of Mr. Crisfield, is not one of my sympathizers. I believe that if compelled to choose between me and my opponent, Mr. Crisfield will certainly receive his support. The severity of Mr. Crisfield's strictures on these resolution has, therefore, no application to me. As late as the 4th March, 1861, you will remember that the President himself said to the disaffected, "The Government will not assail you."

He was then for non-coercion, and if the doctrine were so shocking on the 14th February, 1861, it must have been much more so, when it appeared in the President's Inaugural. But carried away by his petulent temper, excited evidently by my assurance in looking into his record, to which he points so triumphantly, as the "index and the pledge" of his future conduct, he caps the climax of his folly, by arraigning me as responsible for the bloody murders committed in the streets of Baltimore on the 19th April, 1861. Not content with styling me a Revolutionist, an Abolitionist, and a Red Republican, he now piles Ossa on Pelon, by informing me that I am a murderer as well as a traitor; and yet he would be "especially greived if he should be understood as reflecting on Col. Creswell's personal character." What hypocrisy! Having thus shown that the treasonable utterances tributed to me by Mr. Crisfield were the sins of other persons, I humbly beg of Mr. Crisfield that he will permit me to remain outside of Fort Warren, at least until after the election. Lucky am I that Mr. Crisfield is neither Judge or turnkey.

These resolutions, discussed already too much at length, were presented and passed upon more than two years and a half ago. No man in Cecil county has ever, to my knowledge, ventured to cite them against me in support of an effort to impeach my loyalty. Mr. Crisfield has stooped to do what the meanest Secessionist in Cecil county would not attempt. From the day of the meeting in Cecil, on 14th February, 1861 I was ranked among Union men. Shortly thereafter I spoke to a large assemblage at Elkton in relation to public matters, and when the County Convention assembled to nominate a Union ticket in 1861, I was chosen a candidate at the ensuing election. I received the largest vote ever polled for any man in that county, to wit: 3,084 votes, and was elected by over 2,000 majority. No one then doubted my loyalty.—I was considered quite loyal enough to serve Cecil county as one of her delegates in the Legislature. The people of Cecil know fully as well as Mr. Crisfield of what stuff Union men are made. So strong an endorsement by my native county, in my opinion, renders my claims to loyalty so clear that I can safely defy all the invective and vituperation of Mr. Crisfield.

But Mr. Crisfield says I attended the Baltimore Convention of the 23d June last, and adopted the resolutions then passed. I did attend that Convention as a delegate from Cecil county, for the avowed purpose of bringing about a reconcilement of differences existing among the Union men of the State; and every gentleman who witnessed my unwearied efforts to promote that desirable object, will bear witness to the fidelity with which I struggled to discharge my duty. It was I who moved to receive the proposition of the Committee of Confernece appointed by the Convention of the 16th June. It was I who introduced a resolution advocating an adjournment *sinie die* with the understanding that the Central Committee of the State should call another State Convention, in which all Union men could participate. It was I who advocated an adjournment until the morning of 24the June, to give the members time for consultation. All efforts provided abortive.

The Convention of the 23d refused to accede to the overtures of the Convention of the 16th. Finding the division inevitable, I at once determined to take position with the Emancipationists; and, thereupon, I objected to the making of Mr. Maffit's nomination unanimous, because I could not consistently support him. In all these proceedings I was sustained by the entire Cecil delegation. But the Convention of the 23d, though convened in the interest of slavery, and with intent to oppose the movement then about to be inaugurated for Emancipation, was yet driven by the force of public sentiment to add to the resolutions offered in committee by Mr. Mayer another, which became the 5th of the series, and in these words:

Resolved, That in the judgmen of this Convention the Legislature of this State, in conformity with the provisions of the Constituton, at its next session make promopt provision for submitting to the people the question of a call for a Constitutional Convention, and for the assembling of said Convention.

It is true that a large minority voted against this resolution, yet it was passed by a majority vote, and became part of the platform of the Convention.

The large minority vote was given because that resolution was considered to be favorable to the cause of Emancipation, and the first essential step in that direction. And yet Mr. Crisfield, with a degree of unfairness that no man less scrupulous could tolerate, cites the concluding clause of the fourth resolution to prove that it was the intention of that Convention "to ignore the agitation of the slavery question for the present." This fifth resolution was staring him in the face, and yet having eyes he saw not.

Mr. Crisfield has never yet adopted the platform of that Convention. He cannot swallow the fifth resolution, and yet he has assurance to charge me with not supporting it.

Without my knowledge or consent I was appointed a member of the State Central Committee of the 23d of June Convention. I never attended the meetings of that Committee, and never assumed to act under my appointment.—But I long since authorized a member thereof to present my declination to its chairman, and recently, when a series of meetings were called in Cecil, and a friend in my absence appended my name to the notices thereof as a member of that committee, I, as soon as I returned home, directed my name to be erased, upon the ground that I did not desire to assume a character which did not rightfully belong to me.

In a spirit of like illiberality and unfairness, Mr. Crisfield cited my votes on sundry resolutions passed by the last Legislature of Maryland, with an intent that cannot be mistaken.

In quoting Mr. Donaldson's resolutions he leaves out the only one of the series in which I was particularly interested or concerned. I mean the resolution endorsing the course and policy of the President. In the series offered by Mr. D. there was no distinct approval of the President. My resolution was added, and in that form the series was passed. Mr. Crisfield also thus quotes the resolution of Mr. Harris, of St. Mary's, and misrepresents my action thereon. The journal of the House of Delegates, 1861–'62, page 478, will show that on the same day the Harris Resolution passed, by a unanimous vote of 55, I submitted a message to be sent to the Senate asking for its return to the House for further consideration. A motion to lay the message on the table was carried by 27 to 24, my vote being cast in the negative. On reflection, I deemed the resolution objectionable, because it seemed to contain a covert threat against the Government of the United States.—In the Senate the resolution was amended by striking out the words "the Government of the United States," and substituting "the Congress of the United States," and in that shape was finally passed.

In regard to those votes, I have only to say that at that time the Emancipation movement had not commenced in Maryland; a very few, if any, of our citizens had taken ground in favor of it. The slavery interest had complete control of our State Legislature. I said at Elkton, and I repeat:

"In years gone by there was a power here that ruled us with a rod of iron. I was under the influence of it, I admit, and so were you.—We never dared even to dispute its supremacy. Slavery was not then a question of political economy—it was a question of political power, and we all, cowards that we were, shrunk before it. That day has passed in Maryland."

The mighty import of recent transactions has organized an Emancipation party in Maryland with a celerity hitherto unknown in politics.—The minds of men move quickly amidst the voice of battle, opinions are moulded by the victories or defeats of armies. The days in which we live are crowded with events destined to leave an impress upon coming centuries. The prejudice of a lifetime are riven by the experience of an hour.

It is not then what was said or done two years ago concerning the slavery question, that the people care to hear. They seek to know our opinions now. They are struggling to work out a plan of Emancipation, and the question is now propounded for the first time—Are you in favor of it, or opposed to it? Mr. Crisfield says he is opposed to it; I say I am in favor of it. In his effort to discredit me before the people, Mr. Crisfield has resorted to the meanest of expedients by endeavoring to fasten upon my language an interpretation it was never intended to bear.—He cites the following passage from my speech at Elkton:

"The white men of Maryland have been emancipated, *and we dare now say to the world that our proud old State, though bleeding and torn, shall come out of this fearful contest*, like a goddess disenthrallied, with a *crown of freedom* upon her brow. Maryland must *be a free State*."

The *italics* are Mr. Crisfield's. I alluded to the effects of this great war. The "fearful contest" spoken of is the existing war. The war had been frequently referred to before, and every man in that vast assemblage I was addressing perfectly understood my meaning; but read Mr. Crisfield's comments. He says:

"Here is a full-fledged Abolitionist. Maryland must be a Free State, though it cost her civil war; though she may bleed at every pore; though her society shall be convulsed and torn. She shall come out of this fearful *contest* with a crown of freedom on her brow! Wendell Phillips never indulged in words of more fearful import."

Such a construction is so forced and unreasonable that it is simply ridiculous. This very war, instituted and waged by the propagandists of slavery, God, in his providence, has turned against them to the utter subversion of their cherished institution, and I here assert, that however our Maryland may suffer in the exhausting struggle now going on between the Government and its foes, yet at least one great good will result from it, viz: the manumission of slaves. To effect that I want no blood shed, no violation of law; the enlightened judgment of the people, purified and chastened by the sufferings of civil war, will settle the question forever.

