

Charleston is very much like that of New York, the Cooper river representing the East river and the Ashley river the North river. Its width, from river to river, is not half so great as New York; consequently when once taken it can be easily held by gunboats, stationed on these two rivers, against any land forces that might be brought against it. It can thus be cut off from all communication with the main land, like an island, for all military purposes.

What is termed Charleston Bar is not generally understood by those not familiar with nautical matters. The entrance to Charleston across this bar from the sea may be likened to a funnel, the small portion of the funnel commencing at Fort Sumter and extending to the city. The sides of the large portion of the funnel are formed by Sullivan's Island on the north side and Morris Island on the south side. The Charleston Bar commences four miles to the seaward of Sumter and extends along the whole large end of the imaginary funnel from Sullivan's Island to Morris Island, a distance of fully eight miles. The width of this bar at its widest is fully four miles, the outer limits to Sumter and Morris Island being distant from the entrance to the channel to the eastward over two miles.

The Cooper river joins the Charleston river at a right angle from the north, and the continuation of the latter river, running nearly due east, forms the lower harbor and bay of Charleston, which widens gradually from two to five miles to its mouth, distant about ten miles from the city. On the opposite side of the Cooper river, where it debouches into the harbor, a short mile from the city, is Castle Pinckney, a small work, but mounting some heavy guns. Nearly opposite, on the southern side of the harbor, on James Island, about two miles distant, is Fort Johnson. About four miles from the city, midway between Sullivan's and James Islands, is Fort Sumter, and directly northward of it, on Sullivan's Island, at a distance of two thousand yards, is Fort Moultrie. Between these two forts is the main channel for vessels to approach the city. The principal entrance to the harbor is through Ship Channel, the outer bar of which is distant southeast from Fort Sumter about six miles. Shortly after crossing the bar the enemy's vessels will encounter the fire of the batteries on John's Island, near and parallel to which the channel runs in a westerly direction for two miles. It then makes an angle northward, running for more than a mile directly towards Forts Sumter and Moultrie. After passing the former it turns to the west and passes beneath the fortifications, directly under their guns, and then bends to the southwest, in which direction it approaches Fort Johnson for upward of two miles, while on the right it is under the fire of Castle Pinckney. It is not until the enemy's vessels or passes all these works, and others that will announce themselves at the proper time, that he will be able to occupy Cooper and Ashley rivers and place Charleston at the mercy of the shot and shell of his iron-clads.

San Francisco, 17th.—Peter Conyn, beaten by hackmen last week died this morning from the effect of injuries. James Maguire, George Smith, and Charles Harrier were arrested for the murder. Personal rencontre took place between Geo. Penn Johnson and James O'Sullivan, formerly editor of a Sonora paper, this evening—no arrest made. Luback bark Alma arrived on Tuesday. She reports being spoken by the pirate Florida April 21st near the equator 28 west long. She placed six passengers aboard Alma, taken from the ship Commonwealth when captured. They placed the passengers aboard without payment of fare. Alma saw the Florida twice—two times afterwards. Tuesday night the Alma at San Francisco—her officers and crew were all seized by a gang of pirates and held for ransom.

San Francisco, 17th.—A dispatch received at headquarters 11 A. M. to-day from Rosecrans' Adjutant General says battle still going on without any decisive results.

Cincinnati, 21.—Commercial dispatch has the following account of Saturday's fight: Battle commenced at 11 A. M. in the vicinity of Widow Green's House on road leading to Chattanooga. It soon became general, enemy maneuvering his troops finely. Early in the action the rebels made an impetuous charge on Feltton's and Thomas' batteries and 5 out of the 6 parrot guns were captured. Capt. Van Pelt commanding was taken prisoner. At 2 P. M. the contest became terrific, roll of musketry more continuous and deafening than at Stone River. About 2 P. M. the division in the center being pressed retreated in disorder. Col. Barnett succeeding in planting batteries which soon charged the enemy who were in turn driven over the same ground in disorder. Davis' division fell back with heavy loss, and every gun of the 8th Indiana battery was lost, his forces then rallied, pushed the enemy back and retook his guns.—Reynolds lost heavily but stubbornly held his position driving the enemy but never leaving his line. Palmer who was overwhelmed failed to get off his battery and lost 2 guns. Van Cleve's division fought gallantly but he was overpowered and failed to hold his position. Our line was pressed heavily and wavered. Rebels exulting over their apparent success made the air resound with cheers. They advanced along the whole line when a withering fire of musketry rolled from right to left

The Oregon Argus.

