

123

Honors dont change the man  
G. B. Cas

## THE VICE-PRESIDENCY.

THE following points in political and personal history are intended for earnest Republicans, who will take part in bringing forward a nominee for the no longer despised office of Vice-President of the United States.

Accepting Ulysses S. Grant as the almost unanimous choice of the Republican party for President, shall his colleague be a New England man, a Middle State man, a Western man, or a Southern Border State man?

From whatever quarter selected, an unblemished record for loyalty and devotion to principle will be inflexibly demanded, in the nominee.

National affairs at the present juncture, and the severe lessons of experience ought to render superfluous a single word in support of these qualities in the candidate. Such is not the fact.

There are those in our ranks having control of Republican Journals who advocate a *waiver* of any such test. This is especially true of Maryland Journalism. The leading one of these declared, February, 8th ult., that "going back into the antecedents of candidates is both impolitic and unfair;" and those who advised such a course were condemned as begetters of "discord in the party."

When it is remembered that the ills under which the Nation now reels, have their essence and origin in that same *policy*, a plea in its behalf now may justly be stigmatized as hardly less than *treason* to the cause. It was just this "impolitic and unfair" plea that overruled the better judgment of the Convention of 1864, and induced it to afflict the country in the person of Andrew Johnson. A repetition of that policy would fairly be char-

acterized as a betrayal of trust and a crime against Republicanism.

The Republican party, speaking through its delegates at Chicago, will demand that the *records* of Vice-Presidential aspirants be submitted, uncomplainingly and unreservedly, to the closest scrutiny and inspection—that they be thoroughly sifted and weighed.

The Convention may not shrink from this task, disagreeable though it be—it is due to themselves and those they represent, and the principles they uphold, that in this matter they receive nothing upon trust—that they *know* the man whom they designate for the office to be one whose public and private life furnishes a guarantee, anterior to the war, that he is a Republican from conviction and not from expediency—that whether he be of Whig or Democratic extraction and antecedents, his public record shall afford ample security that the *virus* of slavery, anti-coercion or secession has never tainted his political life. This, we believe, they will do.

The Convention should, therefore, be possessed of the fullest information touching those who have been, or who may hereafter be, named as candidates.

The leading Republican Journal of Maryland nominates JOHN A. J. CRESWELL, and sets forth his claims in the following words:

“This result (the nomination of Grant) will induce the selection of a candidate for the Vice-Presidency from one of the Atlantic States, of which Maryland may be considered as one, and among the distinguished names from that section that will be presented to the Convention, none will be able to show a clearer record than Mr. Creswell—or one that gives stronger assurance of consistency and reliability in the future, as it has been clear and bright, and undimmed by a single cloud in the past.”

If what is here said be true, we freely concede there could be just cause for neither doubt nor criticism in presenting his name at Chicago. If on the other hand there should prove to be no inconsiderable mixture of error in the above concise statement, then, his nomination might prove fortunate or disastrous—the future alone could determine, which.

## MR. CRESWELL'S POLITICAL RECORD.

Mr. Creswell is a resident of Elkton, Cecil County, Eastern Shore, Maryland. He was first a candidate on the Whig ticket, for the Constitutional Convention of 1851, but was not elected, the county being Democratic.

In 1852 he supported Gen. Scott for the Presidency, and continued to act with the Whig party until 1855, when he attached himself to the Democracy, and was sent a delegate to Cincinnati in 1856, where he advocated the nomination of James Buchanan for the Presidency. He made numerous speeches for "Buck and Breck," and clung to the old "Pub. Func." until the expiration of his official term. He approved, as we shall presently see, Buchanan's views as to the *grievances* of the South, and united with him in opposing *coercion*.

In 1860 his democracy had assumed the pro-slavery type to the extent that, as between Stephen A. Douglass, the regular nominee of his party, and John C. Breckenridge, the candidate of the bolters and secessionists, he supported the latter on the hustings and at the polls.