Mr. Crisfield has mistaken the temper of those to whom he has appealed. He has placed himself in opposition to the wish of the people, and if I mistake not, he will live to regret it. There are many other matters contained in this address of Mr. Crisfield's that I should be glad, if I had the time, to refer to. I have not the space for Constitutional arguments. But I can say here, that no man has a more profound reverence for the Constitution of the United States than I have, and, therefore, I construe it with a view to its preservation, and not so as to aid its enemies in its destruction. When fighting its battles, I would not fetter myself with a load of self-imposed chains. I would vindicate the Constitution by preserving and maintaining the Government it was intended to establish. Mr. Crisfield is in a maze of Constitutional doubts and difficulties. He voted against the Legal Tender Bill, because he believed it was unconstitutional. He voted against the Bank Bill "with very great doubt," although he was "inclined to think favorably" of it. He voted against the "*Habeas Corpus* Bill," because he would not trust the President with the power it conferred; and yet he declares that he was willing "to provide ample indemnity for the President and every officer of the Government down to the humblest," "although in excess or even in error of law," out of the Treasury of the nation.—These votes have been already sufficiently discussed for the people to understand them; and therefore I make no further comments in relation to them.

But, Mr. Crisfield attempts to justify his course on the "act to suppress insurrection, to punish treason and rebellion, to seize and confiscate the property of Rebels, and for other purposes," by citing the authority of the President to prove that it was unconstitutional to forfeit real estate for a longer time than during the lives of the guilty party, and then adds exultingly, "this is Administration policy, and Col. Creswell, on his theory, is thus disloyal, unless he admits it." This statement made by Mr. Crisfield would lead any person who had not investigated the business for himself to suppose that the President vetoed the bill, and so ended the matter. Not so, Congress had passed a joint resolution explanatory of the bill, which, among other things, provided that no punishment or proceedings thereunder should be so construed as to work a forfeiture of the real estate of the offender beyond his natural life, thereby avoiding the Constitutional objections. The President, therefore, considering the bill and joint resolution explanatory of the act at being substantially one, approved and signed both on the 17th July, 1862. Then the bill and joint resolution as passed declared the policy of the President and Congress. Did Mr. Crisfield favor the measure, even as amended by the joint resolution? Let us see. By turning to the Congressional Globe, second session, 37th Congress, page 3,400 we find that, pending a motion to proceed to the business on the Speaker's table, a motion to adjourn was made, on which Mr. Crisfield voted yea. The yeas and nays were then called on the original motion to proceed to business, &c., and Mr. Crisfield voted nay; another motion was made to adjourn, and Mr. Crisfield voted yea; but all dilatory motions having failed, the resolution explanatory of the act to suppress insurrection, &c., came up first, with a Senate amendment thereto to relieve the measure from the President's objection.

The question was put on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment, and Mr. Crisfield did not vote at all. No quorum having voted, a call of the House was ordered. On the call of the roll Mr. Crisfield answered to his name, yet, on the vote which immediately followed, his name is not recorded.

It would appear from this that, although Mr. Crisfield boasts that "he is not one of those versatile or week-kneed gentlemen who must look who goes ahead and who follows, before they vote, but always thinks and acts for himself," and "never inquires how Mr. Vallandingham or Mr. anybody else is going to vote," yet this same Mr. Crisfield, with so much independence and capacity to judge for himself, was, on the occasion above referred to, engaged in something very like the game of "dodge." Opposed to this act as amended, of course he was. The law contains a section which says: "That the President of the United States is authorized to employ as many persons of African descent as he may deem necessary and proper for the suppression of this rebellion, and for this purpose he may organize and use them in such manner as he may judge best for the public welfare." The "nigger" was in the act, and he was therefore bound to oppose it. But, again, when the "act to amend the act calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, &c.," came up before the House—on a motion to lay upon the table, Mr. Crisfield voted in favor of the motion.

This is the only vote recorded on the measure, but I think it safe to say that Mr. Crisfield voted against the bill on its final passage; for it had the "nigger" in it also, as you will see by reading section 12, which is in the following words: "That the President be and he is hereby authorized to receive into the service of the United States, for the purpose of constructing intrenchments, or performing camp service, or any other labor, or any military or naval service for which they may be found competent, persons of African descent, and such persons shall be enrolled and organized under such regulations not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws as the President may prescribe." Here are two bills advocating enlistment of *negroes*, both of which Mr. Crisfield opposed. But Mr. Crisfield voted for the law to compel white men to go into the military service of the Government. In his "Address" he says: "I certainly was opposed to the proposition to recruit colored men for the army, for the reason that in my judgment it hindered rather than helped the return of National tranquility;" and in another part of the same, paper he denounced the recent enlistment of slaves "as a violation of all laws and propriety;" and exultingly asserts that the President, as soon as it was brought to his notice, ordered it to be stopped, and thus claims that he is on the side of the President, while I am in opposition. The President, it is true, on the representation of Mr. Crisfield's friends, ordered the suspension of negro enlistments; but he, the President, has ordered them, or will order them to be renewed if the people so desire.

Fellow-citizens, the Government must have more recruits for the army. The Government is willing to accept slaves in lieu of white men, for the quota of Maryland, and the slaves are willing to go. It is for you to say whether the slaves shall be taken, or whether you will be drafted yourselves. Mr. Crisfield is opposed to the enlistment of slaves, and by his vote and his influence, has done all he could to prevent it.

I am in favor of such inlistments. If by so doing, we can relieve our white men from the operations of the draft, why should we not rather consult their interest than that of the slaveholder? You have law for it, as I have shown you, and all that you have to do is to insist upon the execution of the law. Slaves will be paid for according to the assessment of a Commission, to be appointed for that purpose, upon their owners showing their *title* to the *slaves*, and their *unquestionable loyalty*. And all slaves will be credited, I am assured by the best authority, properly to the several counties.

In his review of the Ten Million Bill, for the payment of loyal slaveholders, Mr. Crisfield makes a calculation to show the insufficiency of that amount, although there is no evidence anywhere that he ever attempted to have it increased. He starts out to pay all slaveholders, whether loyal or disloyal; whether in the armies of the United States or in the Rebel army; whether resident here or in "Dixie," and thinks that 5 per sent. bonds will not answer for the purpose, but that the 5 per cent. bonds must be reduced to 6 per cents., and not even satisfied with 6 per cent. bonds, or even legal tender Treasury Notes, he insists that they shall be converted into gold, at 70 per cent. premium, before gentlemen could be expected to sell their negroes. He then shows that there would be left an average of only $56 in gold for each slave, and indignantly exclaims, "This is less than the hire of a single year."

Then it appears that Mr. Crisfield insists that negro owners alone, of all the creditors—other than bondholders of the Government—must be paid in gold. That all the Rebels in arms against the Government who own slaves in Maryland, as well as all other slaveholders in active sympathy with them and giving them aid and comfort, must also be paid in gold; and, finally, that negroes, whether owned by Rebels or loyal men, are not exchangeable unless for gold.

Maryland has, perhaps, 13,000 soldiers in the armies, and several thousand sailors in the fleets of the United States. How would Mr. Crisfield pay them? "With gold?" No! With legal tenders, which, notwithstanding all Mr. Chase's unabated labors to maintain their value in the market, are even now much below gold? No! He would pay them with paper depreciated to the one-fifth its nominal value, and almost useless for practical purposes.

Great God! You must pay a Rebel slaveowner with gold, but the maimed and war-worn veteran you will pay with shinplasters. Will you, fellow-citizens?

Mr. Crisfield says, speaking of the gentlemen who invited me to become a candidate for Congress, and who I, in the innocence of my heart described as eminent for their patriotism:—"When the people of Somerset, Worcester and Dorchester come to look at these 'gentlemen eminent for patriotism,' they will not fail to smile at the Colonel's (my) credulity, and he too, I apprehend, will soon learn that 'he has been sold,' if I may be allowed to use a scant phrase."

Again, Mr. Crisfield says, in a like complimentary spirit: "I have no admiration for that class of patriots, no matter where found; whither they be followers of Vallandigham, or Lovejoy, or Winter Davis, or 'gentlemen eminent for patriotism in the leading counties of the Eastern Shore.' They are unworthy of public confidence; their consistency and firmness are only safe in the absence of temptation. I respect Mr. Vallandigham's talents's" &c. In this one quotation, you will observe, fellow-citizens, that Mr. Crisfield informs me, individually, that I have been "sold," and in the next that all of us jointly and severally, may be "bought."

Now Mr. Crisfield may say what he pelases about Vallandigham (and it seems he alone is complimented—the people of Ohio did not the other day manifest so high an appreciation of him), and Lovejoy. I do not know them and care nothing about them. I do know Mr. Winter Davis, and do not fear but that he can take care of himself. But how unkind the allusion to me and my "Mudsills!" What presumption for non-slaveholders to ake any one to become a candidate for Congress in Maryland! How silly in me to regard the call of the people, unless that call be headed by the Earl of Dorchester, the Marquis of Worcester, and the Duke of Somerset!

Since reading Mr. Crisfield's opinion of the men of "my class," I have made diligent inquiry, and find them quite respectable enough for me, and indeed I might well say, quite as respectable as any of the supporters of Mr. Crisfield. Of such material our armies are made, and such men are hereafter to haye a voice in the management of our affairs. It would have been better for my Lord of Somerset if he had not fired that shot. As sure as the day comes, the "Mudsills" will return a broadside on the 4th of next November.

Fellow-citizens, I do not quarrel with Crisfield for what he has been. If, in his letter of acceptance, he had spoken as directly and clearly as Colonel Webster has done, on the issues of the present day I should never have dreamed of opposing him. But I take issue with him for what he is and because he affirms all his errors. Whilst public opinion advances he stands still. Whatever I may have been I am now an Unconditional Union man, and an Emancipationist. Whatever he has been, his position does not satisfy you now. He asks, "what will he (I) be in the next year? a Red Republican? an Imperialist? and if neither, what? who can tell?" He doubts as to my future. I do not doubt as to his. If you ask me, What will he be in the next year? I answer, a Copperhead. Choose ye between us.

JOHN. A. J. CRESWELL.

War Department,

Provost Marshal General's Office, Washington, D. C., September 14, 1863.

Circular No. 83.

Men whose names were drawn in the draft ordered from the War Department, August 9th, 1862, and who, on the 3d of March, 1863, had substitutes in the service of the United States, are held as exempted from liability to service under the present draft.

JAMES B. FRY,
Provost Marshal General.

sep 19-tf

PAINT and Whitewash Brushes—of all sizes, and good quality; also stove, shoe, horse, scrubbing, dusting, sweeping and window Brushes, just received by

DAWSON & BRO.

oct 24

THE EASTON GAZETTE.

SATURDAY MORNING, - - OCTOBER 31, 1863.

EASTON, MD.

S. M. Pettengill & Co.,
No. 37 Park Row, New York, and 6 State St. Boston.
are our Agents for the GAZETTE, in those cities, and are authorized to take Advertisements and Subscriptsons for us at our *Lowest Rates*.

BUSINESS NOTICES.

Merchants and others advertising by the yea will be charged extra for advertisments out o their regular line of buisness.

Marriages and Deaths inserted at 50 cents each. Obituary notices charged for according to advertising rates, ($1 for 6 lines close matter.)

Unconditional Union Ticket.

For Comptroller of the Treasury,
H. H. Goldsborough.

For Commissioner of Land Office,
Wm. L. W. Seabrook.

For Commissioner of public Works,
L. E. Straughn,
Of Dorchester County.

For Commissioner of Public Works,
Lemuel Roberts.

For Congress—First District,
John W. Crisfield.
Of Somerset County.

For Congress—First District,
John A. J. Creswell,
Of Cecil County.

COUNTY TICKET.

For State Senator,
JOHN W. KEMP.

For Delegates to the General Assembly,
DAVID KERR, Jr.,
JAMES H. McNEAL.

For State's Attorney,
WM. B. CLARK.

For Clerk to the Circuit Court,
SAMUEL T. HOPKINS.

For Register of Wills,
JOHN GOLDSBOROUGH.

For Sheriff,
CHARLES H. MANSFIDLD.

For County Commissioners,
ABNER HALL,
JOHN L. SMITH,
EDWARD Y. DAVIS.

Judges of the Orphans' Court,
THOMAS H. LEONARD,
HENRY P. HOPKINS,
SKINNER GRACE.

For County Surveyor,
CHARLES E. SHANAHAN.

District Tickets.

Easton—District No. 1.

For Justices of the Peace,
A. W. Fountain,
W. H. Shepard,
Edward Woodall.

For Constables,
John H. Baker,
James C. Davis.

For Road Supervervisor,
R. H. Gannon.

St. Michaels—District No. 2.

For Justices of the Peace,
T. H. W. Lambdin,
W. T. Grace,
John W. Dean.

For Constables,
R. K. Murphey,
James H. Wharton.

For Road Supervisor,
Thomas J. Leonard.

Trappe—District No. 3.

Justices of the Peace,
Josiah Higgins,
Peter B. Mullikin.

For Constables,
Samuel A. Summers,
Joseph R. Merrick.

For Supervisor,
Charles Sanders.

Chapel—District No. 4.

For Justices of the Peace,
Wm. J. Thomas
Solomon M. Love,

For Constable
Wm. P. Roe,
Joseph E. Millis,

For Road Supervisor,
Henry Warner,

Bay Hundred—District No. 5.

For Magistrates,
James S. Shanahan,
Robt. T. Harrison.

For Constables,
John W. Baker,
John. Kerper.

For Supervisor,
J. F. L. W. Jones.

NEWS SUMMARY.

The St. Louis *News* of October 22 states that mountain men and others have been predicting one of the coldest winters that we have had for years, from the fact that various animals have been making more than usual preparations for the winter, and adds that it certainly looks that way to-day, with snow five or six inches deep on the ground in St. Louis.

The report of the capture of the 7th Maryland regiment at Thoroughfare Gap is incorrect. It appears that the regiment was surprised by a superior force of Rebels late in the afternoon of Monday last, but that the troops succeeded in sustaining themselves until reinforcements arrived, when they cut their way out, losing two killed five wounded, and a small number missing.

General Grant has issued an order assuming command of the Military Division of the Mississippi, and announcing that *his head quarters will be in the field.*

There are unmistakable indications that our armies are about to assume the offensive, and press a vigorous prosecution of the war. The position gained, and now occupied by them, are such as to afford the means for striking the most telling blows the rebellion has yet received.

Active operations are on foot in the vicinity of Corinth. General Sherman has gone to the front, and the streets of the city are filled with moving troops. Gen, Osterhaus' division, which is in the advance, had had a severe skermish.

The recently reported mutiny among the Tennessee troops in front of Chattanooga proves to have been a very serious affair. It appears that a whole brigade attempted to desert to the Union lines, and in resisting their attempt over eight hundred men on both sides were killed.

In the late Pennsylvania election Gov. Curtain received a majority of 15 325 votes.

Letters from headquarters of the Army of the Potomac state that the enemy continue demonstrations in our front. On Monday the 6th and 9th New York cavalry regiments were attacked by the Rebels with artillery, near Bealton Station, as they were going to relieve other cavalry regiments on picket. A brisk engagement ensued, continuing several houres, and our forces were compelled to fall back upon our infantry line. There were few casulties on either side. The woods are infested with guerillas and robbers, who make it exceedingly hazardous for our men to stray beyond camp limits. General Mead's headquarters are still at Warrenton, and the enemy's camp fires indicate that they are in force beyond the Rappahannock. The work of reconstructing the railroad, which the Rebels destroyed, is being prosecuted vigorously.

