Democratic statesmen of the Jackson pattern.—And we are utterly astounded that the professed and acknowledged leaders of the so-called Democratic party in Oregon should be so shamefully ignorant of the history of the country as to blunder along from one campaign to another, stupidly falling into the old heresies of Calhoun, to be exposed and put down by the wisdom of John Marshall and the iron patriotism of Andrew Jackson, in the same order as was Calhoun from 1829 to 1832, by these great statesmen. The idea that U. S. credits could be taxed, originated with John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, and is but part and parcel of this dangerous doctrine of State sovereignty, as interpreted and illustrated by Jefferson Davis and the Southern Confederacy.

We have the warrant of the Constitution of the United States, and a decision of its Supreme Court, while Marshall (a Democrat) was Chief Justice, *that these bonds cannot be taxed*. Upon the Constitution, as interpreted by that Court, the Union party rests the case. If Democrats want to make war upon the Constitution and the Supreme Court, it is nothing less than what Jeff Davis did, nothing less than what the Union party has charged upon the Democracy, and they must be held responsible for their course. In the case of *Weston vs. the City of Charleston*, in 1829, reported on 173d page of vol. 8 Curtis's Supreme Court decisions, Chief Justice Marshall uses the following language:

"This brings us to the main question. Is the stock issued for loans made to the government of the United States liable to be taxed by States and corporations?

Congress has power "to borrow money on the credit of the United States." The stock it issues is the evidence of a debt created by the exercise of this power. The tax in question is a tax upon the contract subsisting between the government and the individual. It bears directly upon that contract, while subsisting and in full force. The power operates upon the contract the instant it is framed, and must imply a right to affect that contract.

If the States and corporations throughout the Union, possess the power to tax a contract for the loan of money, what shall arrest this principle in its application to every other contract? What measure can government adopt which will not be exposed to its influence?

But it is unnecessary to pursue this principle through its diversified application to all the contracts, and to the various operations of government. No one can be selected which is of more vital interest to the community than this of borrowing money on the credit of the United States. No power has been conferred by the American people on their government, the free and unburdened exercise of which more deeply affects every member of our republic. In war, when the honor, the safety, the independence of the nation are to be defended, when all its resources are to be strained to the utmost, credit must be brought in aid of taxation, and the abundant revenue of peace and prosperity must be anticipated to supply the exigencies, the urgent demands, of the moment. The people, for objects the most important which can occur in the progress of nations, have empowered their government to make these anticipations, "to borrow money on the credit of the United States." Can anything be more dangerous or more injurious, than the admission of a principle which authorizes every State and every corporation in the Union which possesses the right of taxation, to burden the exercise of this power at their discretion?

If the right to impose the tax exists, it is a right which in its nature acknowledges no limits. It may be carried to any extent within the jurisdiction of the State or corporation which imposes it, which the will of each State and corporation may prescribe. A power which is given by the whole American people for their common good, which is to be exercised at the most critical periods, for the most important purposes, on the free exercise of which the interests certainly, perhaps the liberty of the whole may depend, may be burdened, impeded, if not arrested, by any of the organized parts of the confederacy."

"The attempt to use the power of taxation on the means employed by the government of the Union in pursuance of the constitution, is itself an abuse, because it is the usurpation of a power which the people of a single State cannot give."

"The right to tax the contract to any extent, when made, must operate upon the power to borrow before it is exercised, and have a sensible influence on the contract. The extent of this influence depends on the will of a distinct government. To any extent, however inconsiderable, it is a burden on the operations of government. It may be carried to an extent which shall arrest them entirely."

"The tax on government stock is thought by this court to be a tax on the contract, a tax on the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and consequently to be repugnant to the constitution."

Such is the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered by Chief Justice John Marshall, a distinguished Virginian, and a Democrat of the times when Democracy meant patriotism and devotion to the Union. We place it against all the sophistries of the Jo Smiths and Kellys of Oregon, not only to satisfy the people that the position of the Union party on this question is correct, but also to show the people that these fellows who are professing Democracy in Oregon, are not genuine; they are spurious coin, opposing the principles of true democracy, as held by such men as Marshall and Jackson. [Applause.] The principle of taxation of the Government contract is not only repudiation in itself, and a violation of the Constitution, but at least two of the Democratic candidates have declared in favor of repudiation: Col. Kelly, by repudiating the contract with the bondholder, and Jas. O'Meara, by declaring that if the Democracy get into power "it would pay the whole public debt in thirty days without any tax." I think this disposes of another one of the "living issues."

PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY.

Although little or nothing is said by the political speakers on either side, on the question, of a Protective Tariff, and Free Trade, yet I esteem it one of the "living issues" of the day, and second only to the question of Reconstruction. It can not be otherwise than that the question of the impoverishment of American soil, or its enrichment, the building up of our Home Manufactures, or their destruction, is one of the most important to the prosperity of the nation and the happiness of its people. When we reflect that by the present tariff (which the Democrats propose to repeal) one hundred million dollars are placed in the national purse annually, it is worth while considering whether that amount shall be struck out, and then, by direct taxes collected from the people, whose industry is by the same act placed on a level with that of all foreign nations. Regarding our national debt not as a "national blessing," but as a sacred obligation to be paid, and scanning our pension lists, which embrace almost as many names as were found on the muster rolls of the contending armies at Waterloo, and not forgetting the widowhood and orphanage, which the nation and its people must in some way provide for, this question of the prosperity of the nation, is no trifling question. In addition to these considerations of patriotism, I know that the citizens of Oregon City, and, I can well add, the whole of Oregon, are vitally interested in the prosperity of our home manufactures.

