

STATE RIGHTS DEMOCRAT.

SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1866.

DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION.

By resolution of the Democratic State Central Committee, at the meeting held in Portland, January 23d, the Democratic State Convention for the nomination of candidates for State officers will be held in the city of Portland, on THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1866.

The Committee recommended that the Democratic County Conventions, for the election of Delegates to the State Convention, be held throughout the State on TUESDAY, MARCH 23d.

With reference to the Apportionment of the Congress.

Resolved, That the apportionment of representatives for the Democratic State Convention, to be held in the city of Portland, April 26, 1866, be as follows: One delegate for each county at large, and for every twenty-five Democratic votes cast at the last Presidential election for McClellan, and one for every fraction of twenty-five, of over thirty-eight.

The apportionment under the rule adopted by the Committee, will be as follows:

Counties, no. of votes, no. of delegates.

Albany, 10,000, 4; Lincoln, 10,000, 4.

Benton, 10,000, 4; Multnomah, 10,000, 4.

Clatsop, 10,000, 4; Polk, 10,000, 4.

Columbia, 10,000, 4; Tillamook, 10,000, 4.

Clatsop, 10,000, 4; Union, 10,000, 4.

Washington, 10,000, 4; Yamhill, 10,000, 4.

Washington, 10,000, 4; Wasco and Grant, 10,000, 4.

Total, 135.

JAS. B. STEPHENS, Ch. St. Con. Com.

LAFAYETTE LANE, Sec'y.

THE VETO IN OREGON.

President Johnson has had the same effect upon the Abolition party of Oregon that it has had upon the same party at the East—that is, it has irretrievably divided the Radical and Conservative factions.

So far, the two leading organs, the Oregonian and the Statesman, are the only ones which have spoken out emphatically upon the subject, and the two are as wide apart in sentiment as Sumner and Johnson.

The Oregonian, as a matter of course, sustains the Radicals in Congress, and the Statesman makes a most urgent appeal in behalf of the President.

The organ in this place is decidedly Radical, and so we opine will be the Journal at Eugene. The Sentinel will follow whichever side its owner thinks will pay best, without regard to principle or party or faction, or his own convictions.

The Oregonian assails the President most venomously, and loves to rake up all the old stories about his drunkenness on the 4th of last March, and other such matter as it declared was "treasonable" and "disloyal" for any Democratic paper to give utterance or place to, only a brief time back. It seems to forget that Abolition dogma that the Executive is the "Government," and ignores the existence of that other Abolition theory that, "no loyal citizen will assail the policy of the President."

The Statesman, on the other hand, accepts the fact that Seward, Dennison, and other members of the Cabinet sustain the President, as a sufficient reason to warrant it in doing the same thing.

In this State, as the two representative organs of the respective factions have come out in such implacable and irreconcilable antagonism, so will the factions they each represent, occupy and maintain equally antagonistic and irreconcilable positions.

The proper conduct for Democrats to pursue in this extraordinary political crisis is manifest. Our principles are firmly established and thoroughly understood.

We have simply to cling to them with the same undeviating devotion and unflinching resolution which has during these past few terrible years characterized the true Democracy of the country.

Mr. Johnson is not the President of our choice; we had no agency in placing him in the position through which he succeeded to his present exalted office. He is an apostate to Democracy, and unworthy of full trust or fellowship among us. He has committed usurpations of Executive power destructive of the rights and liberties of the States and the people, and some of the most vital provisions of the Constitution, and of the dearest privileges of the citizen he yet continues to withhold, by the strong hand of unwarrantable military power. Democrats cannot unqualifiedly endorse the conduct of an Executive who thus plays the Despot; they cannot approve of his whole policy merely because a few special or general actions of his tally with the line of their cardinal faith. What Democrats can consistently do, however, and what we are very sure, they will do, is—to approve of every act of the President's which is in accordance with the genius of our principles, in conformity to the Constitution, and in harmony with Democratic theories. To do this is enough. We do not, as Democrats, worship any ruler, or blindly follow the lead, or servilely bow to the dictation of any man, however exalted a public station he occupies. We bestow the mood of approbation only where it is deserved, and only upon the particular act which challenges that bestowal. It would be dangerous if not slavish to do more than this, in any instance, and particularly in the case of Mr. Johnson, who has committed so many bad or questionable acts, and performed so very few good or wise ones. We have no cause to desert any principle because either an enemy comes, or a transient relative to it, and we can very clearly approve the act without endorsing the actor. So can we endorse an act, and sustain the Executive in that particular act, without extending to him also approbation and support in general terms.