December 3d, 1860, James Buchanan sent to Congress that Message, remarkable only for its imbecility and the encouragement it gave the secession movement, which contained this language:

"The question fairly stated is: Has the Constitution delegated to Congress the power to coerce a State into submission which is attempting to withdraw, or has actually withdrawn from the Confederacy? After much serious reflection, I have arrived at the conclusion that no such power has been delegated to Congress or to any other department of the Federal Government."

What was all this but transparent sophistry and a premium offered to rebellion! The real question being: Has any State a reserved, inherent power to *coerce* the Union into acquiescence in the overthrow of the Federal Constitution, the subversion of the laws and the destruction of our Nationality?

December 18th, Henry Winter Davis offered a resolution in the "Committee of Thirty-three," which was adopted unanimously, and incorporated in the "Corwin Compromise." This resolution requested the several States to revise their statutes, and if any

such were found to be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, that they "be forthwith repealed, as required by a just sense of constitutional obligation, and by a due regard for the peace of the Republic."

December 19th, Andrew Johnson *began* a speech in the United States Senate, in which he maintained the authority and duty of the Government to *coerce* the *people* of the seceding States.

December 20th, South Carolina passed her ordinance of secession.

January 9th, 1861, the gage of battle was offered. The "Star of the West," laden with provisions for the suffering garrison at Fort Sumter, while steaming up the harbor, was fired upon from Fort Moultrie and from a battery on Morris Island, and being struck by a shot was forced to put about. On the same day Mississippi passed her ordinance of secession. Florida followed suit, January 10th; Alabama, January 11th; Georgia, January 18th; Louisiana, January, 26th; Texas, February 1st.

A sovereign Convention of the above States met at Montgomery, Alabama, February 4th, and on the 9th of the same month the "Provisional Government of the Confederate States of America" was adopted, with Jeff. Davis and Alex. H. Stephens, as President and Vice-President.

The *innocent by-play* of the seceded States between the 3d December, 1860, and the 7th February, 1861, is thus recounted by Henry Winter Davis, in his speech in Congress on the date last named :

"We must not coerce a State engaged in the peaceful process of firing into  
 "a United States vessel to prevent the reinforcement of a United States fort!  
 "We must not coerce States, which without any declaration of war, or any  
 "act of hostility of any kind, have united, as have Mississippi, Florida and  
 "Louisiana, their joint forces to seize a public fortress! We must not coerce  
 "a State which has planted cannon upon its shores to prevent the free navigation  
 "of the Mississippi! We must not coerce a State which has robbed  
 "the United States Treasury!

"I say that the Constitution of the United States, and the laws made in  
 "pursuance thereof, must be enforced, and they who stand across the path of  
 "that enforcement must either destroy the power of the United States or it  
 "will destroy them."

These words from Maryland's most gifted son, drew applause from every Union man who heard them, and woke an echo in patriot hearts throughout the land. There was one spot in Ma-

ryland where these utterances were received with marked demonstrations of distaste and condemnation. It was at Elkton, the home of Mr. Creswell.

On the 13th February, an *Anti-coercion* meeting of the citizens of Cecil county was held at the Court House in Elkton. A Committee on Resolutions was appointed, with Mr. Creswell at its head. During the absence of the committee the meeting was addressed by Otho Scott—"taking strong ground in favor of Southern rights, and proclaiming the State of Maryland as Southern in all her interests and feelings."

The Committee on Resolutions, through John A. J. Creswell, reported a Preamble and fourteen Resolutions. The Preamble recites:

"Assembled in County meeting, We, the people of Cecil County, who are favorable to the Constitutional Union of the States—regarding the present distracted condition of the country, as the natural though bitter fruit of the triumph of a sectional party, which despite the warning of the 'Father of his Country'—has arrayed the Fanaticism and Bigotry of the North against the domestic institutions of the South, thereby alarming the people and inducing the belief that their lives and property are seriously imperiled."

