THE STATE RIGHTS DEMOCRAT.

VOL. 1. ALBANY, LINN COUNTY, OREGON, MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1865. NO. 3.

STATE RIGHTS DEMOCRAT.

ISSUED EVERY MONDAY,

IN ALBANY, LINN COUNTY, OGN.

JAS. O'MEARA,

PUBLISHER AND EDITOR.

Office, over the Store of J. Norcross & Co.

TERMS:

FOR SUBSCRIPTION:

One Copy for One Year - - - $3
One Copy for Six Months - - - $2

☞ Payment to be made in advance in every case. The Paper will not be sent to any address unless ordered, and the term for which it shall be ordered be paid for. *No departure will be made from these terms in any instance.*

N. B. Timely prior notice will be given to each Subscriber of the week on which his subscription will expire, and unless an order for its continuance, accompanied with the money, be given, the Paper will be discontinued to that address.

FOR ADVERTISING:

For One Square, of Twelve Lines, or Less, One Insertion - - - - - $3
For Each Subsequent Insertion - - 1

☞ A Liberal Reduction from these Rates to Quarterly, Half Yearly and Yearly Advertisers, and upon all Lengthy Advertisements, will be made.

GENERAL NOTICE:

Correspondents writing over assumed signatures or anonymously, must make known their proper names to the Editor, or no attention will be given to their communications.

All Letters and Communications, whether on business or for publication, should be addressed to the Editor.

Spicy Interview Between President Johnson and Senator Sumner---The latter Snubbed.

The Cincinnati Enquirer of July 17th gives the following:

A friend at Washington assures us that a few weeks since an interview took place between President Johnson and Senator Sumner, which was substantially as follows:

"Good evening, Mr. President," said Senator Sumner, last week, upon entering the President's room in the White House.

"Good evening, Mr. Senator," replied the President. "Please be seated for a moment, until I finish a letter to an old friend."

The letter being finished, the President turned to Mr. Sumner, when the latter said:

"Mr. President, I have called on you for the purpose of expressing to you the views of our people on the subject of reconstruction."

"Well, sir," replied the President.

Mr. Sumner commenced by saying: "Sir, your North Carolina Proclamation does not meet the approbation of the people, and they will not submit to have the great results of the war thus thrown away."

"What people are you representing, Sir?" asked Mr. Johnson.

"The whole Northern people," said Mr. Sumner.

"I apprehend you will find you but represent a small portion of the Northern people," replied Mr. Johnson.

"Then," said Sumner, "we must take your North Carolina Proclamation as an indication of your policy, must we?"

"Yes, sir," replied the President.

"Then, sir," said Sumner, "you do not intend to enfranchise the black man?"

"I have nothing to do with the subject; that exclusively belongs to the States. You certainly would think it a usurpation on my part if I attempted to interfere in fixing the qualifications of electors in Massachusetts."

"But," replied Sumner, "Massachusetts has always been a loyal State."

"That may be," replied the President, "but the loyal men of the South have made untold sacrifices for their Union sentiments, while Massachusetts has made hundreds of millions out of her loyalty, and it would be a poor return for Southern adherence to the Government, if the latter should, in violation of the Constitution, thrust upon them local laws in opposition to their wishes."

At this reply of the President, Mr. Sumner became impatient and irritable, and rejoined by saying: "I am sorry to see you evincing so little sympathy with that element that placed you in power."

At this, the color flashed to the President's face, and he added, emphatically, "You and I might as well understand each other now as any other time. You are aware, sir, I have no respect for a secessionist; but, as much as I despise them, I still have a greater detestation and contempt for a fanatic."

"Good evening," said Sumner, and left in a huff.

FIFTY-FIVE YEARS OF MISSIONARY EFFORT. The American Board of Foreign Missions have been in existence fifty-five years, in which time it has spent some $5,000,000 and converted some 60,000 souls, or a few over 1,000 annually. This is about one-eighth the number of African communicants of Christian churches in the South before this "blessed war" to liberate the negro's soul (from his body) had begun its "holy work." Out of 4,000,000 slaves some 450,000 were Christians, but being unenlightened by the inspiration of the Bible according to Beecher, of course their salvation was not worth a rush compared with the success of "great moral ideas." The converts of heathendom made by all the missionary efforts of all the world did not equal one-half the number of christianized Africans in the South in 1860, to say nothing of the thousands who during sixty or seventy years previous had died rejoicing in their simple faith in Jesus Christ. But then they were slaves, and their 'unpaid labor' was growing cotton to clothe the backs and sugar to tickle the palate of Northern philanthropists, and pious Puritanism was getting no glory to itself from their material and spiritual welfare.—[Republican (L. I.) Watchman.

RIGHT IN THAT.—President Johnson lately ordered the release of two citizens of New York who had been tried by a military court, convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment and fine each, and commanded that they should be handed over for trial to the civil authorities. This was right. Now, let him follow up this excellent precedent

SPEECH OF GEN. BLAIR.

His Views on Negro Suffrage, Reconstruction and the Treatment of Rebels.

The following is copied from the revised report of the speech made by Major General Francis P. Blair of Missouri, at the banquet given to him in St. Louis, June 22d. We ask Democrats to show it to their Abolition neighbors. Gen. Blair said:

Gentlemen and Friends, the war having closed, substantially, a great many of the men who have been engaged in it, among others myself, will soon return to the ranks of the people again, and be promoted as high privates; but the great question which has disturbed the equilibrium of our Government for so many years has been settled, and settled by the sword. I have read the speech of the Governor of our State, delivered on a recent occasion, and he said the soldiers returning from the war came back and found the soil of Missouri unpolluted by slavery; that whilst they had been fighting the enemy, certain things had been achieved here. Slavery had been banished. *It was the sword that banished slavery from the land.* It was the war that settled that question, and although I do not care to deny to any of these gentlemen who have been at home, the glory of having sustained the armies, and aided them in their career of victory, yet it was the war which has decided and finished that question, and settled it forever. That question having been settled, I think we should have some new issues now, and entirely different ones; that we ought to give a decent burial to this institution of slavery, and have done with it, and meet the living issues as they arise; and the great question now is, as it strikes my mind, the question of the reorganization of the States which have been in rebellion. It seems to me to be [illegible] worthy of the consideration [illegible] statesmen, and that they o[illegible] the godsy to questions that a[illegible] ought to be buried, and take h[illegible] and those other living issues [illegible] an interest for our people, a[illegible] will always have an interest f[illegible] It is better, also, that we should get rid of these old issues, because we can then better judge, with clear and unbiassed minds, as to what should be done for the future in the reorganization of the States. If our minds are filled with the old prejudices and feelings on the question of slavery we shall not be able to consider fairly, dispassionately, and with that calmness which the magnitude of the question demands—that great question of the reorganization of the State Governments which have been in rebellion. Therefore, the sooner we get rid of the dead and buried the better for the living.

Now, I believe, for my own part, in the theory proclaimed by Mr. Lincoln for the reorganization of the States—a theory which has been sanctioned by the people in the last Presidential election, and which has been announced in the proclamation of Andrew Johnson. It is, I believe, satisfactorily known to everybody that those who maintained a different view of this question, and contended for the nomination with Mr. Lincoln, did not receive a single vote in the Convention at Baltimore, although there were many who went to that Convention to vote against Mr. Lincoln. Yet Mr. Lincoln had announced again and again in different letters in regard to Louisiana, and in regard to Arkansas especially in a letter which he addressed to General Steele, as to the manner in which these States should be reorganized and come again to resume the functions of Government. The people indorsed it because they elected them, and they rejected the other propositions because they rejected the representative men who put them forward, and Andrew Johnson, true to the pledges which he made to the people, and which were sanctioned by the people in the election, has issued his proclamation for the reorganization of Government in North Carolina and several of the other States, in which he assumed the position maintained by Mr. Lincoln in his last utterance. Said he: "I do not know that these States have ever been abroad." The States have never been out of the Union, and a man who maintains that they have been out of the Union because there were certain traitors in those States is just as much a secessionist as the secessionists themselves who attempted to carry them out. Now, what is the difference between these classes of people? They do it from different motives, and they ought to have the benefit of their motives, but still they maintain that the Union was actually dissolved. They must maintain it, because they undertake to lay on these States conditions which they do not impose on the other Statts. Now every State in the Union has, heretofore, without question from any quarter, decided who should exercise the right of suffrage within its borders. The States always controlled that question. Rhode Island excludes a large part of its foreign population from the right of suffrage by a property qualification. An Irishman or a German, no matter what his other qualifications, cannot vote if he does not own a certain amount of real estate in Rhode Island—and they would have to cut it up very small to afford any large voting population (laughter). He cannot exercise the franchise in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Who has ever questioned the right of Rhode Island, small as she is, or of any other State, to maintain its restrictions upon the elective franchise. But now some men say that the revolted States, those States that have been in rebellion, where certain men have usurped power, that said States subjected themselves to a certain condition of inferiority and that they cannot now return to the Union except the Congress of the United States first prescribe who shall be electors in those States. Andrew Johnson has put his foot on that proposition (cheers), and Andrew Johnson was compelled to put his foot on it if he was an honest man. If he believes in the Constitution of the United States, which he swore to execute when he took his oath of office, he must put his foot on any such proposition.

Now, I shall not pursue this theme at all, because there may be those here who dissent from me, and I simply, after so long an absence, come and exercise my right of speaking my sentiments without reserve, but at the same time without heat or partisan feeling.

But there is another proposition which has an interest for me, and I speak of it because I have thought of it more than any other in my recent career, whilst I have lost sight of some of the questions which have agitated the State of Missouri, and cannot speak of the great question which was recently determined here, very distinctly, although I have a lurking suspicion about it. But these general questions I have thought a great deal about, and the next question is the manner in which we shall treat the population of the South, those even who have been in the rebellion and borne arms. Upon this question I haven't had occasion to change my mind since I spoke here last and quoted the language of Senator Benton. That great man on one occasion gave utterance to the sentiment that moderation was the ornament of victory. It was at a moment when he had been triumphant over his enemies, and his *triumphant friends* surrounded him on all sides, and cheer after cheer rose for him. In the midst of all this exultation he said: "My friends, exultation is natural, but moderation is the ornament of victory."

Now when we look back, and scan for a moment the origin of the rebellion, the manner in which it was brought to pass; when we see—for I refer to what was known to all of you—when we see that a few armed men in these Southern States, armed by conspirators, who got their arms from the Government of the United States; furnished by the Secretary of War, connived at by the President of the United States; when these men had got the whole of the States in their hands, they turned their power, their arms against men devoted to the Union; and our Government at Washington stood still, and did nothing to protect and defend these unarmed men who were Unionists, but allowed them to be forced into rebellion. Can we hold such men to a strict accountability? Who is blameless in this matter, and who is most to blame.

Virginia voted by 80,000 majority against secession, but then conspirators armed by officials of our own Government, forced Virginia out of the Union, and for months after we had a Republican President—not alone while we had a President of the Democratic school—the Government stood by with folded hands and refused even to feed its soldiers cooped up in the beleagured forts of the South. In Louisiana, after the ordinance of secession was passed upon and submitted to the people, it is notorious that it was voted down by a large majority, but the band of conspirators seized the Arsenal, refused to publish the vote, and drove the Union men into rebellion.

That was the condition of affairs. People will say, and people do say—I have heard them say so—that these unarmed Union men of the South, who were a majority of the people, ought not to have submitted, but ought to have been torn asunder rather than submit. But look now how these men treat the subject when it affects other questions and persons. It is notorious that the negroes built almost all the fortifications in the South; but who holds the negroes responsible for these things? Would there not be an outcry raised among those who are so revengeful towards that other class of people, if we should undertake to punish those negroes for building the fortifications around Richmond, Atlanta, and Vicksburg? It would be absurd, it would be ridiculous, to hold them responsible for doing that work, because they did it reluctantly—they were compelled to do it, and this Government of ours had not the power to relieve them. And so it was with the vast majority of the people of the South, in regard to the rebellion, and we all know it to be so.

I would have, instead of the sentiment which I understand was uttered here the other night—that these men shall not be allowed to return to this State—I would have the proclamation of the President carried out in good faith. When an amnesty has been given by the President, an amnesty should be given in good faith by the people. Now this thing of political persecution and execution, which is not necessary for the safety of our Government, is intolerable, and repugnant to every man's sense of justice and right. It is contrary to the character of the great and magnanimous people like that to which we belong—a people who have the power to maintain their own institutions against all adverse fortune—not like the miserable dynasties of Europe, that see suspicion lurking in every shade, and who are ready to hedge themselves round with terror and to execute every man who utters a sentiment of disloyalty to their crown—but we people are great and magnanimous and can forgive, because the principles which we uphold live forever and are indestructible. (loud cheers). And when war is ended, war should end, and peace should begin, else, when can we have peace? We would forever be compelled to keep our armor buckled on and maintain an army which would of itself saddle us with debt and taxation that would be felt by our remotest posterity, and although the Republic has maintained itself against intestine foes, yet if you keep alive this animosity, if the persecuting and unrelenting spirit is allowed to keep alive animosity and keep up a division, it will be productive of no good result. You know and you must all feel that we have other enemies. The gentleman who addressed you a few moments ago (Col. Baker) alluded to the fact that in the home of troubles there came a thief from the other continent, clothed with the mantle of monarchy and seized one of the fairest territories of the American continent—that Bonaparte, with one of the Hapsburgs in his arms, came over and seated him on the throne of the Montezumas, thus occupied the territory which interposes between our great Atlantic and Pacific—a position in which he threatens to divide us in twain as a wedge. Now we have got to look out in that quarter, and there may be other quarters in which we shall have to look, and we cannot afford to make enemies any more than we have.

I say that we can't afford to make any more enemies than we have. I say that there can be no justice for any execution which is not demanded by the safety of the State, because these men have already been afflicted by this war. And retaliation! Follow in the track of the army that marched from this city to the sea, and from thence to Washington, witnessing that scene of desolation and destruction, necessary without doubt for the safety of the Government, and you will think with me that there has been retaliation enough. The war is ended, but the desolation rests and broods upon them still. Their homes exist no longer, and that people are driven out, and therefore, as for myself, to a man accustomed to look at things as I do, I can see no necessity of further making treason odious, as it is already odious, and no punishment that we could possibly inflict could equal the punishment which has already been inflicted—a punishment justified by the laws of war, by the great object we had in view,—the restoration of our Government, but justifiable for no other reason and by no other right; nor can its prosecution in any other shape or form be justifiable, unless the safety of the Government is in peril. And policy, my friends, which proceeds from mere malice comes from hell. (Cheers). Therefore, I embrace the doctrines which have been put forth by the President of the United States in his several proclamations, and I trust that the wounds that have been inflicted by this war will be healed and that the boon of freedom, which is all that we have snatched from this terrible scene of devastation, will repay, (and I think it will at no distant day) all the suffering through we have gone.

Mr. Lincoln Wanted Jeff. Davis to Escape.

"Agate," the correspondent of the Cincinnati Gazette, has the following statement in reference to General Sherman and President Lincoln:

CITY PT. MACON, N. C., June 7, '65.

The General complained, and doubtless with some truth, if not justice, that the Government had never distinctly explained to him what policy it desired to have pursued. "I asked Mr. Lincoln explicitly when I went up to City Point whether he wanted me to capture Jeff. Davis or let him escape, and in reply he told me a story."

That "story" may now have a historical value, and I give it therefore as Gen. Sherman said Mr. Lincoln told it—only premising that it was a favorite story with Mr. Lincoln, which he told many times, and in illustration of many points of public policy.

"I'll tell you, General," Mr. Lincoln was said to have began. "I'll tell you what I think about taking Jeff. Davis. Out in Sangamon County there was an old temperance lecturer, who was very strict in the doctrine and practice of total abstinence. One day, after a long ride in the hot sun, he stopped at the house of a friend, who proposed making him a lemonade. As the mild beverage was being mixed, the friend insinuatingly asked if he wouldn't like just the least drop of something stronger, to brace up his nerves after the exhausting heat and exercise. 'No,' replied the lecturer, 'I couldn't think of it. I'm opposed to it on principle.' 'But,' he added, with a longing glance at the black bottle that stood conveniently at hand, 'if you could manage to put in a drop unbeknownst to me, I guess it wouldn't hurt me much.'"

"Now, General," Mr. Lincoln is said to have concluded, "I'm bound to oppose the escape of Jeff. Davis; but if you could manage to let him slip out unbeknownst-like, I guess it wouldn't hurt me much!"

"And that," exclaimed Gen. Sherman, "is all I could get out of the Government as to what its policy was concerning the rebel leaders, till Secretary Stanton assailed me for Davis' escape."

A Poor Assortment to Select From.

The Harrisburg Patriot, of June 13th, publishing a letter from an imaginary loyal office-holder, to clerical friends, which is one of the best specimens of political satire we have read in a long period, alluding to the common and insulting intimation of so-called "loyal" lecturers that Democrats will be so ashamed of their course that they will want to change their names and those of their children, the writer facetiously says:

"What shall I change it to? If I call myself Greeley they might think that I wrote that poetry about the 'Flaunting Lie' and the 'Starry Rag.' If I call myself Garrison they will swear that I was the chap that denounced the Constitution of the United States as a 'covenant with Death and an agreement with Hell.' If I call myself Sumner I might be mobbed for saying that 'the man who obeyed the Constitution was a dog.' If I took the name of Wright, who knows but that I should be followed up as the howling infidel who said that 'if God Almighty did not abolish slavery, *He was a very great scoundrel.*' And I certainly shan't call myself Phillips, for fear excited bondholders should lynch me for proposing to repudiate the national debt. * * * If I have to drop my old name and take up a new one, *you have a d—d poor assortment in the Abolition vocabulary to choose from.*"

Great talkers are like cracked pitchers; everything runs out of them.

WENDELL PHILLIPS' VIEWS.

He Fears the Reconstruction of the South, and Distrests President Johnson.

Wendell Phillips made a speech at Farmingham, Massachusetts, July 4th, from which we take a significant passage. After describing the four different elements of power which the white race possesses—to-wit: wealth, fashion, money and politics—he asks for the negroes the advantage of the fourth element, to protect themselves against the white race, which possesses against them the three other elements, as well as the fourth. Mr. Phillips then says:

Mr. Sumner, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Kelley, they say to him: "Sir, the white race has three elements; make the fourth impartial." The President says: "I hesitate, I do not see my way clear." What do these gentlemen say? "If you don't see your way clear, stop; if the way don't open before you, stand still until it does. If you don't see your way clear to reorganize those States, keep them where they are." That is the advice Mr. Sumner gave him; that is the advice Mr. Boutwell gave him; that is the advice Judge Kelly gave him. I have no disposition to bear hard upon the President. The solution of the question depends upon his being on our side. I am standing here to-day to take counsel with you to find out—what? Two things: What are the indications in our position today of where the President means to stand? That is the first question. The second is, If he is not standing right today, how can he be made to? Let me show you the importance of this question: "Where will President Johnson stand on the 4th day of December next?" The prominent public speakers recently undertook to discuss how we could keep the rebel States out of Congress. Men say: "The next Congress may be relied upon; they cannot get a majority to vote them in. No matter where President Johnson stands; there is the bulwark of Congress; they never will recognize these States." Is not that the comfort which many politicians gives you? There would be some hope if the members of Congress [illegible] have an opportunity—with the d[illegible] of the rebel States outside of the [illegible] Congress—to vote whether they should sit there. But in my opinion President Johnson's theory is, that the States have never been out of the Union. Their relations have only been [illegible] destroyed. They are going [illegible] bers of Congress chosen [illegible] During the next five months [illegible] elected. On the 4th day of December Congress Southern Congressmen from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Florida and Texas will come into Washington. Will they be outside of the door of Congress? No, they will walk in [illegible] in their old seats [illegible] Senate. Senators [illegible] Senate. Senators [illegible] Senate. Senators