W. L. Adams, Editor.

SALEM:
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1863.

The "Constitution" Explained.

All our readers who have read copperhead papers have noticed that they talk a great deal about the "Constitution." They don't want the rebels hurt, for fear of "violating the Constitution." Whatever Congress does in the way of carrying on the war is a "violation of the Constitution." The legal tender act, an indispensable means of supporting an army, was "unconstitutional." To arrest traitors and spies, is "unconstitutional." When the President suspended the writ of *habeas corpus*, it was a "gross violation of the Constitution," because "Congress only had the power under the Constitution." But when Congress sanctioned the acts of the President, then the copperheads cried out "no violation of the Constitution."

What is the meaning of this? It is to be understood by those not familiar with nautical matters. The entrance to Charleston across this bar from the sea may be likened to a funnel, the small portion of the funnel commencing at Fort Sumter and extending to the city. The sides of the large portion of the funnel are formed by Sullivan's Island on the north side and Morris Island on the south side. The Charleston Bar commences four miles to the seaward of Sumter and extends along the whole large end of the imaginary funnel from Sullivan's Island to Morris Island, a distance of fully eight miles. The width of this bar at its widest is fully four miles, the outer limits to Sumter and Morris Island being distant from the entrance to the channel to the eastward over two miles.

The Cooper river joins the Charleston river at a right angle from the north, and the continuation of the latter river, running nearly due east, forms the lower harbor and bay of Charleston, which widens gradually from two to five miles to its mouth, distant about ten miles from the city. On the opposite side of the Cooper river, where it debouches into the harbor, a short mile from the city, is Castle Pinckney, a small work, but mounting some heavy guns. Nearly opposite, on the southern side of the harbor, on James Island, about two miles distant, is Fort Johnson. About four miles from the city, midway between Sullivan's and James Islands, is Fort Sumter, and directly northward of it, on Sullivan's Island, at a distance of two thousand yards, is Fort Moultrie. Between these two forts is the main channel for vessels to approach the city. The principal entrance to the harbor is through Ship Channel, the outer bar of which is distant southeast from Fort Sumter about six miles. Shortly after crossing the bar the enemy's vessels will encounter the fire of the batteries on John's Island, near and parallel to which the channel runs in a westerly direction for two miles. It then makes an angle northward, running for more than a mile directly towards Forts Sumter and Moultrie. After passing the former it turns to the west and passes beneath the fortifications, directly under their guns, and then bends to the southwest, in which direction it approaches Fort Johnson for upward of two miles, while on the right it is under the fire of Castle Pinckney. It is not until the enemy's vessels or passes all these works, and others that will announce themselves at the proper time, that he will be able to occupy Cooper and Ashley rivers and place Charleston at the mercy of the shot and shell of his iron-clads.

San Francisco, 17th.—Peter Conyn, beaten by hackmen last week died this morning from the effect of injuries. James Maguire, George Smith, and Charles Harrier were arrested for the murder. Personal rencontre took place between Geo. Penn Johnson and James O'Sullivan, formerly editor of a Sonora paper, this evening—no arrest made. Luback bark Alma arrived on Tuesday. She reports being spoken by the pirate Florida April 21st near the equator 28 west long. She placed six passengers aboard Alma, taken from the ship Commonwealth when captured. They placed the passengers aboard without payment of fare. Alma saw the Florida twice—two times afterwards. Tuesday night the Alma at San Francisco—her officers and crew were all seized by a gang of pirates and held for ransom.

San Francisco, 17th.—A dispatch received at headquarters 11 A. M. to-day from Rosecrans' Adjutant General says battle still going on without any decisive results.

Cincinnati, 21.—Commercial dispatch has the following account of Saturday's fight: Battle commenced at 11 A. M. in the vicinity of Widow Green's House on road leading to Chattanooga. It soon became general, enemy maneuvering his troops finely. Early in the action the rebels made an impetuous charge on Feltton's and Thomas' batteries and 5 out of the 6 parrot guns were captured. Capt. Van Pelt commanding was taken prisoner. At 2 P. M. the contest became terrific, roll of musketry more continuous and deafening than at Stone River. About 2 P. M. the division in the center being pressed retreated in disorder. Col. Barnett succeeding in planting batteries which soon charged the enemy who were in turn driven over the same ground in disorder. Davis' division fell back with heavy loss, and every gun of the 8th Indiana battery was lost, his forces then rallied, pushed the enemy back and retook his guns.—Reynolds lost heavily but stubbornly held his position driving the enemy but never leaving his line. Palmer who was overwhelmed failed to get off his battery and lost 2 guns. Van Cleve's division fought gallantly but he was overpowered and failed to hold his position. Our line was pressed heavily and wavered. Rebels exulting over their apparent success made the air resound with cheers. They advanced along the whole line when a withering fire of musketry rolled from right to left

Light Wanted.

Mr. Editor.—In your issue of the 7th inst. is a letter of explanation from Senator Harding. It seems to me that his explanation ought to be explained. Perhaps he would be kind enough to give further light. His constituents should know—not guess at—his position.

Several passages I do not understand. What does he mean by this one? "I admit that if I were called upon to vote for him (Vallandigham) or an extreme abolitionist, who would prosecute the war against the seceded States after they were willing to return to their duty under the Constitution, to compel the abolition of slavery, I would prefer Vallandigham."

Now I would next respectfully ask: Does the Honorable Senator intend here to tell us, that he is so thoroughly opposed to the measures of the Government in regard to the abolition of slavery, that he would rather vote for Vallandigham—bad as he is—than for one who wished to have those measures honestly carried out? Or is the kind of an abolitionist referred to only an imaginary being? Perhaps so; as it is presumed no class of persons, however ultra their opinions may be, would wish to prosecute the war against States after they are willing to come back to their duty. Why does he add the phrase "to compel the abolition of slavery," when it is his duty to come under the Constitution?

Will he tell? But allow me to inquire further: What does he mean by "extreme abolitionist"? Is he speaking of one of the old Garrisonian school? One who would overthrow the government to destroy slavery? When he chooses between such a one and Vallandigham, it would seem that he goes to more than show his love of slavery; because the latter contends that the rebels should be allowed to revolutionize the Government and have everything their own way. Both would destroy the Government. True, they would do this in view of very different objects. The one seeks its destruction in order to terminate slavery; the other to make it universal. From the choice he expresses it looks as though our Senator would prefer slavery to freedom even in a state of anarchy. Does he love it?

Of late not a few who appear to have the least respect for the Constitution speak most of their attachment to it. Just as some persons find it necessary to boast of their own honesty, lest it should be thought they had none. Hence the way Mr. Harding refers to the Constitution looks rather suspicious.

Though from the tenor of his letter in regard to the Government, the Constitution, and the Administration, there appears to be grounds for apprehension, yet perhaps it would be unfair to conclude that he is of the number of those who wish the President's Proclamation respecting slavery to be made a lie to both slave-holders and slaves. The former had been told in good time that if they continued in rebellion till Jan. 1st, 1863, the Government would no longer recognize them as slave-holders; and the latter were assured that in that event they should be free. The day came, and the proclamation was made.—And yet, strange to say, some would have these solemn proceedings set aside as utterly void, in order to favor slave-holders and oppress slaves. That would be setting the few against the many. There are about ten slaves to one slave-holder in our country. It ought to be remembered, moreover, that the good sought by the few in this case is nothing but dollars and cents; while on the other hand, what is sought by the many comprises everything of value in the shape of property, and their wives and children and even their own bodies besides. With the few, only property is pending; with the many, every thing. Government should aim, and good government always does aim at the greatest good to the greatest number. The only way to set aside the force of these facts is to assume that negroes are not human beings. But then how would it be with mulattoes? how with quadroons? and how with such as are as white as their masters? And yet in the face of all these facts, and many more which might be named, and in direct opposition to all principles of justice and humanity, some who profess to possess reason, if not religion, would have us to break faith with the many for the purpose of favoring the few. I trust, however, that Senator Harding is not of that number. Still, his letter makes me fear, it places him in an awkward position. Will he be good enough to

J. Francon.

Ottarbrock, Oct. 18, 1863.

HAYDEN'S GRAND RALLY.

—Hayden of Polk county, is, we are informed, making active efforts to rally the democracy of Polk. Not long since he said to Old Whittly: "We must rally the Democracy or we're beaten." "O, h—ll!" was the old fellow's reply; "there is no use to rally; they've beaten us at Vicksburg and Port Hudson! there's no use to rally now, by G—d there ain't!"

A few days after this conversation a Union man was boring said Whittly about his democratic rally, calling out the direct response, "I'll be d—d if I carry these broken down politicians any longer."

Old Whittly, to say the least, is sensible of his misery.

PRESIDENTIAL.

—The Stockton Independent says: We take it that Mr. Lincoln will be re-nominated by the true Union party of the truly loyal States. They owe it to themselves and to the President. He has filled his fearfully responsible position with rare wisdom, firmness and moderation. * * * The Union party will be doing their cause and its distinguished leader injustice if they now discard him for some less true and tried man. Let us stick to the bridge which carries us safely over.

Address of Brig.-Gen. Alvord to the Militia at the State Fair, Sept. 18, 1863.

FELLOW SOLDIERS.—I have been requested by your Commander in Chief, the Governor of Oregon, to address you, and I cannot decline. I take the deepest interest in your military organizations and in the success of all your enterprises to keep up military knowledge and martial spirit.

There is every reason to stimulate the population of Oregon to encourage such organizations. Our remoteness, our seclusion, our isolation, all admonish us to be ready, to prepare for anything which may happen.

Fortunately in our own right arms, in the manly strength, courage, and patriotic fervor of the masses, are our chief reliance. If California and Oregon shall turn out their population capable of bearing arms and doing good service, they can raise splendid armies, full of hardihood, nerve and valor, and which will be large enough to cope with any army a foreign foe can send to such remote points. If I can only get, on the occurrence of any trouble, the naval assistance and artillery I have already invoked from the Government, we can occupy a very satisfactory position in this region. The population on this coast are naturally brave soldiers—they are unused to the fatigues, and camp life, but they are willing to be led by us. Why does he add the phrase "to compel the abolition of slavery," when it is his duty to come under the Constitution?

Will he tell? But allow me to inquire further: What does he mean by "extreme abolitionist"? Is he speaking of one of the old Garrisonian school? One who would overthrow the government to destroy slavery? When he chooses between such a one and Vallandigham, it would seem that he goes to more than show his love of slavery; because the latter contends that the rebels should be allowed to revolutionize the Government and have everything their own way. Both would destroy the Government. True, they would do this in view of very different objects. The one seeks its destruction in order to terminate slavery; the other to make it universal. From the choice he expresses it looks as though our Senator would prefer slavery to freedom even in a state of anarchy. Does he love it?

Of late not a few who appear to have the least respect for the Constitution speak most of their attachment to it. Just as some persons find it necessary to boast of their own honesty, lest it should be thought they had none. Hence the way Mr. Harding refers to the Constitution looks rather suspicious.

Though from the tenor of his letter in regard to the Government, the Constitution, and the Administration, there appears to be grounds for apprehension, yet perhaps it would be unfair to conclude that he is of the number of those who wish the President's Proclamation respecting slavery to be made a lie to both slave-holders and slaves. The former had been told in good time that if they continued in rebellion till Jan. 1st, 1863, the Government would no longer recognize them as slave-holders; and the latter were assured that in that event they should be free. The day came, and the proclamation was made.—And yet, strange to say, some would have these solemn proceedings set aside as utterly void, in order to favor slave-holders and oppress slaves. That would be setting the few against the many. There are about ten slaves to one slave-holder in our country. It ought to be remembered, moreover, that the good sought by the few in this case is nothing but dollars and cents; while on the other hand, what is sought by the many comprises everything of value in the shape of property, and their wives and children and even their own bodies besides. With the few, only property is pending; with the many, every thing. Government should aim, and good government always does aim at the greatest good to the greatest number. The only way to set aside the force of these facts is to assume that negroes are not human beings. But then how would it be with mulattoes? how with quadroons? and how with such as are as white as their masters? And yet in the face of all these facts, and many more which might be named, and in direct opposition to all principles of justice and humanity, some who profess to possess reason, if not religion, would have us to break faith with the many for the purpose of favoring the few. I trust, however, that Senator Harding is not of that number. Still, his letter makes me fear, it places him in an awkward position. Will he be good enough to

J. Francon.

Ottarbrock, Oct. 18, 1863.

HAYDEN'S GRAND RALLY.

—Hayden of Polk county, is, we are informed, making active efforts to rally the democracy of Polk. Not long since he said to Old Whittly: "We must rally the Democracy or we're beaten." "O, h—ll!" was the old fellow's reply; "there is no use to rally; they've beaten us at Vicksburg and Port Hudson! there's no use to rally now, by G—d there ain't!"

A few days after this conversation a Union man was boring said Whittly about his democratic rally, calling out the direct response, "I'll be d—d if I carry these broken down politicians any longer."

Old Whittly, to say the least, is sensible of his misery.

PRESIDENTIAL.

—The Stockton Independent says: We take it that Mr. Lincoln will be re-nominated by the true Union party of the truly loyal States. They owe it to themselves and to the President. He has filled his fearfully responsible position with rare wisdom, firmness and moderation. * * * The Union party will be doing their cause and its distinguished leader injustice if they now discard him for some less true and tried man. Let us stick to the bridge which carries us safely over.

Light Wanted.

Mr. Editor.—In your issue of the 7th inst. is a letter of explanation from Senator Harding. It seems to me that his explanation ought to be explained. Perhaps he would be kind enough to give further light. His constituents should know—not guess at—his position.

Several passages I do not understand. What does he mean by this one? "I admit that if I were called upon to vote for him (Vallandigham) or an extreme abolitionist, who would prosecute the war against the seceded States after they were willing to return to their duty under the Constitution, to compel the abolition of slavery, I would prefer Vallandigham."

Now I would next respectfully ask: Does the Honorable Senator intend here to tell us, that he is so thoroughly opposed to the measures of the Government in regard to the abolition of slavery, that he would rather vote for Vallandigham—bad as he is—than for one who wished to have those measures honestly carried out? Or is the kind of an abolitionist referred to only an imaginary being? Perhaps so; as it is presumed no class of persons, however ultra their opinions may be, would wish to prosecute the war against States after they are willing to come back to their duty. Why does he add the phrase "to compel the abolition of slavery," when it is his duty to come under the Constitution?

Will he tell? But allow me to inquire further: What does he mean by "extreme abolitionist"? Is he speaking of one of the old Garrisonian school? One who would overthrow the government to destroy slavery? When he chooses between such a one and Vallandigham, it would seem that he goes to more than show his love of slavery; because the latter contends that the rebels should be allowed to revolutionize the Government and have everything their own way. Both would destroy the Government. True, they would do this in view of very different objects. The one seeks its destruction in order to terminate slavery; the other to make it universal. From the choice he expresses it looks as though our Senator would prefer slavery to freedom even in a state of anarchy. Does he love it?

Of late not a few who appear to have the least respect for the Constitution speak most of their attachment to it. Just as some persons find it necessary to boast of their own honesty, lest it should be thought they had none. Hence the way Mr. Harding refers to the Constitution looks rather suspicious.

Though from the tenor of his letter in regard to the Government, the Constitution, and the Administration, there appears to be grounds for apprehension, yet perhaps it would be unfair to conclude that he is of the number of those who wish the President's Proclamation respecting slavery to be made a lie to both slave-holders and slaves. The former had been told in good time that if they continued in rebellion till Jan. 1st, 1863, the Government would no longer recognize them as slave-holders; and the latter were assured that in that event they should be free. The day came, and the proclamation was made.—And yet, strange to say, some would have these solemn proceedings set aside as utterly void, in order to favor slave-holders and oppress slaves. That would be setting the few against the many. There are about ten slaves to one slave-holder in our country. It ought to be remembered, moreover, that the good sought by the few in this case is nothing but dollars and cents; while on the other hand, what is sought by the many comprises everything of value in the shape of property, and their wives and children and even their own bodies besides. With the few, only property is pending; with the many, every thing. Government should aim, and good government always does aim at the greatest good to the greatest number. The only way to set aside the force of these facts is to assume that negroes are not human beings. But then how would it be with mulattoes? how with quadroons? and how with such as are as white as their masters? And yet in the face of all these facts, and many more which might be named, and in direct opposition to all principles of justice and humanity, some who profess to possess reason, if not religion, would have us to break faith with the many for the purpose of favoring the few. I trust, however, that Senator Harding is not of that number. Still, his letter makes me fear, it places him in an awkward position. Will he be good enough to

J. Francon.

Ottarbrock, Oct. 18, 1863.

HAYDEN'S GRAND RALLY.

—Hayden of Polk county, is, we are informed, making active efforts to rally the democracy of Polk. Not long since he said to Old Whittly: "We must rally the Democracy or we're beaten." "O, h—ll!" was the old fellow's reply; "there is no use to rally; they've beaten us at Vicksburg and Port Hudson! there's no use to rally now, by G—d there ain't!"

A few days after this conversation a Union man was boring said Whittly about his democratic rally, calling out the direct response, "I'll be d—d if I carry these broken down politicians any longer."

Old Whittly, to say the least, is sensible of his misery.

PRESIDENTIAL.

—The Stockton Independent says: We take it that Mr. Lincoln will be re-nominated by the true Union party of the truly loyal States. They owe it to themselves and to the President. He has filled his fearfully responsible position with rare wisdom, firmness and moderation. * * * The Union party will be doing their cause and its distinguished leader injustice if they now discard him for some less true and tried man. Let us stick to the bridge which carries us safely over.

Address of Brig.-Gen. Alvord to the Militia at the State Fair, Sept. 18, 1863.

FELLOW SOLDIERS.—I have been requested by your Commander in Chief, the Governor of Oregon, to address you, and I cannot decline. I take the deepest interest in your military organizations and in the success of all your enterprises to keep up military knowledge and martial spirit.

There is every reason to stimulate the population of Oregon to encourage such organizations. Our remoteness, our seclusion, our isolation, all admonish us to be ready, to prepare for anything which may happen.

Fortunately in our own right arms, in the manly strength, courage, and patriotic fervor of the masses, are our chief reliance. If California and Oregon shall turn out their population capable of bearing arms and doing good service, they can raise splendid armies, full of hardihood, nerve and valor, and which will be large enough to cope with any army a foreign foe can send to such remote points. If I can only get, on the occurrence of any trouble, the naval assistance and artillery I have already invoked from the Government, we can occupy a very satisfactory position in this region. The population on this coast are naturally brave soldiers—they are unused to the fatigues, and camp life, but they are willing to be led by us. Why does he add the phrase "to compel the abolition of slavery," when it is his duty to come under the Constitution?

Will he tell? But allow me to inquire further: What does he mean by "extreme abolitionist"? Is he speaking of one of the old Garrisonian school? One who would overthrow the government to destroy slavery? When he chooses between such a one and Vallandigham, it would seem that he goes to more than show his love of slavery; because the latter contends that the rebels should be allowed to revolutionize the Government and have everything their own way. Both would destroy the Government. True, they would do this in view of very different objects. The one seeks its destruction in order to terminate slavery; the other to make it universal. From the choice he expresses it looks as though our Senator would prefer slavery to freedom even in a state of anarchy. Does he love it?

Of late not a few who appear to have the least respect for the Constitution speak most of their attachment to it. Just as some persons find it necessary to boast of their own honesty, lest it should be thought they had none. Hence the way Mr. Harding refers to the Constitution looks rather suspicious.

Though from the tenor of his letter in regard to the Government, the Constitution, and the Administration, there appears to be grounds for apprehension, yet perhaps it would be unfair to conclude that he is of the number of those who wish the President's Proclamation respecting slavery to be made a lie to both slave-holders and slaves. The former had been told in good time that if they continued in rebellion till Jan. 1st, 1863, the Government would no longer recognize them as slave-holders; and the latter were assured that in that event they should be free. The day came, and the proclamation was made.—And yet, strange to say, some would have these solemn proceedings set aside as utterly void, in order to favor slave-holders and oppress slaves. That would be setting the few against the many. There are about ten slaves to one slave-holder in our country. It ought to be remembered, moreover, that the good sought by the few in this case is nothing but dollars and cents; while on the other hand, what is sought by the many comprises everything of value in the shape of property, and their wives and children and even their own bodies besides. With the few, only property is pending; with the many, every thing. Government should aim, and good government always does aim at the greatest good to the greatest number. The only way to set aside the force of these facts is to assume that negroes are not human beings. But then how would it be with mulattoes? how with quadroons? and how with such as are as white as their masters? And yet in the face of all these facts, and many more which might be named, and in direct opposition to all principles of justice and humanity, some who profess to possess reason, if not religion, would have us to break faith with the many for the purpose of favoring the few. I trust, however, that Senator Harding is not of that number. Still, his letter makes me fear, it places him in an awkward position. Will he be good enough to

J. Francon.

Ottarbrock, Oct. 18, 1863.

HAYDEN'S GRAND RALLY.

—Hayden of Polk county, is, we are informed, making active efforts to rally the democracy of Polk. Not long since he said to Old Whittly: "We must rally the Democracy or we're beaten." "O, h—ll!" was the old fellow's reply; "there is no use to rally; they've beaten us at Vicksburg and Port Hudson! there's no use to rally now, by G—d there ain't!"

A few days after this conversation a Union man was boring said Whittly about his democratic rally, calling out the direct response, "I'll be d—d if I carry these broken down politicians any longer."

Old Whittly, to say the least, is sensible of his misery.

PRESIDENTIAL.

—The Stockton Independent says: We take it that Mr. Lincoln will be re-nominated by the true Union party of the truly loyal States. They owe it to themselves and to the President. He has filled his fearfully responsible position with rare wisdom, firmness and moderation. * * * The Union party will be doing their cause and its distinguished leader injustice if they now discard him for some less true and tried man. Let us stick to the bridge which carries us safely over.

Light Wanted.

Mr. Editor.—In your issue of the 7th inst. is a letter of explanation from Senator Harding. It seems to me that his explanation ought to be explained. Perhaps he would be kind enough to give further light. His constituents should know—not guess at—his position.

Several passages I do not understand. What does he mean by this one? "I admit that if I were called upon to vote for him (Vallandigham) or an extreme abolitionist, who would prosecute the war against the seceded States after they were willing to return to their duty under the Constitution, to compel the abolition of slavery, I would prefer Vallandigham."

Now I would next respectfully ask: Does the Honorable Senator intend here to tell us, that he is so thoroughly opposed to the measures of the Government in regard to the abolition of slavery, that he would rather vote for Vallandigham—bad as he is—than for one who wished to have those measures honestly carried out? Or is the kind of an abolitionist referred to only an imaginary being? Perhaps so; as it is presumed no class of persons, however ultra their opinions may be, would wish to prosecute the war against States after they are willing to come back to their duty. Why does he add the phrase "to compel the abolition of slavery," when it is his duty to come under the Constitution?

Will he tell? But allow me to inquire further: What does he mean by "extreme abolitionist"? Is he speaking of one of the old Garrisonian school? One who would overthrow the government to destroy slavery? When he chooses between such a one and Vallandigham, it would seem that he goes to more than show his love of slavery; because the latter contends that the rebels should be allowed to revolutionize the Government and have everything their own way. Both would destroy the Government. True, they would do this in view of very different objects. The one seeks its destruction in order to terminate slavery; the other to make it universal. From the choice he expresses it looks as though our Senator would prefer slavery to freedom even in a state of anarchy. Does he love it?

Of late not a few who appear to have the least respect for the Constitution speak most of their attachment to it. Just as some persons find it necessary to boast of their own honesty, lest it should be thought they had none. Hence the way Mr. Harding refers to the Constitution looks rather suspicious.

Though from the tenor of his letter in regard to the Government, the Constitution, and the Administration, there appears to be grounds for apprehension, yet perhaps it would be unfair to conclude that he is of the number of those who wish the President's Proclamation respecting slavery to be made a lie to both slave-holders and slaves. The former had been told in good time that if they continued in rebellion till Jan. 1st, 1863, the Government would no longer recognize them as slave-holders; and the latter were assured that in that event they should be free. The day came, and the proclamation was made.—And yet, strange to say, some would have these solemn proceedings set aside as utterly void, in order to favor slave-holders and oppress slaves. That would be setting the few against the many. There are about ten slaves to one slave-holder in our country. It ought to be remembered, moreover, that the good sought by the few in this case is nothing but dollars and cents; while on the other hand, what is sought by the many comprises everything of value in the shape of property, and their wives and children and even their own bodies besides. With the few, only property is pending; with the many, every thing. Government should aim, and good government always does aim at the greatest good to the greatest number. The only way to set aside the force of these facts is to assume that negroes are not human beings. But then how would it be with mulattoes? how with quadroons? and how with such as are as white as their masters? And yet in the face of all these facts, and many more which might be named, and in direct opposition to all principles of justice and humanity, some who profess to possess reason, if not religion, would have us to break faith with the many for the purpose of favoring the few. I trust, however, that Senator Harding is not of that number. Still, his letter makes me fear, it places him in an awkward position. Will he be good enough to

J. Francon.

Ottarbrock, Oct. 18, 1863.

HAYDEN'S GRAND RALLY.

—Hayden of Polk county, is, we are informed, making active efforts to rally the democracy of Polk. Not long since he said to Old Whittly: "We must rally the Democracy or we're beaten." "O, h—ll!" was the old fellow's reply; "there is no use to rally; they've beaten us at Vicksburg and Port Hudson! there's no use to rally now, by G—d there ain't!"

A few days after this conversation a Union man was boring said Whittly about his democratic rally, calling out the direct response, "I'll be d—d if I carry these broken down politicians any longer."

Old Whittly, to say the least, is sensible of his misery.

PRESIDENTIAL.

—The Stockton Independent says: We take it that Mr. Lincoln will be re-nominated by the true Union party of the truly loyal States. They owe it to themselves and to the President. He has filled his fearfully responsible position with rare wisdom, firmness and moderation. * * * The Union party will be doing their cause and its distinguished leader injustice if they now discard him for some less true and tried man. Let us stick to the bridge which carries us safely over.