"Resolved (9.) That we most solemnly protest against any attempt at COERCION, believing that such an attempt would precipitate us into civil war, with all its untold horrors; would render nugatory all efforts for a satisfactory adjustment, and would certainly cause a permanent and bloody dissolution of the Union.

"Resolved (13.) That while we feel the most devoted attachment to the Union of these States as the source of security, &c., we feel bound also to declare that if the North shall persistently deny to us the Constitutional rights which we claim, and thereby occasion an entire disruption of our Union, then we are bound by every obligation to our honor and dignity as well as to our interests, to cast our lot with our brethren of the Southern Border States."

The 14th Resolution was devoted to *abuse* of Henry Winter Davis, for his patriotic sentiments of the 7th February, and is thus described by Mr. Creswell in his "oration" of February 22, 1866:

"His (Mr. Davis') language was then deemed too harsh and unconciliatory, and hundreds, I among the number, denounced him in UNMEASURED TERMS."

On the 19th February, 1868, Philip F. Thomas, holding a commission from the Legislature and Governor of the State of Maryland, was refused admission to a seat in the United States Senate, because on the 11th January, 1861, he had resigned the

position of Secretary of the Treasury on account of his opposition to *coercion*.

Will any casuist point out the moral distinction between Mr. Thomas' *resignation* on the 11th June, '61, on account of his opposition to *coercion*, and Mr. Creswell's SOLEMN PROTEST against the *same thing* more than a month later?

It is not to be wondered at therefore, that Mr. Creswell should forsake his retirement at Elkton, proceed to Washington, and there press Republican Senators to vote *for* the admission of Mr. Thomas. In so doing, he was but *vindicating* himself.

Whether Mr. Creswell knew any of the antecedent facts of history heretofore recited—such as the firing upon the Star of the West, the secession of seven States, and the adoption of the Confederate Government—on the 13th February, 1861, does not appear from anything contained in the above Resolutions. In charity, we may conclude, that there was some irregularity in the mail service to Elkton between the above historic dates and that last mentioned.

APRIL 19th was rendered doubly memorable by the attack of a rebel mob upon the Massachusetts 6th Regiment, in the streets of Baltimore. Mr. Creswell was at the same period in command of a militia company in Elkton, and volunteered the declaration that "sooner than use his command in enforcing the doctrine of *coercion* he would resign his commission."

The first "Union State Convention" of Maryland was held in Baltimore, May 24, 1861. Most of the counties were represented by mass delegations. Eighteen delegates were present from Cecil—Mr. Creswell was not of the number; a circumstance from which the inference may be drawn, that the odor of anti-coercion was somewhat offensive to Union olfactories, when the list of delegates was made out.

A special election, to fill a vacancy in the Legislature was held in Cecil county, May 29, 1861, which resulted in the success of the Union candidate (Mr. McIntyre) by a majority of over 2,000 votes. From that point of time we hear of no more "protests" against coercion from Mr. Creswell. Thenceforward, he is a coercionist with a *proviso*—that the war be constitutionally waged, without interference with the "*domestic institution*."

Being now looked upon somewhat in the light of a *convert*—“a brand saved,” &c.—there were those who urged the *policy*, that his name upon the Legislative ticket in November would seal him to the Union cause, and would confirm to the wavering and the halting that a welcome and a place was open to them in the Union fold. Mr. Creswell was, accordingly elected to a seat in the House of Delegates for the session of '61-2.

A United States Senator was to be chosen. The candidates were Henry Winter Davis, William Price and Reverdy Johnson—the advanced position of each, respecting Unionism and the support of war measures, being in the order in which they are respectively named above. The balloting was protracted, eventuating in the success of Mr. Johnson.

Through it all, the weak-kneed Unionist constantly gravitated to the weak-kneed candidate—Mr. Creswell being ever by the side of Mr. Johnson.

If then, the genius and eloquence and statesmanship of Henry Winter Davis were not permitted to honor his State in the United States Senate, nor his culture and dignity and manly presence to adorn the Senate House, without any borrowed lustre from departed greatness, Mr. Creswell may not hold himself blameless in the matter. Indeed, his aversion to the man seems to have extended to every proposition or measure emanating from that high source. A “bill” defining and punishing *treason* against the State, drawn by Mr. Davis, came before the Legislature—Mr. Creswell recorded his vote *against* it.

March 10th, 1862, a series of Resolutions was adopted. The 3d and 4th were as follows :

“ 3. Resolved, That the State of Maryland will cheerfully contribute her proportion of men and means to sustain the Nation in its struggle for existence, so long as the war is conducted in accordance with the principles of the Constitution, and so long as the purpose of those in power is the maintenance of the Union, with the rights guaranteed to the States unimpaired.

“ 4. Resolved, That the loyalty of the people of Maryland to the General Government, established by the Constitution, is untouched by any shade of servility, and they must ever regard with extreme jealousy all attempts, from whatever quarter, to make the present war for the restoration of the Union, the means of interfering with the DOMESTIC INSTITUTIONS of the States ”

Conservative and rose-waterish as were these resolutions, Mr. Creswell could not vote for them, without first trying by an *amendment* to dilute them still further.

On the 18th of February, 1862, a vote was taken upon the following, offered by Benjamin G. Harris, of St. Mary's, the man who afterwards represented his district in Congress, and proclaimed his rebel sympathies in the face of the Nation :

"Whereas, A bill was, on the 13th instant, reported to the Senate of the United States, for the *release of certain persons held to service and labor in the District of Columbia*; Therefore,

"It is unanimously resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That this General Assembly witnesses with *great regret the efforts which are now making for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia*. The agitation of the subject is calculated to *disturb the relation of master and slave within this State*; and the success of the agitators in this scheme would strike a serious blow at the interest of the people of Maryland, and impress them with the belief that the Congress of the United States have not a *due regard for their rights, institutions and feelings*."

The "Journal of the House" shows that in whatever other respects the delegate from disloyal St. Mary's differed with the delegate from loyal Cecil, here, at least, was common ground, on which they could stand; and they are recorded, side by side, among the "AYES" on this proposition of Benjamin G. Harris.

#### MR. CRESWELL'S OPPOSITION TO EMANCIPATION.

Early in the Spring of 1863, the subject of Emancipation in Maryland began to be discussed among the earnest supporters of the Government. Repeated conferences were held in Baltimore. Two years of slaveholding Rebellion, and the support which it was deriving from the "domestic institution," it was thought ought to suffice for educating the people up to the point that Emancipation was both just and necessary.

The first Emancipation Convention ever held in Maryland convened at Baltimore, June 16, 1863. The delegates from Cecil county were Hamilton Morton, J. T. McCullough, David Scott and Barclay Reynolds. The Convention unanimously adopted a *platform*—it was brief, and to the point:

"1st. A hearty support of the whole policy of the Administration.

"2d. That the policy of Emancipation ought to be inaugurated in Maryland."

On the 23d of June, 1863, an Anti-Emancipation Convention assembled in Baltimore. Two delegations were present from Cecil county. The one recognized in the organization of the body was headed by George R. Howard, who was chosen one of the

Vice-Presidents. The contestants were John A. J. Creswell, Jacob Tome, T. P. Jones and A. McIntyre. At the afternoon session, the Committee on Credentials reported in favor of the Contestants, and they were promptly admitted to seats. Mr. Creswell took an active part in the proceedings, served upon committees, was appointed one of its State Committee, (Thomas Swann, Chairman,) and approved its *platform*. Its opposition to Emancipation was couched in these terms:

"This Convention *ignores all issues. Local or National*, but those of war, until treason shall succumb before the majesty of an offended people."

August 11th, 1863, Hon. John W. Crisfield was re-nominated for Congress. Those who adhered to the Platform of 16th June were dissatisfied with Mr. Crisfield on account of his opposition to Emancipation. Another Convention was, therefore, called at Denton. Mr. Creswell disapproved this move, and made no secret in declaring that "Mr. Crisfield had been regularly nominated by the Union party, and ought to, and he hoped would, receive the undivided support of the Union men of the District."

The Denton Convention nominated W. J. Jones, of Cecil, to oppose Mr. Crisfield. Mr. Jones, by letter dated September 24, declined the nomination. The time being very limited in which to make a canvas, it was deemed advisable to dispense with a Convention in bringing forward another candidate. It was here suggested that as Mr. Creswell had "experienced a change" upon the Emancipation question, had good *physique*, and had grown not a little in Union grace since the Spring of '61, and the Winter of '62, and the Summer of '63, he would make an available Fall candidate.

#### MR. CRESWELL SUPPORTS EMANCIPATION.

A *call*, dated Salisbury, Somerset County, October 2d, signed by a few citizens from sundry points in the Congressional District, solicited the use of his name. Mr. Creswell accepted, by letter dated Elkton, Cecil County, October 3d; the correspondence first appearing in the "Baltimore American" of Monday, October 5. When confronted by Mr. Crisfield with the *inconsistencies* of his record, he frankly confessed its *incongruities*, and plead the righteousness of his *present cause*; in other words, that he was not the

Creswell of former years—no, not even the Creswell of former months. Aided by the masterly eloquence of Winter Davis, and the still more cogent logic, practically enforced, that the ballot was meant for loyal men, Mr. Creswell was accredited a Representative in Congress from the 1st District.

Leaning upon the strong arm of him to whom he owed so much, and from whom so little had been due, he passed through the 38th Congress, gathering few laurels, and distinguishable more by the radiance which he borrowed as the associate of his illustrious colleague than by any coruscations struck from his own intellect.

The *free* Constitution of Maryland having been adopted in the Summer of 1864, under its provisions an election for members of Congress came off in November following. Mr. Creswell suffered *defeat* by over 3000 votes.

The ensuing winter a vacancy was created in the United States Senate by the death of Thomas H. Hicks. By a statute of the State, one of the Senators was required to be an inhabitant of the Eastern shore. Governor Hicks having been a resident of that shore, Mr. Creswell was geographically in the line of promotion, then as *now*. He succeeded in being returned for the unexpired term of two years.

#### MR. CRESWELL OPPOSES MANHOOD SUFFRAGE.

July 4th, 1865, Henry Winter Davis delivered an oration at Chicago. "Agate," of the "Cincinnati Gazette," in speaking of it, said :

"When public men were standing aghast at the image of *negro suffrage*, and not another Southern man could be found to lisp a syllable in its favor, he electrified the Nation by his masterly plea at Chicago for the "ballot for all men."

February 22d, 1866, Mr. Creswell delivered an oration, in which he thus recites history and proclaims his future purpose :

"In January, 1861, the ensign of the Republic, while covering a mission of mercy, was fired on by traitors.

"In February, Jefferson Davis said at Stevenson, Alabama, 'We will carry war,' &c.

"The long patient North, slow to anger," &c. (Referring to Sumter.)

"We resolved to break that last tie, (slavery in Maryland,) and to take position unalterably on the side of the Union and freedom, and thus to deal the final blow to the cause and support of rebellion.

" We organized our little band, almost ridiculous from its want of numbers, *early in 1863.*

" A Sibley tent would have held *our* whole army.

" *Our* enemies laughed us to scorn, and the politicians would not accept *our* help on any terms.

" Lost to me is the strong arm whereon I have so often leaned; but in that path which in time past we trod most joyfully together, I shall continue, as God shall give me to see my duty, with unflinching though perhaps with unskilful steps, right onward to the end."

The dates of historic incident thus recounted, and the proper or improper connection with them of the "*we's*" and the "*our's*," where they occur, the reader can compare with the preceding facts, and draw therefrom his own conclusions. Of the continuance "*right onward,*" in the path which had been marked out for him at Chicago, we shall now see.

March 8th, 1866, in the United States Senate, Henry Wilson, speaking upon the proposed Constitutional Amendment regulating the basis of representation said:

" I believe if this amendment were placed in the Constitution, it would bring suffrage to the black men of the country within five years; I entertain not the shadow of a doubt about it."

Senator Fessenden said, speaking upon the same subject:

" If this is done, we might hope in a few years to see all men placed upon the same broad constitutional level, enjoying the same rights."

It was this "*hope,*" as expressed by Mr. Fessenden, which finally carried that proposition through the Senate. It was believed to be the only feasible means of attaining impartial suffrage within a reasonable time. But for this expectation, the measure would not have received a single Republican vote—unless, perhaps, it were Mr. Creswell's.

While the proposition was pending before the Senate, a vote was taken, March 9th, on a substitute offered by Mr. Sumner, to the effect that—

" No State, in prescribing the qualifications requisite for electors therein, shall discriminate against any person on account of color or race."

Mr. Creswell voted *NAY* upon it.

On the same day a vote was taken upon an *amendment* offered by Senator Yates, which provided that:

" Hereafter, all citizens, without distinction of race, color or previous condition of slavery, shall be protected in the full and equal enjoyment

"and exercise of all their civil and political rights, *including the right of suffrage.*"

Mr. Creswell voted *against* this amendment also.

We have already anticipated that it may be urged, "Mr. Creswell was not alone on the Republican side in his opposition to the above." We answer still further, that the Republican Senators who voted as did Mr. Creswell, did not disguise that they were influenced in so doing by the reasons assigned by Senators Wilson and Fessenden; that they greatly preferred the proposed amendment of either Mr. Sumner or Mr. Yates, but believing that either of these would surely be rejected by the States, they accepted the amendment of the committee. This, however, was not Mr. Creswell's *reason*, as we shall presently see.

April 25, 1866, the admission of Colorado as a State was before the Senate. Her Constitution had not only the "white suffrage" clause, but required a *two-thirds* vote of the Legislature to alter or amend the same.

Senators Edmunds, Sumner and others opposed her admission with these clauses in her fundamental law.

Mr. Creswell said:

"He had not in his mind any of those difficulties which the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Vermont had presented."

June 6th, 1866, a Republican State Convention was held in Baltimore. The following was adopted:

"Resolved, That we are pledged to the maintenance of the present Constitution of Maryland, *which expressly and emphatically prohibits both Rebel suffrage and Negro suffrage*; and we are equally determined to uphold the "Registry law, *which disfranchises Rebels and excludes Negroes from voting, and have no desire or intention of rescinding or abolishing either the Constitution or the Registry law.*"

Mr. Creswell addressed the Convention, and heartily endorsed the resolutions which had been adopted.

August 15, 1866, a Republican Convention met for the nomination of State candidates. Among the resolutions adopted was the following:

"Resolved, That *we are not in favor of extending the elective franchise to any class of persons now excluded from the same by the Constitution of Maryland.*"

Mr. Creswell cordially approved the above resolution.

September 3d, 1866, the Philadelphia Loyalist Convention met. The second day of the session, Judge Bond, of Maryland, introduced this resolution :

"That in our opinion there can be no *permanent peace or security for loyal men of the South, without a return to Negro suffrage.*"

Mr. Creswell pronounced the resolution a fire-brand ; its author, he said, stood alone in the delegation, misrepresented the loyal men of his own State, and concluded by offering the following, as containing his own views and those of his colleagues :

"That the Union party of the Southern States accepts, in all its length and breadth, the political platform offered to the Nation in the Amendment to the Constitution by our late wise and patriotic Congress, and are *OPPOSED to any additional requirements for the immediate admission of the late rebellious States.*"

October 24th, 1866, a Republican Mass Meeting was held at Frederick, Md. Mr. Creswell was one of the speakers at the same. In the course of his remarks he said :

"In relation to the Constitutional Amendment proposed by Congress, and now before the people for their ratification or rejection, the other side say *it was devised to compel the people to let Negroes vote in Maryland.* There *is only one way to meet this allegation, and that is to pronounce it a lie.*"

#### MR. CRESWELL'S DIFFICULTIES REMOVED.

November 7th, 1866, a Legislature was elected entrusted with the selection of Mr. Creswell's successor. Like Jonah's gourd, Mr. Creswell's hopes for a return to the Senate were withered in a night, and the morning of the succeeding day found him ready to support not only Judge Bond's resolution, but any number of additional requirements.

February 20th, 1867, the Reconstruction Act passed in the United States Senate. It extended Negro suffrage and Military supervision over all the States lately in rebellion.

Mr. Creswell, notwithstanding his repugnance to Negro suffrage in Maryland, as evinced on the 6th of June and 15th of August preceding, and his opposition to "additional requirements from the late rebellious States," on the 4th September, at Philadelphia, found no difficulty in voting YEA on the passage of the Reconstruction bill.

May 15, 1867, a State Convention was held at Broadway Hall, Baltimore, composed of delegates "without regard to past political

differences, race or color." Mr. Creswell was chosen its chairman. In his address to the body, he said:

"We demand the early passage of the *Sumner bill*. *Will Congress shrink from its duty?* I trow not. We do not claim the ballot for the black man merely because he will vote with us. We stand on no such narrow platform. But *assured by a retrospect of the last five years*, believing that "we have been right in our efforts to preserve the liberties of our country and *to give suffrage and all the other rights of citizenship to colored men.*"

Among the resolutions unanimously adopted were these:

"Resolved by the Republicans of Maryland assembled in Convention, "That we reaffirm our demand heretofore made, for the recognition by law "over all the country, of the *entire equality of all American citizens* in all "civil and *political rights, without regard to color.*

"Resolved, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to *carry out the principles of the Declaration of Independence*, and the power given "by the Constitution and its recent amendments, *to abolish all legal distinctions on account of color, and to give the suffrage to the colored classes of this "and all the States by the passage of the Sumner-Wilson bill at the earliest "practicable moment.*"

They also called a Border State Convention "to advance the cause of *Manhood suffrage*, and to demand of Congress the *passage of the Sumner-Wilson bill.*"

September 12th, 1867, the Border State Convention assembled in Baltimore. Mr. Creswell was Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions. He also addressed the Convention as follows:

"The loyal men of Maryland are as true to-day as ever. They, and all "classes, have said they will march side by side, *black and white*, and *re-* "deem their Country. *Thirty thousand blacks stand ready in Maryland to "cast the ballot. Shall we trust them? We no longer doubt them. Ten-* "nessee and the District of Columbia have settled that question forever. "We ask that *Congress shall secure to every one of our citizens the right of "suffrage. I do not doubt myself as to the power of Congress over that "entire question. I believe it settled by the 15th Amendment. I believe it "was previously incorporated in another provision guaranteeing to all the "States a republican form of government. But a man may ask me if I would "vote alongside of the Negro? I say, why I only ask this Congress of the "United States to give me a chance to do that very thing.*"

#### MR. CRESWELL AGAINST NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

A Republican State Convention has been called to appoint delegates to the National Convention. Mr. Creswell is a candidate both *for Chicago and at Chicago*. In the meetings to choose delegates for the State Convention, he is *against* any participation of the 30,000 *blacks*. The movement for their *exclusion now*, has already awakened their suspicions as to the sincerity of the

Republican leaders in Maryland. The Republican voters of Maryland are about *one-fifth* of the white voting population of the State. Her vote in the Electoral College may, consequently, be counted "*out*" as against Grant and whomsoever may be associated with him on the ticket. There are, however, a few *modest* Republicans here, who think this *the* State, and Creswell *the* man entitled to appropriate the Vice-Presidency, all to themselves.

Of Mr. Creswell the citizen and Mr. Creswell the exponent of Republicanism at home and abroad, we have naught to say. It is with *Mr. Creswell the candidate* for the *Vice-Presidency* at Chicago that we now have to do. And we submit that the record herein set down does not exhibit that laudable consistency, that profound conviction of the right, that steadfastness of purpose, that reckless devotion to principle which have been claimed for him, and which is demanded just now for the place.

The "New York Evening Post" said of Henry Winter Davis: "With his abilities and fair opportunity, any position in the Union was possible to him, and he could, without *impertinence*, aspire to the highest." In the face of this record, can as *much* be said of Mr. Creswell in his *aspirations* for the Vice-Presidency?

---

MR. CRESWELL'S RECORD, CHRONOLOGICALLY STATED.

- In November, 1852—An Old Line Whig.  
 " 1856—A Buchanan Democrat.  
 " 1860—A Breckenridge Democrat.  
 February, 1861—An Anti-Coercion Democrat.  
 April 1861—Still opposed to Coercion.  
 November, 1861—A Coercionist with a proviso.  
 January, 1862—Votes for Reverdy Johnson for U. S. Senator, over Winter Davis.  
 March, 1862—For the War, provided it does not touch "Slavery."  
 February, 1862—Protests against the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.  
 June, 1863—Contests a seat in an Anti-Emancipation Convention.  
 " 1863—Wants to ignore Emancipation until after the War.  
 August, 1863—Maintains the *regularity* of Mr. Crisfield's nomination.  
 October, 1863—Becomes a candidate in *opposition* to Mr. Crisfield.

- November, 1863—Is elected to Congress as an Emancipationist.  
“ 1864—Is *defeated* for Congress by 3,000 majority.
- March, 1865—Is elected to fill an unexpired term in the U. S. Senate.
- February, 1866—Means to follow “right onward” in a certain path.  
“ 1866—Votes against Sumner’s amendment for *equal suffrage*.  
“ 1866—Votes against Yates’ “ “ “
- April, 1866—Supports “white suffrage” in Colorado.
- June, 1866—Is equally opposed to Negro and Rebel Suffrage.
- August, 1866—Is opposed to extending *suffrage* in Maryland.
- September, 1866—Denounces Judge Bond for maintaining “Negro Suffrage” in the South.  
“ 1866—Is opposed to any *additional requirements* for the *immediate admission* of the late rebellious States.
- October, 1866—Pronounces a certain statement “a lie.”
- January, 1867—Is *defeated* for re-election to U. S. Senate—slightly veers, thereafter, in his course.
- February, 1867—Votes for Reconstruction, *with additional requirements*.  
“ 1867—Supports *Negro Suffrage* in all the late rebellious States.
- May, 1867—Finds, by a *retrospect*, that he has been in favor of negro suffrage for *five years* past.  
“ 1867—Calls on Congress to carry out the principles of the Declaration of Independence.  
“ 1867—Must have Sumner-Wilson bill at the earliest moment.  
“ 1867—Calls Border State Convention to advance the cause of “manhood suffrage.”  
“ 1867—Desires Border State Convention to unite in the demand for the Sumner-Wilson bill.
- September, 1867—Is *longing* for a chance “to vote alongside of the negro.”  
“ 1867—Believes Congress has, by the 13th Amendment *full power* to make suffrage universal over the country.  
“ 1867—Believes the *power* also exists in the Republican guarantee clause of the Constitution
- January, 1868—Is a Vice-Presidential candidate in expectancy.
- February, 1868—Is opposed to the “30,000 blacks” having a hand in making the nomination for Vice-President.
- March, 1868—Is opposed to making a *platform* at Chicago—thinks the *record* of the candidates (himself being one) the best guarantee the country could have of a *consistent* support of Republican principles, for the next four years.