This campaign is the first time that the Democrats have raised the Tariff question since 1860. Why is it? Because (reason the Democrats) the Southern States are coming back into the Union; they will want free trade with England, according to the good old times of Frank Pierce, and now let us get into shape and have our platforms to suit them. Slavery has now been broken down, there is no more negro in the wood-pile, but ye democracy thinks that Free Trade, as in 1832, will be the Southern hobby, and therefore Democracy makes haste to bow down to the cotton-planting chivalry. In the Atlantic States, Democracy has taken the same position as it does here. Democrats are simply setting up their stakes to be in line with the old policy of the South, and what they expect will be again demanded by Southern representatives when they get into the halls of Congress. Their anti-tariff plank is a mere party move, having no higher motive than harmony with Southern politicians.

So important is this question of a protective tariff, that many leading statesmen have expressed the opinion that if we had maintained the protective policy as a national policy, in the past, we would not have had a civil war. If you will revert to the history of the last forty years, you will find that when we had a protective tariff comparative quiet prevailed in the country; but as soon as protection to free labor was withdrawn sectional excitement and animosity followed.—How wicked is the selfishness that, right on the heels of the war that has so desolated the South and so burdened the North, seeks to deprive the labor of both North and South of protection, chaining the latter down in its poverty, and hamstringing the former as it endeavors to carry its load and save the nation's credit and prosperity. Industry alone can reconstruct the whole Union. Free Trade opposes this reconstruction. The deadliest disunionist that now glides masked through our politics is the opponent of Protection to Home Industry.

So far, in the history of the country, and, we may safely say, in the history of all countries, the protective policy has been vindicated by the prosperity which it has invariably produced.—The Union party has been, and is yet, in favor of a tariff for protection, while the present Democratic party is bitterly opposed. By a tariff for protection, we mean a tariff that is reasonable and adapted to the capacities and circumstances of the country. We can manufacture all kinds of woolen, cotton, and flax goods, all kinds of iron and hardware, cutlery, copperware, etc., just as cheaply and just as well in the United States as they can be manufactured in foreign countries. If we have not yet got the mechanics and manufacturers, or enough of them, it is plainly our duty as a nation to adopt such legislation as will induce them to come to this country with their families, their labor, and their wealth. We would not favor a law that would compel Oregon to raise its own tea and coffee, or do without them, or pay such prices as would render the consumption of such articles an impossibility with the day-laborer. That would be plainly unreasonable, as Oregon can raise neither tea nor coffee, and cannot therefore in any way compete with foreign countries in such articles. The true rule is to protect the production and manufacture at home of all those articles which we can as reasonably and cheaply produce as foreign countries, having due regard to the cost of transportation between countries.

With the farmer, the vital question is, where can I buy the most iron, or the most cloth, or the most coffee, with my crop of wheat, or my crop of wool? and not, where can I buy the most of these articles for so many dollars in gold? If the farmer buys with money, he must first convert his crop into money. If he has no home market, he must send it abroad to find a market; and when he ships it out of his own country, it always goes to the manufacturing towns—his cotton and wool to the manufacturer and his flour and bacon to the operatives. The farmer loses the cost of the transportation, and again he is compelled to pay the cost of transporting the manufactured article back to him. Now both these losses in transportation would be avoided if a proper tariff protected and encouraged manufactures at home. If we hire our manufacturing done in England, we must send the bread there to support the operative, and pay him for his labor. And between the man who raises bread in the United States and the man who eats in England, there is a vast army of commission men, common carriers, brokers, shippers, etc., all of whom must be paid for the mere business of taking the products of one man's labor and giving it to the other; and they all make money out of the man who is separated from his consumer, and, to the extent of their wages, they make the producer poorer. Free trade between the man who raises corn in Illinois, and the man who makes spades in England, is but a cunning device to keep both men poor as long as they do business that far away from each other.

The great advantages to be derived from encouraging home manufactures, arise from the fact that such legislation keeps the profits and products of our own industry at home, and accumulates and invests it in new towns and cities, and in productive farms and factories. It abolishes the losses consequent on expensive transportation and the wages of thousands of mere middle-men. A protective policy which secures the manufacture of home made cloth, furnishes cheaper cloth in reality than any foreign rival although the foreign goods might be offered for less money. How is this? Horace Greeley answers this question as follows: "Because the fabrication of his cloth in Europe necessitates the exportation of his grain, and the consequent graduation of its price by that ruling in Europe, deducting from his returns the cost of transporting it thither. Let us suppose that Iowa grows mainly wheat for sale, and must send the larger portion of her surplus across the Atlantic to find consumers, selling it in Birmingham or Sheffield at two dollars per bushel, whereof one dollar and fifty cents is absorbed in the cost and charges of transmission. Of course, her farmers can receive, in the average, but fifty cents per bushel. But transfer the production of her fabrics from Europe to America, and much of it to Iowa and its vicinity, and now the price of grain in Iowa rises by a law inexorable as that of gravitation. It is no longer depressed by the necessity of finding a market for a good part of it four thousand miles away, but rises to a far higher level. And not only is wheat dearer to the farmer and cheaper to the manufacturer than it was, but the farmer now finds a ready market for fruit, vegetables, hay, etc., which he could scarcely sell at any price, so long as our people's productive energies were devoted to agriculture alone."

What we seek by protection is to shorten the distance which separates farmers from manufacturers, and thereby diminish the too heavy cost of exchanging their products respectively. If a thousand farmers growing grain in Iowa, and a thousand manufacturers making wares and fabrics in England, exchange their products across four thousand miles of land and water, employing the services and consuming the time of three thousand forwarders, boatmen, railroad hands, seamen, etc., in so doing, it is manifest that the whole five thousand must be subsisted on the products of the two thousand actual producers.—Now, bring the manufacturers so near the farmers that one thousand men can easily perform all the labor required to exchange their products, and it is clear that we have liberated two thousand from various non productive employments or functions, and added them to the number of producers. We have more grain grown and more cloth made, more wealth created and less capacity absorbed in pursuits which, however necessary under certain circumstances, add nothing to the sum of human comforts.