Address of Brig.-Gen. Alvord to the Militia at the State Fair, Sept. 18, 1863.

FELLOW SOLDIERS.—I have been requested by your Commander in Chief, the Governor of Oregon, to address you, and I cannot decline. I take the deepest interest in your military organizations and in the success of all your enterprises to keep up military knowledge and martial spirit.

There is every reason to stimulate the population of Oregon to encourage such organizations. Our remoteness, our seclusion, our isolation, all admonish us to be ready, to prepare for anything which may happen.

Fortunately in our own right arms, in the manly strength, courage, and patriotic fervor of the masses, are our chief reliance. If California and Oregon shall turn out their population capable of bearing arms and doing good service, they can raise splendid armies, full of hardihood, nerve and valor, and which will be large enough to cope with any army a foreign foe can send to such remote points. If I can only get, on the occurrence of any trouble, the naval assistance and artillery I have already invoked from the Government, we can occupy a very satisfactory position in this region. The population on this coast are naturally brave soldiers—they are unused to the fatigues, and camp life, but they are willing to be led by us. Why does he add the phrase "to compel the abolition of slavery," when it is his duty to come under the Constitution?

Will he tell? But allow me to inquire further: What does he mean by "extreme abolitionist"? Is he speaking of one of the old Garrisonian school? One who would overthrow the government to destroy slavery? When he chooses between such a one and Vallandigham, it would seem that he goes to more than show his love of slavery; because the latter contends that the rebels should be allowed to revolutionize the Government and have everything their own way. Both would destroy the Government. True, they would do this in view of very different objects. The one seeks its destruction in order to terminate slavery; the other to make it universal. From the choice he expresses it looks as though our Senator would prefer slavery to freedom even in a state of anarchy. Does he love it?

Of late not a few who appear to have the least respect for the Constitution speak most of their attachment to it. Just as some persons find it necessary to boast of their own honesty, lest it should be thought they had none. Hence the way Mr. Harding refers to the Constitution looks rather suspicious.

Though from the tenor of his letter in regard to the Government, the Constitution, and the Administration, there appears to be grounds for apprehension, yet perhaps it would be unfair to conclude that he is of the number of those who wish the President's Proclamation respecting slavery to be made a lie to both slave-holders and slaves. The former had been told in good time that if they continued in rebellion till Jan. 1st, 1863, the Government would no longer recognize them as slave-holders; and the latter were assured that in that event they should be free. The day came, and the proclamation was made.—And yet, strange to say, some would have these solemn proceedings set aside as utterly void, in order to favor slave-holders and oppress slaves. That would be setting the few against the many. There are about ten slaves to one slave-holder in our country. It ought to be remembered, moreover, that the good sought by the few in this case is nothing but dollars and cents; while on the other hand, what is sought by the many comprises everything of value in the shape of property, and their wives and children and even their own bodies besides. With the few, only property is pending; with the many, every thing. Government should aim, and good government always does aim at the greatest good to the greatest number. The only way to set aside the force of these facts is to assume that negroes are not human beings. But then how would it be with mulattoes? how with quadroons? and how with such as are as white as their masters? And yet in the face of all these facts, and many more which might be named, and in direct opposition to all principles of justice and humanity, some who profess to possess reason, if not religion, would have us to break faith with the many for the purpose of favoring the few. I trust, however, that Senator Harding is not of that number. Still, his letter makes me fear, it places him in an awkward position. Will he be good enough to

J. Francon.

Ottarbrock, Oct. 18, 1863.

HAYDEN'S GRAND RALLY.

—Hayden of Polk county, is, we are informed, making active efforts to rally the democracy of Polk. Not long since he said to Old Whittly: "We must rally the Democracy or we're beaten." "O, h—ll!" was the old fellow's reply; "there is no use to rally; they've beaten us at Vicksburg and Port Hudson! there's no use to rally now, by G—d there ain't!"

A few days after this conversation a Union man was boring said Whittly about his democratic rally, calling out the direct response, "I'll be d—d if I carry these broken down politicians any longer."

Old Whittly, to say the least, is sensible of his misery.

PRESIDENTIAL.

—The Stockton Independent says: We take it that Mr. Lincoln will be re-nominated by the true Union party of the truly loyal States. They owe it to themselves and to the President. He has filled his fearfully responsible position with rare wisdom, firmness and moderation. * * * The Union party will be doing their cause and its distinguished leader injustice if they now discard him for some less true and tried man. Let us stick to the bridge which carries us safely over.