirty years been resolved to break up the Union as soon as they ceased to control the United States Government, and that the Slavery question was but a pretext for keeping up agitation and rallying the South.

Notwithstanding this state of things, and the wholly unwarrantable manner in which the policy of Secession was initiated by South Carolina, and followed up by the other Cotton States, and in spite of the seizure of the public establishments and the public property—which in the absence of any joint act of partition, was sheer plunder—it was my opinion that, if they would abstain from further aggression, and were determined to separate, we had better part in peace. But the wanton attack on Fort Sumter (which took place, not from any military necessity, for what harm was a single company, cooped up in Charleston harbor, able to do to South Carolina? but for the avowed purpose of "stirring the blood" of the South, and thus bringing in the Border States) and the subsequent proceedings at Montgomery have wholly changed the state of affairs. The South has levied an unprovoked war against the Government of the United States, the mildest and most beneficent in the world, and has made it the duty of every good citizen to rally to its support.

I perceive that my having publicly expressed that sentiment, and contributed my mite toward the regiment of Mr. Webster (who inherits the conservative opinions of his illustrious father), has caused surprise on the part of some of my Southern friends—yourself among the most valued of them—as if my so doing was inconsistent with the friendly feelings I have ever cherished toward the South. But these friends forget that as early as the 12th of April, that is before the Proclamation of President Lincoln, the Secretary of War at Montgomery had threatened that by the 1st of May, the Confederate flag should float over the Capitol at Washington, and in due time over Faneuil Hall. When General Beauregard proceeds to execute this threat, his red hot cannon balls and shells will not spare the roof that shelters my daughter and four little children at Washington, nor my own roof in Boston. Must I, because I have been the steady friend of the South, sit still while he is battering my house about my ears?

I certainly deprecate the choice of a President, exclusively by the electoral votes of one section of the country though consenting with the greatest reluctance to be myself upon one of the opposing tickets. It was, however, fully in the power of the South to have produced a different result. But the disunionists were determined to have their own candidate, though mistaken I trust in the belief that he shared their disloyal views. I make this charge against them without scruple, justified by subsequent events, as well as by the language of the entire Union press at the South during the canvass.

After the election was decided, the Disunionists would not wait for *overt acts*, because they knew none could or would be committed. They knew that there was an anti-Republican majority in the Senate and that there would be one in the present House. They "precipitated" the rupture of the Union, because they knew that if they waited, even the pretext for it would fail.

After the Cotton States had seceded, and, although that circumstance greatly increased the difficulty of compromise, measures were nevertheless adopted or proposed in Congress, which must have removed all sincere alarm on the part of the South, that their constitutional rights were threatened. The accredited leaders of the Republican party, including the President elect, uniformly pledged themselves to that effect. The two Houses, by a constitutional majority, pledged themselves in like manner against any future amendment of the Constitution violating the rights of the South. A member from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams), possessing the entire confidence of the incoming Administration, proposed to admit New Mexico as a State, and three new Territories were organized without any Anti-Slavery restriction. While this was done in Congress, the States repealed or modified the laws throwing obstacles in the way of recovering fugitive slaves—laws which have never been of any practical injury to the Cotton States. These conciliatory demonstrations had no effect in staying the progress of Secession, because the leaders of that revolution were determined not to be satisfied; and to maintain their policy, which in the light of the Constitution is simply rebellion and treason, they have appealed to the sword.

You say that the South desires nothing but peace, and ask whether the North will not "let you alone? But my good friend, the South demands a great deal more than "peace." She claims the Capital of the country, although she has but a third of its population. She claims the control of outlet of Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries; the right to command the most direct route (the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad) to the Atlantic from Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, (States whose population amounts to five and a half millions;) the right to dragoon the State of Maryland and the western part of your own State, with Kentucky, Missouri, and Tennessee, into joining the Southern Confederacy; the right to occupy the fortresses which protect the trade of the Gulf of Mexico; the right to shut up the outlet of the Ohio, Mississippi, and the Missouri—and finally, she claims the right for any State, that choose to pass a law to that effect, to break up the Union. In enforcing these unconstitutional, monstrous, and unheard-of usurpations, she asks to be "let alone;" and when the Government of the United States, in obedience to the solemn oaths of its members (from which the leaders of the revolt dispense themselves), take measures to defend itself, the Capital of the Union, the public establishments, and the rights of the people against this invasion, long premeditated by the ambitions and disappointed politicians (for Mr. A. H. Stephens truly declares that to be "the source of a great part of our troubles,") she exclaims that the North seeks "to subjugate the South."

I cannot describe to you, my dear friend, the sorrow caused me by this state of things. Circumstances, as you well know, had led me to form personal friendly relations at the South, more extensively than most Northern men, and the support given, especially in the Border States, to the ticket on which my name was born at the late election, filled me with gratitude. If the sacrifice of all I have could have averted the present disastrous struggle, I could have made it willingly, joyfully. But, I pray you, believe me that I speak not only my own conviction, but that of the entire North, when I say that we feel that the conflict has been forced upon us, to gratify the aspiration of ambitious men; that it is our duty to ourselves, to our children, and to the whole people, to sustain the Government; and that it is, if possible more the interest of the South than of the North, that this attempt to break up the Union should fail.

I remain, my dear Mr. ——,
Sorrowfully and sincerely yours,
(Signed) EDWARD EVERETT.

Important from France.

The final interview between the Emperor Napoleon and Mr. Faulkner, the American envoy, on the latter taking leave prior to his departure for home, seems to have been the occasion of some very important declarations, which, however, are variously reported. The correspondent of the New York Times says that the Emperor repeated to Mr. Faulkner (on the occasion of the latter's formal parting interview) the language I have already given you several times, as that which his Majesty habitually utters on the question of the contest in the United States. He assured Mr. Faulkner that he was watching the progress of events with the greatest solicitude; that he should be deeply pained to see a disruption of the Union; that he felt as much interest in the progress and prosperity of the American people almost as if they were a part of his own people, and terminated by making an offer of his services in any way they might be made useful to bring about a reunion and an avoidance of bloodshed. M. Thouvenel, Minister of Foreign Affairs, went further, and assured Mr. Sanford that not only did he approve of the course of Mr. Lincoln's administration, but that he would be glad if he could be in some way useful in aiding to put down the rebellion. So, too, the Prince Murat, a member of the Imperial family, begged to know of Mr. Sanford if there was not some way in which the French Government might aid in putting down the rebellion.

NOW AND THEN.—In the year 1859 Jefferson Davis was invited to attend a meeting in Salem, Mass., held to celebrate the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. The following paragraph appears in his letter of reply:

"To make war upon the Government would be suicidal, and cannot be anticipated until madness and venality have usurped the seats of reason and virtue."

THE British Government has decided not to allow the entry of privateers at any of its ports.