For one, we are willing to believe that Mr. Johnson is disgusted with the policy and designs of the Radicals, but we have no just or sufficient cause to warrant the belief that he proposes to hereafter administer the Government in a strictly constitutional manner, agreeably to Democratic precedents and principles; and, until he shall have faithfully performed this good work, we would withhold from him any broad endorsement or full support by the Democratic party. His veto is not an affirmative Democratic act; it is simply a blow against the Radicals. When he shall have restored habeas corpus, the civil over the military law, the rights of States and the liberties of the people, and performed other important constitutional duties, we shall be pleased to give him adequate credit for his acts. We now give him credit for his acts. We hope he will still endeavor to be a patriot rather than a partisan, a faithful servant of the people rather than over-ambitious aspirant for a continued lease of power, and a President of the whole United States rather than the tool of any faction, or the head of any governing junta.

THE ADAMS ROBBERY.—From late San Francisco papers we derive additional facts in regard to the reported robbery of \$20,000 from Collector Adams of Oregon, while he was on the steamer from Astoria to San Francisco, or in that city. From all we can gather we have no doubt that that amount of Government money has been stolen, but we cannot believe that any person not in charge of Mr. Adams' trunk stole it, because he declares the trunk was "locked and tied with a strong rope," and was "never out of his sight during the voyage, except while he was writing a letter to his wife." Of course no one will doubt Parson Billy's own word. Accordingly, if the \$20,000 was stolen, Billy would have seen the thief, and could have prevented the robbery. Yet, we are not going to doubt his word when he declares that the large sum named is missing from the Government funds he had in charge. And we will be so accommodating at present as to let Billy explain any discrepancy in the two important but very conflicting statements he makes in relation to the robbery. His bondsman may regret the robbery, however.

CHEAP TRAVELING.—It is cheaper to travel now-a-days than to remain at home. On the Willamette the steamers are plying a rigorous opposition, and passengers are taken at from nothing to one dollar to Portland. The new Company is the strongest backed, and is likely to break down the old monopoly. Between Portland and San Francisco there is also a strong opposition, caused by the coming of the new line of propellers from the East for that trade. Passage is now only \$15 for cabin and \$5 for steerage, on the old steamers, and perhaps even less, on the new ones. The new opposition line between San Francisco and New York will also soon be in perfect operation, and then doubtless a person can go from here to the East for \$100 passage money in all. The people can stand it, if the steamer owners can.

THE OREGON SENATORS.—Williams and Nesmith voted against each other on the veto—Williams with the Radicals, Nesmith with the President. That trifle of saltpetre will not save Nesmith. As for Williams, he has simply given another illustration of his "immovable convictions." He has departed from the platform constructed by himself that the President was "the living flesh and blood Government," and gone another step farther. Only a few weeks ago the Statesman published a letter from the Senator in which he revealed the substance of a "private interview" he had with the President. He then declared his entire approval of the President's policy. Now, he opposes it. Another "immovable conviction," surely.

THE MEETING AT CORVALLIS.—The Democratic meeting at Corvallis last Saturday, held for the purpose of organizing a Democratic Club, was very largely attended. The principal speakers were George R. Helm, Rep. of this city, R. S. Strahan and A. J. Thayer, Esqs., of Corvallis, each of whom delivered appropriate and effective speeches. The Club organized by the election of M. H. Walker, President, A. J. Thayer, Vice President, and R. S. Strahan, Secretary. Nearly one hundred names signed the Club roll.

The Democracy of Benton county are zealous and energetic in the cause, and sound to the core in the faith. Success to their Club, and to their ticket in June.

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY.—In Lafayette, we learn from the Courier, this anniversary day was appropriately celebrated. The large flag presented to the Democratic Club by the young ladies of Yamhill, was displayed from its lofty staff, and everything passed off finely.

IN TROUBLE.—The Abolitionists are now without hope of carrying Oregon in June. The veto has broken their party strength entirely down. They can barely hope to carry a county—not even Washington, Marion or Multnomah.

CHARACTERISTICS.—Not one of the Abolition State Legislatures in session at the East adjourned over in honor of Washington's Birthday anniversary. They worship John Brown, all of them.

TELEGRAPHIC.

OVERLAND DISPATCHES.

DATES TO FEBRUARY 25.

THE VETO EXCITEMENT.

Washington, Feb. 20.—A large crowd headed by Judge Hughes of Indiana, Green C. Smith of Kentucky, and G. F. Train of the President in honor of the veto. He did not respond.

Some of the prominent persons in the crowd were also addressed by the parade went up to the late at William's, and drank a toast to the three greatest Americans—Jefferson Davis, Andrew Johnson and Robert E. Lee.

Running says both Stanton and Harlan will remain in the city of the veto.

Report says that Seward, Welles, Denison and McCulloch favor the veto, and the rest of the Cabinet oppose it. The branch between Congress and the President is widened.

Washington, Feb. 23.—While the crowd were singing to and from the front of the White House yesterday, guards were placed around the entrance, and none but Democrats were allowed to pass. The meeting was also addressed by Postmaster General Denison, Henry J. