THE STATE RIGHTS DEMOCRAT.

VOL. 1. ALBANY, LINN COUNTY, OREGON, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1865. NO. 5.

STATE RIGHTS DEMOCRAT.

ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY,

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.

THE STAMMERING WIFE.

When, deeply in love with Miss Emily Pryne,
I vowed, if the maiden would only be mine,
I would always endeavor to please her—
She blushed her consent, tho' the stuttering lass
Said never a word, except, "You're an ass—
An ass—an ass-iduous teazer!"

But when we were married, I found to my ruth,
The stammering lady had spoken the truth,
For often, in obvious dudgeon,
She'd say—if I ventured to give her a jog
In the way of reproof, "You're a dog—you're a dog—
A dog—a dog-matic curmudgeon!"

And once when I said, we can hardly afford
This extravagant style, with our moderate hoard,
And hinted we ought to be wiser,
She looked, I assure you, exceedingly blue,
And fretfully cried, "You're a Jew—you're a Jew—
A very ju-dicious adviser!"

Again, when it happened that, wishing to shirk
Some rather unpleasant and arduous work,
I begged her to go to a neighbor,
She wanted to know why I made such a fuss,
And saucily said, "You're a cus—cus—cus
You were always so-cus-tomed to labor!"

Out of temper at last with the insolent dame,
And feeling that Madam was greatly to blame
To scold me instead of caressing,
I mimicked her speech—like a churl as I am—
And angrily said, "You're a dam—dam—dam—
A dam-age instead of a blessing!"

Military Tyranny in Virginia.

General Terry, commanding the Department of Virginia, has suppressed the Richmond Enquirer, on charges of disloyalty. Robert Ridgeway, who was shot for disloyalty, Robert that newspaper on the breaking out of the rebellion, because of his opposition to secession, returned to his old position and signalized his reappearance in an editorial of which the subjoined was part:

"I am strongly and inflexibly opposed to the execution, imprisonment or further embarrassment of any person who was connected in any way, officially or otherwise, with the late rebellion. All classes and conditions of our people have alike suffered enough. The guilty and the innocent alike have drained the cup of misery and humiliation to its very depth. I am equally opposed to the mean, brutally and cowardly policy of confiscation. The possession of property, whether little or much, is not a crime, nor is recognized as such by any code, written or unwritten, or by any nation, civilized or savage, on the face of the earth. And let not the best Government the world ever saw make itself the worst and the most despicable by the adoption of a policy which measures the guilt of an offender by the amount of his property. The revolting absurdity of such a policy is equaled only by its atrocious injustice."

For this the Whig was suppressed. Disloyalty," then, is humanity, magnanimity, justice, right and reason. Of course, it follows that "loyalty" is the reverse of all these. We cheerfully admit the Abolition party to be very "loyal."

FINALLY TOOK THE OATH.—A correspondent tells the following good joke, which occurred in Richmond, Va., a short time ago:

A modest young country girl, on applying for rations to one of our relief agents, a few days ago, was asked if she had ever taken the oath. "No, indeed, sir," was her terrified reply, "I never swore in all my life." "But you must take the oath, my good girl," said the agent, "or I cannot give you the rations." "No, indeed, I can't sir," said the girl, "mother always taught me never to swear." The agent mildly persisted, and the maiden as pertinaciously refused all attempts at persuasion, until—overcome at last by the dreadful conflict between necessity and her high sense of moral duty—she stammered out, with downcast lids, "Well, sir, if you will make me do such a horrid, wicked thing, why— d——n the Yankees!"