The true protective policy is simply the saving of human labor. Instead of sending wool, grain, and meat from America to Europe, and bringing back fabrics in return, it is cheaper and better to bring the manufacturer, once for all, from Europe to America, here feed him from the products of our generous soil. We hold that the farmer and manufacturer are alike benefited by this course; and that it insures to each a fuller reward for his labor, and a larger measure of sustenance and enjoyment.

But the best illustration of the benefits of a protective tariff is here in our own State. In 1860, we had but one woolen factory, and that one could scarcely pay running expenses by peddling out its goods. In 1861, when the Union party came into power, Congress passed a protective tariff act, and immediately our Oregon factory commenced making money. It not only paid off all its old debts, but built a large addition, filled it with new machinery, and followed that up by building in Salem the largest and finest flouring mill on the Pacific coast; and, not stopping at this, the principal stockholders in the concern have accumulated so much that, with singular ingratitude and no consistency, they now afford the time and money to go around over Oregon making copperhead speeches, and trying to convince the people that the policy of this Union party, which has made *them* rich, will now make everybody poor. This protective tariff law of the Union party, which put a proper tax on the goods of foreign manufactures, has not only brought great prosperity to the Salem Woolen Factory but it raised the price of wool in Oregon from 16 cents in 1860 to about 25 cents in 1864. More than this, it has so encouraged our wool-growers, that from one factory in 1860, the business now demands the services of four factories. For the great value of home manufactures, we need not go out of our own State for proof. Before the erection of the Salem Factory, Oregon wool was a useless commodity, in a great measure. When any price was placed upon it, it was a nominal one of 8 or 10 cents; but the erection of this Factory gave the article a standing on the market report at something about 16 cents, and gave hope to the wool grower. Now we have three factories in active operation, and a fourth almost ready to turn the water on the wheel. Let us make a little calculation, and see what these four factories will do for Oregon under the present protective tariff.—The Salem Mill employs an average of 80 men, at an average yearly pay of $700; and works up 300,000 lbs. wool annually. The Oregon City Factory will do about the same work, with about the same force. The Brownsville Factory will employ about 40 men, and work up about 150,000 lbs. wool. The Ellendale Factory will employ about twenty men, and work up about 75,000 lbs. wool annually. The pay of employees averages the same at each factory. Here, then, we have our four factories working up annually over 800,000 lbs. of Oregon wool; paying $700 per year to a small brigade of two hundred and twenty operatives—and paying out in Oregon for wool and labor alone nearly $330,000 per annum. In this calculation no reference is made to the cost of the buildings, or the employment which these operatives furnish to the butchers, shoemakers, and all other mechanics. Now, we ask the wool growers, farmers, mechanics, merchants, and manufacturers of Oregon, whether you want to see these Oregon woolen factories broken down, by removing the tariff from English goods, and thus permit English manufacturers to flood the country with goods made by labor at 60 cents per day, out of wool raised by the half-naked herdsmen of Australia and other penal colonies, at five cents per pound. If *you* do want to break down these Oregon factories, and destroy the business of growing wool in Oregon, then support the Democratic party, as that party is pledged to British free trade, and will most certainly repeal the present protective tariff, if it gets the control of Congress. But if the wool growers of Oregon desire to maintain their business, and aid our home factories to pay them living prices for wool, let them vote for the continuation of our protective tariff by voting for Mallory for Congress, and for Union members of the Legislature. Wool growers must not only vote for protection for the manufacturer, but also for themselves. Foreign wool is now taxed, and should be even more so than it is. Suppose the tax on foreign wool was taken off, as it will be if the Democrats obtain control of Congress. These factories here in Oregon could buy your wheat at a low price, ship it to Australia, and exchange it for Australian wool at 5 and 10 cents per pound, and bring it here, for less than you can raise wool in Oregon. Now, are you Oregon wool growers willing to be placed in competition on a level with the labor of the half-naked herdsmen, Botany Bay convicts, and London thieves of Australia? You must reflect seriously upon these matters before election day. The present tariff law is all that has protected you from that competition heretofore, and our Democratic politicians boldly put it in their platform that they will repeal that law, if they get a chance; and if they should succeed, and get the law repealed, *Oregon wool would not be worth ten cents a pound, or sheep four bits a head.* The wool growers of the Great West and of the Atlantic States are fully aroused on this question, and are battling manfully for protection—for more protection—and, for one, I am in favor of granting it.

The Wool Growers' Convention, of Southern Wisconsin and Northern Illinois, recently assembled at Burlington, Wisconsin, adopted the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of Congress to provide sufficient protection against the low prices of foreign wool grown in warm latitudes where the raising of food for sheep is unnecessary, and where wool can be grown for from five to twelve cents per pound.

2. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of Congress to impose a specific duty upon foreign wools competing with American wools, at the rate of fifteen cents per pound upon all unwashed wool thirty cents per pound on all washed wool, forty-five cents per pound on all scoured wool, and twenty-five cents per pound on all shoddy and woollen rags.

Oregon wool growers ought to resolve on this question by their most effective ballot. While the honest yeomanry, the laboring man, at home with his flocks, is asking protection, Oregon Democracy is declaring he shall not have it. The great advantages to a nation arising from protective tariffs was discovered long ago. Athens with her mining and manufacturing, governed Greece. Carthage, largely engaged in manufactures, controlled the commerce of half the then discovered globe. Holland was mistress of the commercial world in those days when the people of the Rhine cities boasted that they "bought of the stupid Englishman skins at a sixpence, and paid for them in tails at a shilling." The English, wiser grown, have got into the place of the Dutch in this relation of skins and tails, and preach Free Trade to the World. Their gospel is, "let the British do your manufacturing; confine yourselves to raising raw produce—sell them to us and take your pay in finished goods." If the United States have yet any hankering to swap skins at a sixpence for tails at a shilling, they had better fold up the stars and stripes and return to British Colonial vassalage. For that trade, which is British Free Trade, will make them slaves—slaves in dependence, slaves in poverty.

It is easily explained why the South wanted Free Trade before the war. Prof. Elliott, of the Planter's college, in Mississippi, explains it in his book, published in 1860, entitled—"Cotton is King," as follows:

"The opposition to the protective tariff by the South arose from two causes; the first openly avowed at the time, and the second clearly deducible from the policy it pursued.—The one to secure the foreign market for its cotton, the other to obtain a bountiful supply of provisions at cheap rates." * * * But they could not monopolize the market unless they could obtain a cheap supply of food and clothing for their negroes, and raise their cotton at such reduced prices as to undersell their rivals. A manufacturing population, with its mechanical coadjutors in the midst of the provision growers, on a scale such as the protective policy contemplated, it was conceived would create a permanent market for their products, and enhance the price; whereas, if this manufacturing could be prevented, and a system of free trade be adopted, the South would constitute the principal provision market of the country, and the fertile land of the North supply the cheap food demanded for its slaves."

Wool growers and wool manufacturers, you may be told that there is no danger; but I caution you to beware of the movements of these anti-protection democrats! They are pushing their views on this subject for some purpose or other. A few days ago, the democratic *Daily Herald*, of Portland, declared the following:

"But again, in accord with their old time faith of hostility to high tariffs, and protection for protection's sake, the democracy are calling upon the people to move upon the present tariff." This anti-protection movement, so soon after the war, is but a poor disguise for bankruptcy and repudiation. Repeal the Protective Tariff, flood the country with British goods, drain all the coin from the country to pay for them, break down all the home manufactures of iron, hardware, cotton and woolen goods, stop your factories and raise sheep only for the mutton, and it requires but little foresight to see what a universal crash would follow; the entire support of the government, with all the interest on the national debt, would then have to be wrung from the people by direct taxes; and in such a deplorable state of affairs it is easy to see that Southern Congressmen would be joined by Northern democrats in one universal howl for REPUDIATION. And in such a state of affairs, we are not certain of the result of such a cry. To forever prevent such a national dishonor, we must stick to "Protection and prosperity." One more thought on this subject, before we leave it. I assert that this anti-protection free trade move of democracy has been originated in England by the same men who contributed money to fit out the Alabama, and other pirates to prey upon American commerce, and aid the Southern Confederacy, by privateering and blockade running;—and that these enemies on British soil, the Southern Secessionists, and the Northern copperheads, have perfectly agreed and pulled together during the whole war, in aiding the rebellion, and that they are now in perfect accord on this question, and heartily working together, to the damage and imminent danger of American prosperity, and American Industry. In proof this, I submit the following extract from the *London Miners' Journal*, of January 6th:

"REPORT FROM NORTH AND SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE.

Orders are not yet coming in to such an extent; but there is pretty well to do, and decided confidence in the future. The fear that the American Congress may yet raise the duties on the import of iron into the States is almost the only speck in the horizon. Should that however, be done, it will probably give vigor to the free trade agitation, of which there are some signs, though there seems no hope of the speedy strengthening in Congress of the voice of that party by the admission of the representatives of the Confederacy."

There is a text for reflection, and I hope every lover of his country will think over it seriously, before election day.

English capitalists expended $1,250,000 in Washington City to procure the repeal of the protective tariff of 1842; and they have now reorganized their Free trade League, and are scattering British gold; and every copperhead newspaper is advocating their cause and making war on American industry. In reply to all this, the Democrats say that we are but asking protection for New England, and that New England is making fortunes out of Western consumers. It is doubtless true that New England manufacturers are making money, but it is equally true that during the past four years, the farmers, coal diggers, iron puddlers, and spinners have also made money. When one factory makes more than reasonable profits another factory will be started up to divide with the first, just as we have seen it with the woolen factories in Oregon. I am most heartily in favor of free trade among American Citizens, but not with foreigners who have no interest in our laws, or prosperity.

On the question also, of a protective tariff, I undertake to say that the present so-called Democratic party, is in direct opposition to James Madison, "the Father of the Constitution," Thos. Jefferson, James Monroe, and in fact all the best men of the Democratic party prior to the days of Jackson; and in conflict with the political principles of the Fathers of the Republic.

In 1791 Congress adopted an act for imposing duties on imports, the preamble of which contains the following language:

"Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States *and the encouragement and protection of manufacturers*, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported."

In a communication five years later than this, Washington said:

"Congress have repeatedly directed their attention to the encouragement of manufacturers. The object is of too much importance not to insure a continuance of these efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

In a special Message to Congress, dated Feb 20th, 1815, Madison says:

But there is no subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of congress, than a consideration of the means to *preserve and promote* the manufactures which have sprung into existence and attained an unparalled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of *national independence and wealth* I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant guardianship of congress.

In a letter to Benjamin Austin, dated Jan. 18th, 1816 Thomas Jefferson says:

"You tell me I am quoted by those who wish to continue our dependence on England for manufactures. There was a time when I might have been so quoted with more candor." * * * * "We have since experienced what we did not then believe, that there exists both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations—that to be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ourselves. *We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist.*" * * * * "He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say that I am not one of these. *Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort*; and if those who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me *in purchasing nothing foreign where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without any regard to difference of price*, it will not be our fault if we do not have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has so long wantonly violated it."

In his first annual Message, James Monroe says of manufactures.

Their prosecution, which depends on due encouragement, is connected with the high interests of the nation." (Born, raised, lived and died in Virginia, he was no New Englander, or Yankee.)

In his second (November 17, 1818,) he says:

The strict execution of the revenue laws, resulting principally from the salutary provisions of the act of the 20th of April last amending the several collection laws, has, it is presumed, secured to domestic manufactures all the relief that can be derived from the duties which have been imposed upon foreign merchandise *for their protection*. Under the influence of this relief, several branches of this important national interest have assumed greater activity, and although it is hoped that others will gradually revive and ultimately triumph over every obstacle, yet the expediency of granting *further protection* is submitted to your consideration.

In 1824 Gen. Jackson wrote a letter to Dr. Coleman of North Carolina, of which the following is an extract, in relation to the free trade ideas that Calhoun was then promulgating in the South:

"I will ask, what is the real situation of the agriculturist? Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus products? Except for cotton, he has neither a foreign nor a home market. Does not this clearly prove, when there is no market, either at home or abroad, that there is too much labor employed in agriculture, and that the channels of labor should be multiplied? Common sense points out at once the remedy. Draw from agriculture the superabundant labor; employ it in mechanism and manufactures, thereby creating a home market for your breadstuffs, and distributing labor to a most profitable account; and benefits to the country will result. Take from agriculture in the United States six hundred thousand men, women, and children, and you at once give a home market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes us. In short, sir, we have been too long subject to the policy of the British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of Europe, feed our own; or else, in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall all be paupers ourselves."

There is the testimony of the Father of his Country, of four Virginians, of the four greatest statesmen the Democratic party has ever produced, of five Southern men, having no connections with, or interests in New England, *directly against the present position* of Democracy on this question. No, fellow citizens, the Joe. Smiths, Kellys, O'Mearas and Fays, are not Democrats of the old school. They have no right to the name of Democracy. They have not got a single drop of true Democracy in their veins. The Union party now represents the principles of the true Democracy, and these fellows that are now claiming the name of Democracy in Oregon are bastards and spurious coin. Let the country be true to its own citizens and protect its own interests, and we will not halt on the road to peace and prosperity. Let it be settled that Protection is the policy of the Country, and we will yet see every drop of water now idly pouring over your majestic Falls, turned upon tireless wheels, factories and mills of every kind being multiplied, and Oregon City number its population of industrious and prosperous citizens, by scores of thousands.

I may have been tedious in treating this question, but its great importance, as one of the "living issues" of American politics at this time, must be my apology.

RECONSTRUCTION.

On the subject of reconstructing, or restoring the Southern States, to their proper relations with the Union, much misapprehension and confusion of ideas has doubtless been created by the terms "in the Union," and out of the Union. So far as the proper legislation is concerned, it is a matter of little consequence whether these rebel states be considered in the Union or out of it. That the actual relations existing between these States and the Union have been *altered and influenced* by the acts of secession, rebellion and war, cannot be reasonably denied. It would be simply ridiculous to assert that South Carolina maintained the same relations with the Union in 1863, as did Oregon; and to some extent the condition of South Carolina in 1863, attaches to the State, until her former relations with the Union are completely restored. In his late able speech in Congress Judge Williams says that the rebel States are not out of the Union in the sense in which Canada, a foreign nation, is out, and yet it is not in the Union as Oregon is. Probably the best of all definitions of this unsettled question, is the one given by the lamented martyr President in a speech made to some soldiers after the fall of Richmond, and a day or two before his assassination, where he spoke of the next great duty as being that of restoring these rebel States, "to their proper, practical relations with the Union." President Johnson recognized this disturbance of relations between the States and the Union, when he set up provisional governments in each of the rebel States. Congress repeatedly recognized the same state of affairs during the war, and long prior to any disagreement of opinion with the President. There is then not only a disturbance of the relations between the rebel States and the Union, and something necessary to be done to restore these States "to their proper practical relations with the Union"; but there is the far greater question—the removal of the cause of all this trouble, and exaction of "security for the future." These questions form at present the great centre of American politics, and about the disposal of which, political parties will fight their hardest battles.

Reconstruction of the rebel States, on the basis of future peace and security to the Union, involves 1st, the rights of States; 2d, the rights of persons.

From the formation of the government to the present time, there has been propagated more or less, a political idea inimical to the peace and prosperity of the Union: viz. That this United States government is but a compact between independent States; and *not* a government formed by the people and for the people. I assume to say that this doctrine was the cause of the late terrible war; and that until it is directly repudiated by the express language of the Constitution we cannot hope for peace or safety. I desire to briefly trace the history of this doctrine, and ask your careful attention to it. It is not altogether American in its origin. Although our present Constitution was bitterly opposed by Patrick Henry and others, because the preamble uses the words "we the people," and that far negatives the above doctrine, yet probably the first propagator of this heresy, after the Constitution had been adopted by the people of the United States, was a foreign emissary, sent to this country for the express purpose of sowing the seeds of dissolution, by teaching State Sovereignty to the dissatisfied and disappointed politicians of early days. Washington himself tells us that such emissaries came here from France during his administration; and it is a matter of history that a French Agent named Genet came to this country about that time, and established his headquarters at Charleston, South Carolina, and from thence, issued letters of marque against the British commerce, and did many other things to annoy the government and involve the people of South Carolina in trouble. The purpose and object of these emissaries of monarchical governments is plain. After the adoption of our Constitution, it was heralded throughout France and other European nations as a great achievement for liberty; and then the Republicans of France declared for "Washington's Constitution." I was forcibly reminded of the truth of this while speaking on this same subject the other day at Waconda; when Dr. Poujade, a white haired patriarch, a native of France, and a true Republican, warmly greeted me with the declaration "yes, yes, we Frenchmen always say *vive la* Washington." And no sooner had the Republicans of France declared for "Washington's Constitution," than the monarchists of that day at once assumed to be the best friends of liberty; just as we have seen in our day, the Democracy of Oregon claiming to be the best friends of the Constitution, while at the same time advocating the doctrines of Secession and Nullification, as stated in the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798. It was for the purpose of sapping "Washington's Constitution," and securing its future overthrow, that these emissaries of despotism and monarchy in Europe, came to this country, and taught to all whose ear could be obtained, the *European idea* that our government is but a compact between independent States, and not a government of the people. The crowned heads of Europe well knew, that if the whole American mind could be educated to that idea, it would not be many years until some local question would produce the practical application of the doctrine, in the nullification of some Congressional act, or the secession of some aggrieved State. This idea of course ignores the existence of the common arbiter of all the States—the Supreme Court.

The first out cropping of this "compact" theory of our general government, is found in the aforenamed Kentucky resolutions of 1798.

The first of these resolutions reads as follows:

Resolved, That the several States composing the United States of America, are not unlimited on the principle of unlimited submission to the General Government, but that by a compact, under the style of a constitution for the United States, and amendments thereto, they constitute a general government for special purposes, delegated to that government certain definitive powers, reserving, each State to itself, the residuary mass of the right to self government, and that whensoever the general Government assumes undelegated powers, its acts are unauthorized, void and of no force; that to this compact each State acceded as a and is an integral party; and its co-States forming as to itself the other party; and the government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact, among powers having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions, as the mode and measure of redress.

This resolution nowhere admits the people to be the source from whence came the general government, but utterly ignores their power or existence in the general government, and refers to the States as "powers," using the very language of the European diplomatists. It is well known to you all that these resolutions were sent to all the States then formed, and except as to Virginia, were repudiated by all the other States, as heretical and anti-republican.

We next hear of these Kentucky resolutions in 1832, where John C. Calhoun makes them the basis of nullification, and the excuse for attempted secession at that time. Gen. Jackson being President then, very unceremoniously snuffed out the South Carolina Confederacy.

We next hear of these resolutions in 1860, when every traitor and secessionist in the South quoted them as good and sufficient democratic authority for secession. They were not only so used by Southern traitors; but every democrat of the North who would not go into the Union party, fell back on these resolutions as an excuse for the revolutionary proceedings going on in the South.

To show you, gentlemen, the perfect concord between the secessionists and rebels of the South and the Democrats of Oregon, *on matters of platform and principle*, permit me to call your especial attention to two facts. The first is this: Jefferson Davis, in his special message to the Congress of the Southern Confederacy, April 20th, 1861, asserts that the democratic party of the free States stands committed to secession, in the following words: "From a period as early as 1798, there has existed in all the States a party, almost uninterruptedly in the majority, based upon the creed that each State was, in the last resort, the sole judge as well of its wrongs as of the mode and measure of redress. * * * * The democratic party of the United States repeated, in its successful canvass of 1836, the declarations made in previous political contests, that it would faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky resolutions of 1798."

Now to that assertion that the Northern democracy was pledged to sustain secession, how did the Oregon democracy respond at its convention in 1864? Did it repudiate the assertion of the traitor Jeff Davis, as it now repudiates the charge of secession, when made in the Union platform? No sirs. Instead of repudiating the charge of secession then, when made by Jefferson Davis, the Oregon Democracy, at its convention in 1864, responded back to Jeff Davis at Montgomery: "We agree with you, brother Jeff; we stand on that platform of yours;" and we adopt the resolutions of 1798." [A voice, "that's so."] The Oregon Democracy agreed with Davis in 1864, and adopted secession and nullification, and Col. Kelly ran for Congress on that Davis platform, and went all over the State making speeches in favor of it. And yet in his speech at Salem he had the effrontery to deny that democracy had ever recognized secession, in any way, and defied his competitor, Gov. Woods, to produce the resolution of any democratic convention to disprove his statement. There is the resolution which disproves Col. Kelly's statement, and establishes the truth of the charge made in the Union Platform. There is the resolution, and the history, which shows the perfect concord between the Democracy of Oregon, and the secessionists and traitors of the South. If Col. Kelly desired more testimony than this to make him acknowledge the error of his denial, it is found in the following resolutions adopted by the California Democratic State Convention, of 1862:

Resolved, That we are opposed to the employment of force by the General Government against the Seceded States for the purpose of compelling obedience and submission to the Federal authority.

Resolved, That we are in favor of the preservation of the Union upon constitutional guarantees which will be acceptable to both sections of the Confederacy, but if that desirable consummation be impossible, *then we are in favor of the recognition of the independence of the Confederate States* and a treaty of amity and peace between them and the United States government as the alternative which will terminate the horrors of civil war, and bring back happiness to our distracted country.

If the democratic party is not now in favor of secession, when did it cease to be? We do not desire to take up time reading from a thousand sources the evidence, unquestioned and undeniable, that the Oregon Democracy has for the last four years been entirely upon the side of secession and treason, of rebellion and traitors.

We have been thus careful to trace the history of this "State sovereignty," "State compact," theory of our government, in order to show not only its foreign anti-republican origin but also its growth, and legitimate fruits; and the necessity now existing, at this crisis of public affairs, for the election of Union men to the Legislature and other offices, to the end that this hateful heresy may be directly and certainly repudiated by the express language of the Constitution, in adopting amendments thereto. The recent language of Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, the most thoughtful and considerate of Southern leaders, in which he declares that the Southern men have not changed much on the subject of States Rights, together with the testimony of Gen. Thomas, and many others to the effect that the Southern people have not changed their minds on the subject of secession, and that they yet entertain hopes of establishing the Southern Confederacy, warn the American people to be sure that they settle this question of Secession and nullification, while the power yet remains in the hands of those who are unquestionably loyal to the Union of the people.

I may be told here, that there is danger of centralization and consolidation. So long as we recognize the doctrine that it is the people who bear rule, there is no danger of doing any hurt by consolidization. The interests of the Republic are now too extensive and diverse to admit of any dangerous consolidation of power. But that there is need of a consolidation of interests to the extent that the government of the United States shall be recognized as a government *of the people and by the people*. I earnestly maintain. On this question, again, I will offer the testimony of the "Fathers of the Constitution," and great leaders of the Democratic party in the days of its purity.—George Washington was President of the Convention which framed the Constitution. It will not be denied that he is a good witness.—In his official letter to the Continental Congress, transmitting the new Constitution he says:

"In all our deliberations on this subject, (the Constitution,) we kept steadily in view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American, *the consolidation of our Union*, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence."

This letter of Washington's was unanimously endorsed by the Constitutional Convention. In the Federalist, James Madison frequently alludes to the proposed government as a "Nation," and as a government of the people. But the most authoritative statement ever made by Madison on the point at issue is made in his celebrated letter to Edward Everett, dated August, 1830, on the subject of nullification. He commences that letter by referring to the resolutions of 1798 and 1799, and then, speaking of the Constitution of the United States, says:

"It was formed, *not by the governments of the component States*, as the Federal Government (the old Confederation), for which it was substituted, was formed. Nor was it formed by a majority of the people of the United States, as a single community, in the manner of a consolidated government. It was formed by the States, that is, *by the people in each of the States*, acting in their highest sovereign capacity—and formed, consequently, by the same authority that formed the State constitutions. Being thus derived from the same source as the Constitutions of the States, it has within each State the same authority as the Constitution of the State."

Patrick Henry violently opposed the adoption of the Constitution, for the very reason that the preamble to the Constitution uses the words, "We, the people," instead of "We, the States," and Madison advocated its adoption, for the same reason. There can be no doubt that the Fathers of the Constitution, Washington, Madison, Jay and Hamilton, and their associates, considered the government formed, as one deriving its power and authority directly from the people, and not from the State governments. And here again, the Oregon democracy are directly in opposition to the fathers of the old Democratic party.

It is an important question, now, one of the "living issues," whether or not some amendment shall be added to the Constitution, clearly settling this matter, and forever quieting the minds of the American people on this doctrine of Secession and Nullification. The Union party is in favor of such an amendment, while the democracy is opposed to it. In proposing any amendment, we ought to go back to first principles. In a republican form of government, all power and authority is derived from the people. It was intended by the framers of our government, to lay the foundations of a Republic, in truth and in fact, and to lay such foundations on the unchanging basis of justice and right. It is not surprising that there should have been some questions left open for discussion. This State Sovereignty question has been open for discussion, and it has been the cause of all our troubles. It is necessary to settle it now and forever. The Reconstruction Committee in Congress has reported an amendment for that purpose, which will doubtless be submitted by Congress to the States. It is in the following words:

Sec. 1. No State shall make any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without a due process of law, nor deny any person within its jurisdiction equal protection under the law.

This is the principal amendment, and if incorporated into the Constitution, will forever bury the treasonable heresies of secession and nullification. It will also secure justice to every person within the jurisdiction of the Union. It ought to be adopted; *and it will be adopted.* [Applause.]

At this stage of the discussion, we are frequently asked about the admission to Congress of the Southern Representatives. For my part, and so far as I know, I believe that the Union party is agreed to the admission of such loyal Representatives from the South as desire to come in now. But the Union men will never agree that notorious rebels shall be recognized as loyal men, simply because they can exhibit an executive pardon. [Applause.] This is not the evidence of loyalty which genuine patriotism would offer; and because nineteen twentieths of the Southern Representatives are of this class, Congress has justly refused to admit them.

President Johnson would doubtless be satisfied with the admission of the Tennessee members, and Congress has more than once signified a willingness to admit them, upon taking the test oath, but there is even some of these who cannot take this oath. It must be borne in mind, that Col. Stokes of Tennessee, and the other truly loyal Representatives from the South, have declined to go into Congress until the whole question of Reconstruction has been settled. They have adopted this course in order that their admission may not be taken as a precedent to affect other cases before the complete adjustment of the whole question.

Congress has proposed some other amendments, some of which may be ratified, and some may not be. The whole of them, and each of them are designed to secure peace in the future. The main features of them will be adopted in some shape or other. They embrace nothing more than President Johnson has heretofore indicated in his speeches and letters. In the language of the President, when he accepted the Union nomination for the Vice Presidency: "*Treason must be made odious, and traitors must be punished.* And while society is in this disordered state, and we are seeking security, *let us fix the foundation of the government on principles of eternal justice, which will endure for all time.*" (Applause.)

In examining the second proposition of the subject of reconstruction; viz: The Rights of Persons, the Union party has taken the ground that justice must be secured to each and all alike, without distinction of color. And I know of no better foundation, or platform of principles, on this subject than the one so well defined by President Johnson in his speech to the colored soldiers in October, 1865. In that somewhat celebrated speech, President Johnson says:

"It being unusual in this Government and in most of the other Governments to have colored troops engaged in their service, you have gone forth as events have shown, and served with patience and endurance in the cause of your country. This is your country as well as anybody else's country. [Cheers.] This is the country in which you expect to live and in which you should expect to do something by your example in civil life as you have done in the field. This country is founded upon the principles of equality, and at the same time the standard by which persons are to be estimated is according to heir merit and their worth; and you have observed no doubt, that for him who does his duty faithfully and honestly, there is always a just public judgment that will appreciate and measure out to him his proper reward. * * * In a government of freedom and of liberty there must be law and there must be obedience and submission to law, without regard to color.—[Cheers.] Liberty (and may I not call you my countrymen?) consists in the glorious privilege of work; of pursuing the ordinary avocations of peace with industry and with economy; and that being done, all those who have been industrious and economical are permitted to appropriate and enjoy the products of their own labor." [Cheers.]