☞ In another column we have given space to a communication from an advocate of the cause of Messrs. Crisfield and Maffit. The writer takes us to task for withdrawing our support from Mr. Crisfield and says that in doing this we "do great injustice to the supporters of Messrs. Crisfield and Maffit, as well as to themselves." To this charge we do not plead guilty. If Messrs. Crisfield and Maffit are injured in any particular, the course which they themselves have pursued has done it. Our reason for withdrawing our support from Mr. Crisfield is the same that has caused hundreds of others to support Col. Creswell. As we said in our last issue, Mr. Crisfield was looked to with great anxiety by the straighout Union men of the District, to see whether or not he would define his position upon the new issues which the rebellion has inaugurated, but they were sadly disappointed, and we believe had he not had an opponent (who is making him strain every nerve to carry his election) the people would not yet have known the views which he has only a week or two before the election made public. Had Mr. Crisfield shown a willingness to inform the people that be entertained the views that he has so recently expressed, we doubt whether there would have been such a clamor for an opponent, but as they have apparently been forced from him by competition, they will not carry with them the weight and influence they would otherwise have done. This correspondent also says that Mr. Crisfield agrees with the policy of the Administration in suppressing the rebellion, "but only declines to endorse those measures which he cannot approve." This appears to us to be a singular mode of reasoning. If he opposes it he can not favor it.—Two of the very important points in which Mr. Crisfield differs with the President, are first, while the President thinks the negro had just as well be put into the army and bear the hardships of camp life, shoot rebels and be shot at by rebels, as the white man, Mr. Crisfield is willing to vote the last dollar and the last white man, while the 'gentlemen of color' are to be left behind, to enjoy the peaceful and quiet homes of their 'nabob' masters, who though they have encouraged the rebellion, must not be interrupted only when called upon to pay a few dollars in the way of taxes, and then probably at the expense of the feelings of the collector or assessor.—Secondly, the President recommends gradual emancipation in Maryland, while Mr. Crisfield thinks that this is not the time to meddle with the question, but prefers to wait until after the war, which suits the slave aristocracy precisely, as they think no doubt, that if the question remains undisturbed until that period the institution will revive and they will still continue to lord it over the working class and keep the laboring man bowed in the dust. Mr. Crisfield's friends argue that emancipation has nothing to do with crushing the rebellion and that it is interfering with the question at an unseasonable time, but we are unable to see it. Why does the Rebel Government still claim Maryland after she has spoken several times for the Union and the Rebel army has twice been driven from her soil? Why the State is yet claimed by them because the institution of slavery still remains. Why does not Jeff Davis claim Pennsylvania or Ohio as well as Maryland? The reason is so plain that "the way-faring man cannot err therein." It is because the institution of slavery does not exist there, and neither would they lay further claim to Maryland were she to become a free State. These are stubborn facts and cannot be denied. How Mr. Crisfield would vote upon the speakership, if elected, has also caused deep concern in the minds of the people, and during his speech in the Court House last week, he gave his views upon that question (which will be found in the proceedings,) but on being interrogated, he illustrated his position by saying he would neither vote for Thad. Stevens nor Ben. Wood. This brings up another very important question. Suppose the contest is between two such men—which may be the case—then who would Mr. Crisfield vote for? Would he vote for Stevens, who, though he might somewhat transcend the bounds of propriety on the negro question, would, never-the-less, render every assistance to the Administration in crushing the rebellion, would he vote for Wood, who might be so fearful of violating the Constitution that he would completely tie the hands of the President and thereby give full sway to the rebel army, or would he not vote at all? So far as these questions are concerned Mr. Crisfield's friends are completely in the dark, and yet his position upon that point, as they say, is satisfactory. Those who oppose Mr. Crisfield are also called disorganizers. When they make that charge doubtless it is forgotten that Mr. Crisfield's own friends first showed the spirit of disorganization, for it cannot be denied that had not the Cambridge Convention nominated him his friends would have bolted the decision of that Convention and nominated him at the Convention which they had advertised to take place at Denton, and which convention the Queen Annes delegation was nominated to attend It is true Queen Annes was represented at Cambridge, but it was done by constituting a gentleman, a delegate, who was present from that county who cast the vote of the county. So when the friends of Mr. Crisfield charge those of Col. Creswell with being disorganizers, let them cast their eyes toward their Denton Convention, for we say, "physician heal thyself."

As for Mr. Maffit, though we respect him as an officer and a good citizen, we think his chance is so small, that he will not make the race, between himself and Gen. Goldsborough, tight enough to be interesting, consequently it is useless to feel but little concern about the result of their contest. And it is between these two gentlemen that the sense of the State is to be judged in reference to Emancipation. It is not because the people think that Gen. Goldsborough will make a better officer than Mr. Maffit, but it is because Mr. Maffit stands where Mr. Crisfield does in reference to a State Convention. Mr. Maffit opposes a Convention when an overwhelming majority of the people are crying out for it. The day has passed when a candidate can hold the people to his peculiar notions, the candidate must conform to the wishes of the masses, or they will leap beyond him and make him the follower. We predict that the majority in the State will be overwhelming for Goldsborough and a Convention.

Something Rotten.

As strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless a fact, that when Mr. Crisfield spoke here two years ago, he was denounced and abused by the rebels, and even his old acquantances, who had turned their backs upon their country, passed him by unnoticed and uncared for, for they thought he was opposed to their combined scheme to take the State out of the Union, but, although Mr. Crisfield says he has not swerved a hair's breadth and remains just as he was then, they now think that he is just the man for the times. During his speech here last week he was applauded by them and his doctrine was adopted as their doctrine, they called on him and to show the great regard they always had for a Union man they have all determined to vote for him. Of course they have no other object in view. It is their chief desire to elevate a Union man to a high position. This reminds us of a man hugging another with one arm and stabbing him in the side with the other. There is something rotten. They either expect something from Mr. Crisfield (and for which expectation we understand he gave them no room) as they intend to work a very pretty little game of shuffle. Politically they are not to be trusted. They would betray Union men by their artful and wily manœuvering just as quick as the serpent betrayed mother Eve. They would be very willing to vote for Mr. Crisfield, to them the least of two evils, for the sake of enjoying the privilege of American citizens (which they forfeited in the first word of exultation they uttered over a rebel victory) to secure all the county offices—after having done everything in their power to disorganize and destroy our peace and happiness.—Let every Union man be at the polls and vote the Unconditional Union ticket. Don't stay away because there is nothing but a mere skeleton opposition ticket before the people. The misery and distress which is upon the country now was concocted and schemed in the darkness of the night and in secret, while in the light of day everything looked bright and fair. Let Union men keep their eyes open or a like deception will be practiced upon them on Wednesday next.