AFTER "ANDY."—The Radicals of Massachusetts have issued an address to the people of the United States. It is severely denunciatory of the President's policy of restoration, and declares that his attitude must be changed or the republic will be lost. It proposes either to subdue or flank him, and elaborate the argument in favor of Whiting-ism made by Richard H. Dana, Jr., in the recent Boston meeting. It is signed by many of the most eminent of the party in the State. We notice the names of Theophilus Parsons, Julius Rockwell, Richard H. Dana, John G. Whittier, Amasa Walker, and others. The practical conclusion reached is that the South must be "kept out in the cold" (if such an expression in relation to so warm a country is not a solecism) until she adopts the multitude of isms Massachusetts presents for her acceptance.

GETTING EVEN.—The Louisville Democrat of a late date says:

It seems to have become a common thing for white soldiers to whip every negro they catch up town. Night before last three soldiers caught a negro on Main, above Hancock street, and each of them tried his hand upon him. They said they had been fighting for him for four years, and they wanted some out of him. They'll get it.

GEN. F. P. BLAIR AGAIN.

His Lexington Speech---His Views on Negro Suffrage and Treatment of the Rebels---He Pitches into Chase, Stanton and Jo. Holt.

We print below the most interesting and important portions of the speech delivered by General Francis P. Blair at Lexington, Ky., on the 10th of July last. The Abolition papers of Oregon do not furnish their readers the late speeches of the Blairs, and other leaders of their party, for reasons best known to themselves; therefore, as we are disposed to have them informed of the positions assumed by these leaders on the living issues of the day, we afford them opportunity to learn from our columns what their own organs withhold. And we hope Democratic readers will take some pains to lay this speech, and others of the kind we shall hereafter publish, before their erring, hoodwinked Abolition neighbors. It will be seen from Gen. Blair's remarks that there is not much harmony in his party, that a division in their ranks is imminent, and that he is hopeful of building up a "Johnson party," which shall break down the Radicals of New England, and likewise overcome the Democracy. Democrats need have no fear of the latter contingency. The triumph of our party in the next Presidential contest is now almost a foregone conclusion. It is noticeable that while Gen. Blair sustains President Johnson, he is very severe on Secretary Stanton, Judge Advocate Holt, and Chief Justice Chase. It is fair to presume that he is simply starting the ball in motion, with which Johnson is willing that his Secretary, his obsequious tool, Holt, and the Chief Justice, shall all be timely crushed. Here is the speech:

The question of negro suffrage is the real one, and the prolongation of the struggle about negro slavery is made the handle of and is intended to carry the other question with it, and you are playing into the hands of those who premeditate the enforcement of negro suffrage upon the Southern States. You are aiding and abetting and assisting in carrying out their idea. It is not an unusual thing, my friends, to see politicians, to see generals, to see men in different employments in life—lawyers especially—carrying one question by the use of another. You have seen that done often in politics, in war and in law. I do not agree with the gentleman who has just addressed you (Mr. Kasson, of Iowa) on this topic, that there is not a serious intention to give the ballot to the negroes in this country. There is a serious intention to do it. There has been a plan harbored at the North, among politicians of a certain class, to enforce that upon the South, before recognizing their States as restored to the Union. I speak words of truth and soberness to the people among whom I was born and reared. You aid and abet this plan, the more you prolong this struggle about a thing which is dead, which can do you no good, and which will certainly do you harm. It keeps up among you a condition of uncertainty and perplexity, which prevents the people of this State from settling upon any plan of future prosperity and welfare of their State; which not only keeps up the spirit of discontent and discord among you here, but gives your enemies a handle which they can and will use against you. If the question of slavery is only once settled by the assent of the people of Kentucky; if the people of this State, and the other border States and Southern States, consent that slavery shall be abolished by the adoption of this amendment, then the question of negro suffrage comes up for discussion upon its own merits. Parties, as they at present exist, will be broken up, and new parties will be formed. Men will assume the side to which they feel they belong. They will not be carrying the Republican flag under a Republican organization, as it is called, nor the Democratic flag under a Democratic organization, as it is called, upon questions which have long since been decided.

The question of negro slavery, whether Kentucky assents or not, is in process of death and decent burial, and why should the people of Kentucky, who have a high, great, and solemn interests to attend to—things that affect their welfare here and hereafter—engage their attention about this dead and buried carcass, this obsolete issue, this thing which, whether you will or not, is to go out of sight? Why should you engage your attention on this, when there are other things that demand your attention, and upon which you can call to your assistance many who, upon the issue, are against you, and will be against you. If those of us who have gone through the controversy of four years can be assured that a vestige of slavery yet remains in the country, do you suppose we will be willing to disband that great and powerful organization, which has pursued it now almost to death's door? Don't you believe that we will stand firm, no matter what may be our disagreements on other subjects? Don't you believe we will stand together, until we carry it out and put it under ground? I think you have seen enough to convince you that we will. We shall not abandon that organization until its work is perfect and complete. When it is, we shall take our side upon the new issue. We shall side, choosing the opinions and the men that we prefer, and acting with them. It may be that some of these gentlemen may go to the side of giving the right of suffrage to this race of people. It may be that they will take the opposite side of the issue.

But certain statesmen and politicians of some of the New England States have taken it into their heads that the rebellion has carried certain States out of the Union. They adopt the doctrine of the secessionists, and proclaim that the Union was virtually dissolved. Mr. Chase, and other gentlemen distinguished like him, have given their opinion, not, probably, in so many words, but really in effect, that these States have been out of the Union—that the Union has actually been dissolved by the acts of secession of these States. In this respect they do not differ from Jeff. Davis or any other gentleman of that kind. [laughter.] the difference between them being about the same as the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. One side saying, "they are out," and the other, "you are out." One saying, "let us go," and the other, "let them go"—because that is exactly the thing Mr. [illegible] did say. Now they claim—these same politicians claim—that the Union having been dissolved, and these States having been subjugated they have the right to impose conditions upon their return to the Union. Among the conditions is one that Congress has a right to prescribe who shall be entitled to the elective franchise in these States. Now, my friends, I don't wish to deceive you by saying that I attach no importance to the party which has assumed this ground. I differ entirely from my friend (Mr. Kasson) on that point. He seemed to think that because in the State of Iowa there were men who held the old ground on that subject, he seemed to think that because he held the old ground, and others in the North held that ground, therefore we were not in danger upon that question. But he and all of us would be sadly mistaken if we confided in that belief. There is a real danger. The men who have propounded that scheme—the Chief Justice of the United States, who slipped down from his high place and traversed the South upon a public vessel, and urged the negroes in Vicksburg and elsewhere to protest against the appointment of Judge Sharkey, who is a far better man than he [a voice, "Give it to him"]—when he traversed and coasted around the southern portions of the Union, and impreguated those people with that idea—I tell you he had ends of his own to serve. He was looking forward. He was willing the South should go, in the early stages of the war, because he thought he would have a better chance in the North without the South. But the South having been brought back by other hands than his own; by another policy than his; by a better and firmer spirit than ever animated him, he goes for making a set of electors there from whom he can hope for some favor.

Therefore, I think, my friends, it is about time that, in the State of Kentucky, practical statesmanship that used to bear sway in the days anterior to those counselors who declined to take the price of your slaves when it was offered to them, that the people of Kentucky ought to [illegible] practical wisdom, and agree which is a foregone conclusion, Constitution, which will give quiet and restore the State of Kentucky to tranquility, which will make every man in the United States free before the law, which will then give a dignity to our nation which it never heretofore enjoyed, and at the same time it will give to your State a voice, and a potent influence in the councils of the nation, which will enable her to maintain her own rights and those of the States that are to be restored to the Union; which will give to them the same rights and privileges enjoyed by the other States—Rhode Island not excepted—[laughter]; which will restore you to equal dignity and full equality, on the floors of Congress and the councils of the nation; which will take from you that badge of servitude, because there are other sources of servitude than negro slavery, and one of them is that inequality which is sought to be placed upon the Southern States.

Now, I am not like my friend (Mr. Kasson) in another respect, although in his general conclusions we agree, and I am very glad to have the happiness to agree with a gentleman I have known so long, and esteemed so highly; but upon this point I do not agree with him—that he would rather ten thousand times, I believe he said, that the loyal negroes should vote than those who have been fighting against the Government—our secession friends. I have not any great love for those who have been fighting against us; I have no cause to love them, yet I do not agree with him, and I believe they are not quite so much to blame for what they have done as some other people who have engaged them to do it, without the manhood to take sides with them. I would give them a proclamation of amnesty, because they have fought bravely and well in a mistaken cause. I would prefer to put it in this phrase: "That I cordially thank President Johnson for what he has done, and President Lincoln for what he did in his life, in recognizing that principle." I would like to see a question tried before the judicial tribunals. I wish that A. H. Stevens would not ask for pardon or amnesty, but that he would submit himself to be tried before the courts of the United States, and plead in his defence that he was a Union man; that he had fought for the Union in the State of Georgia, and in the convention which that State held, when he made one of the best speeches ever made for the Union. That would be true. That while he was thus battling for the Union, the present Chief of the Bureau of Military Justice, who was then a Cabinet Counselor, into a truce with rebel Commissioners by which the Government of the United States was prohibited from preparing its forts for defence, from reinforcing them and putting food in them, and by which the rebels were allowed to erect batteries around these forts which afterwards destroyed them; that, while he was making these speeches in defence of the Union, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Floyd, and other Cabinet Ministers were putting arms in the hands of treasonable parties in the South to put the Union men down and coerce them into rebellion. I would have him make that plea. I would have him set up the plea that the present Secretary of War was a member of the Cabinet of James Buchanan at the time this truce was made by which the fate of Sumter was sealed. I would have him say that, even after Mr. Lincoln assumed the reins of power, the question of reinforcing and victualling Fort Sumter was discussed in the Cabinet, and every member of that Cabinet, with the exception of one, voted against its reinforcement and in favor of surrendering it to the rebels. I would have him say that citizens in faith to the Government's faith to its citizens; that the Government was bound to protect its citizens, bound not to give arms to traitors and rebels, but bound to send its arms and its armies to its true and faithful citizens. It did not do it. Mr. Stephens thought that, having been abandoned by his Government, he could find no greater fault in finally yielding allegiance than the Government did in deserting him in the first place.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that the turpitude of one individual is any excuse or defence for the crime of another, but Mr. Buchanan, and Floyd, and Holt, and the other Cabinet Ministers, made the actual Government at the time, and that Government furnished arms to the rebels, and entered into conventions with the rebels, enabling them to use those arms, while it tied the hands of the Government as against the rebels. Thus the Government actually betrayed the Unionists of the South, and not only permitted but aided the rebels to coerce them into secession. A man who is constrained to commit a crime cannot be punished for it, especially by those who aided in constraining him to the commission of the deed, more especially if those who aided in constraining him were bound to protect and defend him. Now, imagine Aleck Stephens in the criminal dock with Joe Holt as the public prosecutor; Aleck making that magnificent Union speech which he delivered in the Georgia convention, and contrasting with it Joe Holt's letter of November or December, 1860, justifying treason and rebellion, and also with the Convention made by Buchanan's Cabinet with the rebel Commissioners and signed by Joe Holt and Toucey, in which they agreed not to defend or reinforce the forts, but allowed the rebels to construct batteries against them, which afterward destroyed them. Who, I ask would look most like a criminal in the eyes of the nation?

Now, I have made this supposition because I have heard so much about the total prohibition of those men who have been in rebellion, especially by those men who have never been down here to help to kill any of them—who were careful not to go South as long as the rebels had arms to defend themselves with. That class are for exterminating the people of the South and brushing out their State lines.

[illegible] to their consideration, in the strongest point of view which I am capable, the attitude occupied by our Government to these States in the beginning of the war. When Virginia voted, by 80,000 majority, for the Union, but when a crowd of bullies in Richmond were ready to drive the State out of the Union, the Government stood by with its arms folded. Didn't these loyal men have the right to demand protection at that time as much as the Government had to demand them to remain loyal? When every State in the South was in the same condition—with the exception of South Carolina. I don't believe it can be asserted of any State that a majority were in favor of secession. I put in this plea in behalf of a great number of men who remained loyal and true to the Government as long as they could do so, and would have remained loyal and true to this day if the Government had remained loyal and true to them. I say that they shall not now be proscribed by the very men who deserted and abandoned them in the days of their trial.

True Democracy.

It can never be out of place in a Democratic journal to reprint the following comprehensive synopsis of true American Democracy, from the pen of its great expounder, Thos. Jefferson;

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the safest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people; a mild and safe corrective of abuses, which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace, and for the first movements in war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts, and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce, as it handmaid; the diffusion of information, and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public [illegible]

STATUS OF SOUTHERN STATES.

An Able Letter from C. Chauncey Burr.

The following very clear views of the status of the Southern States were given by C. Chauncey Burr, of New Jersey, in a recent letter to the New York News:

Over the name of "Virginia," a correspondent in the News of last Saturday makes a statement in relation to the present legal status of the Southern States, which seems to me to be absurd and mischievous. He says of the Southern States, they have "lost all they before possessed. They have lost their former rights and franchises. They are now at the mercy of their conquerors. It is in the power of the latter to deal with them as they may think fit. If they choose, they can take from them the privilege of suffrage; they can render them ineligible to office; they can confiscate their property, and make it unlawful for them to engage in any kind of business."

What a monstrous conclusion! We did not suppose that those States had lost any right or one franchise which they ever possessed. The laws or customs of civilized nations do not permit a people to treat as conquered any portion of its own territory. All the Federal Government can lawfully do, is to put down resistance to its laws. The attempted secession of States imparted no new powers to the Federal Government. A wrong act on the part of a State does not convert the Federal Government into a colossal despotism, with power to subject the people of the State to serfdom. The Federal Government can assert its constitutional authority, and it can lawfully do no more. The instant resistance to Federal laws ceases in a State—the instant it peacefully submits to the authority of the Union—it assumes precisely its old *status* in the Union; and all the Federal Government can legally do, is to appoint the Federal officers which the Constitution provides for the State. To do more than this is usurpation and despotism. It is a crime which exposes all concerned in it to the severest punishment. The moment that *law* takes the place of usurpation, all concerned in this despotism may be arraigned for their high crimes, from the President down. We are talking now of *law*. The case was clearly stated by Judge Sprague, of Boston, in the United States District Court, in April, 1862, in the case of the Amy Warwick. The eminent jurist then said:

"It has been supposed that after the rebellion is suppressed the Government will have the rights of conquest; that a State and its inhabitants may be permanently divested of all political privileges, and treated as foreign territory acquired by arms. This is an error—a grave and dangerous error. Under despotic governments the power of municipal confiscation may be unlimited; but under our Government the right of sovereignty over any portion of a State is given and limited by the Constitution, and will be the same after the war as it was before. When the United States takes possession of any rebel district, they [illegible] title, but merely vindicate that which previously existed."

This is the law, as laid down by one of the most learned Judges of the United States Courts. And I am glad that he is a Massachusetts Judge. No respectable lawyer will call in question the correctness of the points made. They do not admit of debate. If the attempted secession of a State imparted new and despotic powers to the Federal Government, all an ambitious and corrupt President would have to do to assume despotic powers, and to make an end of the Republic, would be to cunningly get up a "rebellion" in one or more of the States. With political parties in the hands of such demagogues and hirelings as have ruled elections in this country for the last few years, a "rebellion" could be hatched in any State as easily and as quietly as a "free-love" meeting can be assembled in Boston. This country has been full enough of "rebellion" for the last twenty years. Every Northern State, except New Jersey, has been in "rebellion" for many years. Every State which passed what is called "personal liberty bills," that is, bills to nullify and resist the fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the two acts of Congress passed to enforce it, were in "rebellion" against the Constitution and laws of the Union.

In many of the Northern States this "rebellion" assumed the proportions of an armed resistance, and every State passing such bills was, by its legislative action, in a state of "rebellion" against the Union. But did any President, therefore, assume that the Federal Government acquired new and punitive powers over the fortunes, and liberty, and lives of the people? Did any President claim, on this account, the right to fill all the States as full of Provost Marshals as Egypt was of vermin in the time of the Pharaohs—Provost Marshals that are as offensive to liberty as the Egyptian vermin were to the cleanliness and comfort of the people? No. Until the present hour of demoralization, the people of the United States would have been apt to have dealt summary justice to any President who should have asserted claims so monstrous! The powers of the Federal Government are defined and limited by the Constitution. Neither the follies nor crimes of the States can enlarge those powers, nor contract the original and inalienable rights of the States. Whatever the rights of the States were before the "rebellion," are their rights now the "rebellion" is over. The Federal Government has no lawful authority to do more than to see that the constitutional authority of the Union is obeyed in all the States. All States submitting to the laws of the Union, are in the Union, and they are there upon precisely the same basis that every other State is there, viz: that of coequality, sovereignty, and fraternity. Any other theory ends not only the Union, but the very form of government established by our fathers, agglomerating all into a frightful mass of anarchy and despotism. Just such a horrible condition of things as we have now! The "rebellion" is over, so far as States are concerned; but the Federal Government appears to be keeping up a "rebellion" of its own, which, if it is not designed to completely overthrow our free system of government, must be meant, I suppose, for the benefit of hordes of such interpolated officials as Provost Marshals, who are still to be supported by fat salaries, wrung from the sweat and muscle of our poor working masses!

Yours, in the blessed hope of a restoration of the Union, and of liberty.

C. CHAUNCEY BURR.

New Jersey, July 16, 1865.

Horace Greely on Stanton.

The Oregonian, the Journal, and pretty nearly all of the Abolition organs in Oregon, have much fault to find because Democratic papers see fit to tell the truth and speak openly of the acts of Stanton. Let us show them what Horace Greeley thinks of their sanguinary, arbitrary idol. We take the following from a late Tribune:

FORD—STANTON.

A Mr. Ford appears to be the owner of a theater in Washington City, wherein President Lincoln was assassinated. Being thereupon closed, Mr. Ford attempted to open it some days afterward, but was forbidden and prevented. He next sold it for a church, but the purchasers were unable to fulfill their engagement, and the property reverted. Last Monday evening, he tried once more to reopen, but was peremptorily shut up by an order from the War Department. The Herald says of Ford's attempt to resume his regular business:

"It was an attempt to coin the blood of the great man. People in Washington as well as elsewhere felt that that theater was a doomed and; that it was morally, if not in fact, involved in the crime committed in it, just as a murderer's weapon, which from time immemorial has been forfeited to the law. The War Department forbade the performance and closed the theater; and in so doing it only acted up to the popular thought; and though we shall on this subject hear many Copperhead growls, the act will receive the full approval of the people."

It is quite probable that "the popular thought" accords with the above assumptions; but there is at least one journal which dares defy "popular" impulses when they contravene law and justice. We had intended to let this matter pass without comment, with many similar vagaries of the War Department; but its clamp justification by the Herald imposes the duty of emphatic dissent.

Under what law, by what right, did Edwin M. Stanton thus deprive John T. Ford of the use of his private property? It surely will not be pretended that an imminent, overrulling public danger dictated the Secretary's high-handed course. We have heard that he apprehended a riot in case the theatre was opened—so he arbitrarily closed it, in pursuance of a [illegible] in which Abolitionists of other days were long accustomed without becoming reconciled. The police fear your property will be injured if you use it; so—instead of protecting you in its use—they forbid and prevent your using it at all! It would take a long and severe training to enlighten us as to the beauties of such legal protection.

Mr. Ford, it is said, evinced bad taste, or a deficient sense of propriety, in undertaking to re-open his theater within three months after Mr. Lincoln's assassination. Very likely. But in what clause of the Constitution, what chapter of the Statutes at Large, do we find the regulation of public or private taste, the enforcement of a due regard for propriety, made a duty of the Secretary of War? If he is to regulate other men's regard for appearances, for decorum, who is to regulate—or educate—his?

We know nothing of Ford or of his theater but what is everywhere current. But suppose he is in debt, and his creditors want their pay—suppose his property heavily mortgaged, and the interest eating him up—suppose him to have a theatrical company on his hands and no means of paying them except from his receipts. His loss by the suspension of his business for eleven or twelve weeks, while Washington was full of idle soldiers just paid off, must already amount to many thousands of dollars; who is to reimburse it? And by what right is he forcibly deprived of the use of his property, the means of paying his debts, in obedience to others' sense of fitness? Why should they evince their regard for our late President's memory at his expense rather than their own?

We urge these considerations with no idle conceit of influencing the course of Secretary Stanton. That functionary seems incapable of comprehending that our country has, or should have, any other law than his own arbitrary will. But he cannot remain in office forever; and, when he retires, we hope to have a restoration of the privilege of habeas corpus and supremacy of law; and then we shall hope for a legal scrutiny of some of his many "fantastic tricks" and an adjudication between them and the personal rights they have ruthlessly violated. Meantime, we only wish it to stand on record that we hold his assumptions of power utterly unwarranted and without excuse.

IS SLAVERY ABOLISHED?

Under this caption, a correspondent thus writes to the New York News:

When a nation proclaims to the world the accomplishment of a great deed, that world may justly question the degree of consistency observed between the principles thereby asserted and that nation's ensuing acts. All national acts involve of necessity certain guiding principles, and when a people accept certain principles to govern their acts, they should fully understand those principles in all their bearings, and be prepared to obey them to their just extent.

By proclamation of the late President, freedom was proclaimed to four millions of slaves. Laying aside the question of the right to bestow such freedom, the argument rests upon the principle attempted to be established. The principle involved in the emancipation is that of liberty.

There can be no such state as restricted or partial liberty; for the term liberty implies a state entirely impartial and unrestrained. Liberty to be virtual must be entire. Therefore, when a nation asserts that liberty is the principle of their government they must be prepared to grant that liberty to all; else is their assumed liberty but a partial liberty, granted to some, denied to others; thereby proving that they understand not true liberty, and that their assertions of a great principle established are false.

Liberty is a term liable to perversion. The South assert that they have been fighting for liberty; the North assert the same. Liberty was the war cry of each combatant. Both could not be right. It therefore follows that in the downfall of one or the other of the contestants was involved the downfall of liberty. It but remains to ask, had they who stood conquerors the right to shout "liberty?"

Liberty has by nations been construed to mean freedom of speech and act. The reverse of freedom must be slavery. If, therefore, a people are deprived of freedom of speech and act, then that people are deprived of liberty, and being deprived of liberty, a consequent slavery is imposed. Though it be impossible to take from a people principles inherent in certain of their moral and legal rights, it is yet possible to deprive said people of the power or liberty to exercise those rights; and the people thus deprived are held in subjection or slavery.

The term Union has heretofore implied a conjunction of equal rights. If, therefore, Union signifies equality of rights, it naturally follows that no one portion of the people within that Union could arrogate superior powers over any other portion; for so soon as sufficient cause arose to enable one portion to assume such powers the equality was destroyed, and with the destruction of equality was virtually dissolved the Union, and there could but remain several distinct people connected with each other by the mere force of subjugation. To preserve the Union, therefore, equality must be preserved, and to preserve equality, liberty must be preserved.

But how are the people of the North preserving that liberty? The answer is severe with truth. By not only forbidding, under death penalty, all freedom of speech and act—and thus, by denying positive liberty, admitting negative slavery—but a set form of both word and act is compelled, and with such compulsion an absolute slavery is established. When a people are not allowed to speak otherwise than according to a certain form—when a people are not allowed to act but within certain prescribed limits—when a people are not only withheld from acting, but are compelled to act by the taking of imposed oaths—when a people are liable to sudden arrests and secret tribunals; and when a people are compelled to an outward support of such arbitrary power under the terrible alternative of the oath which lies, or the prison at the scaffold base, then there is no freedom among that people, and liberty, polluted by the tyrant's grasp, lies crushed beneath the despot's heel.

This, then, is the slavery imposed upon the people of the so-called Union; a slavery of speech and of act; a slavery imposed by them that dare not brook a difference of opinion. If the people of the Union would have that Union restored in all its pristine grandeur, they must restore its original equality of rights. Unless equality of rights is restored; unless freedom of speech and act is restored; unless all the rights of citizenship are restored, the proclamation of emancipation will not have abolished slavery, but merely have transferred it from one race inured to servitude to another who have never breathed aught but liberty; and slavery will thus be established upon a more degrading basis than our annals have yet known. Then may our enemies reiterate with some show of truth, what they have so often asserted, that this war has been waged not for freedom and right, but for subjugation and wrong.

ELECTIONEERING IN KENTUCKY.—An Owen county correspondent of the Louisville Democrat thus describes the mode of electioneering practiced by the Abolitionists in Kentucky:

Gen. Rousseau and others are canvassing the district as candidates for Congress. General Rousseau carries with him, wherever he goes, forty United States soldiers as a body guard. He stops at any house he chooses, which is always the house of an opponent, and there quarters his soldiers without asking leave. First, it looks rather farcical to [illegible] a man protected by a body of soldiers from the very people whose suffrage he is asking. Second, it is a considerable tax, and very inconvenient for the poor farmers, in this county, to have to provide for forty men upon hardly as many minutes' notice. Thirdly, are the people taxed and an army kept up that the soldiers of the United States may escort a candidate on his canvass? This looks very little like Republicanism. I cannot understand. I am in a muddle."

The young King of Greece will soon marry, says rumor, the Princes Olga, daughter of the Grand Duke Constantine of Russia.

[illegible] offer his Professional services to the [illegible] place and surrounding country. [illegible] stairs in Foster's Brick Building, [illegible] side of the Pacific Hotel. [illegible] ust 14th, 1865. aug14tf

GEO. R. HELM.

[illegible] NOR & HELM,

Subscr[illegible] In this depa[illegible] always find a va[illegible] &c., which are [illegible] exclusively by [illegible] promptly given [illegible] person.

DIED:

[illegible] precinct, Linn county, Sept. 5th, [illegible] about 40 years.

[illegible] able man has been gathered to [illegible] uly abode. Peace to his ashes.

[illegible] county, Aug. 29th, Isabella, wife [illegible] and daughter of Charles and [illegible] d 26 years.

[illegible] e, Aug. 28th. Angus Ross, aged [illegible] s and 26 days.

[illegible] of John Topper, six miles from [illegible] 29th, Kathrina Bruns, wife of [illegible] 38 years, 2 months and 27

ROCK

CALL AT UI [illegible] lishment a [illegible] Chair.

Cash paid [illegible] Stored at [illegible]

GRINDSTO[illegible] G. [illegible] establishment

CHAIRS—A [illegible] Establishmen[illegible]

BEDSTEAD[illegible]

CASH PAI[illegible] OATS, by [illegible]

50 TONS [illegible] cheap, by [illegible]