There is the Civil Rights Bill in a very few words. But again:

"Henceforth, each and all of you must be measured according to your merit. If one man is more meritorious than the other they cannot be equals; and he is the most exalted who is the most meritorious, without regard to color. And the idea of having a law passed in the morning that will make a white man black before night, and a black man a white man before day, is absurd. That is not the standard. It is your own conduct; it is your own merit; it is your own talents and your own intellectuality and moral qualities."

I clipped this speech from the *State Rights Democrat*, of December 2, 1865. O'Meara prefacing it with the remark, "How this expression of sentiment will be received by Mr. Johnson's new 'democratic' friends, brief time must develop." Well, now, what did "brief time" develop? That for the hope of getting votes, the Democracy of Oregon is now pretending to endorse "our Andy" everywhere, and therefore endorsing this piece of *unalloyed negro equality*. [Great applause.] Yes, gentlemen, we have fastened negro equality upon the Democracy, or they must repudiate Johnson, and they can choose either horn of the dilemma they please. But it matters not what they do; it matters not what Johnson or Congress may do; the principles enunciated by Johnson in that speech, are now thoroughly settled in the American mind, and if neither he nor Congress carries out these principles, the American people will. [Applause.] In that speech, Johnson laid down the principles of the Civil Rights Bill, nearly six months before the Bill was thought of. The Union men endorse Johnson's speech to the colored soldiers, and they endorse the Civil Rights Bill. On other occasions, Johnson has gone further than Congress has ever gone. Even old Thad Stevens has now given up negro suffrage, and yet Johnson has repeatedly recommended negro suffrage to the Southern States. Do the Democrats endorse this? If they do not, their endorsement of Johnson is not honest, and made only to deceive. The American people have made up their minds to do justice to the negro. Justice will be secured to him before reconstruction is completed. In the language of President Johnson himself, "No state can be regarded as thoroughly organized, which has not adopted *irreversible guarantees* for the rights of the freedmen." Irreversible guarantees can be such only as are put into the Constitution of the United States. If put in a State Constitution only, the State might reverse them, but when placed in the national bond of Union, the great loyal heart of the North will forever prevent their reversal.

I think it has been shown that on all the great questions now pending, the Democracy of Oregon, is not only on the wrong side, but in direct opposition to the principles of the Fathers of the old Democratic party. The so-called Democracy of Oregon, appeal to the past as proof their wisdom, when the fact is that they cannot possibly trace their principles back farther than Frank Pierce and old Buchanan, and both of these Democrats are on the record in favor of secession and the Southern Confederacy. The principles of these Oregon Democrats are a disgrace to such names as Madison and Jackson. The Oregon Democracy ought to be named the *Demagoguery* party, instead of the old name. The Union party now hold the principles of Andrew Jackson, and the Fathers of the Constitution; while these latter-day Democrats, being first demoralized by joining with slavery, have become rotten and fetid with a treasonable sympathy with the Southern traitors. They have a kind word in their platform for the lamented Douglas. They have no right to mention his name. In his lifetime they heaped upon his head their vilest curses. Here is what he thinks of them, taken from one of his speeches made in 1846. Listen to it:

"Patriotism emanates from the heart, fills the soul, infuses itself into the whole man, and speaks and acts the same language. A friend of his country in war will feel, speak and act for his country, revere his country's cause and hate his country's enemies. America wants no friend, acknowledges the fidelity of no citizen, who, after war is declared, condemns the justice of her cause and sympathizes with the enemy. All such are traitors in their hearts." [Applause.]

Let the Jo Smiths and the Kelleys wriggle and squirm under the charge of treason, here are the words of Stephen A. Douglas, who declares "*all such to be traitors in their hearts.*" [Applause.] Let no friend of the noble Douglas ever consort with the Oregon Democrats; his last words to his countrymen, appealed to you, and to all, to rally to the support of Abraham Lincoln, and aid him in putting down the traitors of the South. There can be no divisions between old line Republicans and the true friends of Douglas. They shook hands over the grave of Douglas, and mingled their tears in one common oblation over the grave of the martyred Lincoln, and henceforth they will march forward, shoulder to shoulder, in one solid and indivisible phalanx, keeping step to the music of the Union, until the principles of freedom and justice shall be so established in the laws and ordinances of the land, and in the hearts and affections of the people, that no traitor band will ever disturb their deep repose. [Applause.]

In conclusion, let me appeal to you, fellow-citizens, to work with a will for the overwhelming triumph of our whole ticket. I thank you for your kind attention. [Applause.]

OREGON CITY, May 18, 1866.

PUBLISHER STATESMAN—Having heard the speech delivered by Mr. J. Gaston, at Oregon City, on the 17th day of May, and believing that the facts and figures embodied therein would make an effective campaign document, we would ask you to publish it in the *Statesman*, if convenient for you to do so.

W. W. BUCK, JOSEPH D. LOCEY,
HENRY WARREN, OWEN WADE,
D. P. THOMPSON, J. L. BARLOW.

Notice.

I OFFER for sale a half or a whole section of land of early selection and of superior quality, nearly all inclosed and well improved, with all necessary buildings. Living water on the premises—part prairie, part timber and brush land. And a good variety of fruit trees.

I propose to sell the above tracts of land at half their cost.

My residence is four miles north of Silverton, Marion county, Oregon. BENJ. CLEAVER.

May 4th, 1866. 3w11pd