MORE NEW GOODS.—We invite the attention of our readers to the advertisements of Messrs. John W. Cheezum, Jas. H. Grace, Loveday & Wright and Jas. D. Mansfield, in this morning's paper. These gentlemen have recently returned from the city with large supplies of Goods, and they ask an examination of their stocks. They are old dealers and they guarantee the satisfaction in the future that they have given in the past.

GREAT MASS MEETING.—The Unconditional Union men of Baltimore held one of the largest and grandest Mass meetings in Monument Square, on Wednesday night last that has been held there for years past. At which the following resolutions were read by Hon. William B. Hill, and adopted by acclamation:

Resolved, by the Unconditional Union men of Baltimore in mass meeting assembled, That the war for the preservation of the Union ought to be prosecuted until the authority of the Government is acknowledged, and its flag waves unassailed over every inch of the national territory.

Resolved, That we support the whole policy of the Administration for the suppression of the Rebellion and for guaranteeing Republican government in the States in Rebellion after the Rebellion is suppressed, and that the members of Congress from this State ought to enter and abide by the administration caucus for Speaker, and give a cordial support to the National Administration.

Resolved, That we hail with joy the result of the election in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and we extend to the suporters of Curtain and Brough the hearty congratulations of the lyoal people of Baltimore.

Resolved, That we are in favor of Emancipation in Maryland by a Constitutional Convention, and that the Convention ought to meet and conclude its labors, that the Constitution may be finally ratified, at least by the next Presidential election.

Resolved, That traitors who do not acknowledge the Government, wose authority protects the ballot box, have no right to meddle with the elections.

[COMMUNICATED]

Eeditor Easton Gazette:—In your remarks last week giving your reasons for withdrawing your support from our present able and faithful Representative in Congress, Mr. Crisfield, who is the regular nominee of the Union party of this District, and giving it to Mr. Creswell, an independent candidate, you do great injustice to the supporters of both Messers Crisfield and Maffit, as well as to those gentlemen themelves. You say, "we find that Mr. Crisfield and Mr. Maffit appear to be supported principally by the same class of persons, viz: *those who declare their opposition to the policy of the administration in suppressing the rebellion.*" Mr. Crisfield, in his speech on Friday, gave, as for as I have heard, unqualified satisfaction to every Union man who is not determined upon a full and entire affiliation with the Republican party. His loyalty is unquestioned and unquestionable, and there was no one to object to his course until after his offical duties were ended. He is not, therefore opposed to "the policy of the administration in crushing the rebellion," but only declines to endorse those measures which he cannot approve.

The platform adopted by the regular Union Convention, which nominated Mr. Maffit, our present Comptroller, and which that gentleman fully endorses, breathes a spirit of the most devoted patriotism, and so far from opposing "the policy of the administration in crushing the rebellion," pledges to the Government a hearty support in the "firm, unflinching, vigorous prosecution of the war." The platform of the self-styled "Unconditional Union party," on the contrary, as reportde in the proceedings of the Convention, say *not one word* in favor of the Union, but is made up of expressions of devotion to the *Administration*, and in favor of Emancipation. [Two additional resolutions re published in the address of the Central Committee, which I cannot find in any report of the proceedings of the Convention.] Its supporters have no alternative but to be absorbed into the Republican party, and to go with that party wherever it may lead.

The friends of the nominees of the regular Union party ask nothing more than that the platforms of the two parties be published side by side. That of Mr. Maffit had the harty support of every Union man in the Border States until a secret League was formed, and threw dissension and discord into the Union ranks by requiring new tests, forcing new issues upon us, and putting forward new candidates, and is the same in principle and policy as that on which the Union men of Kentucky lately fought and won so glorious a victory. Mr. Crisfield stands upon substantially the same ground, and is supported by the same party the regular Union party of Maryland, which is in favor of the Government, but opposed to the *political* policy of the party now in power.

The record of both Messrs. Maffit and Cris-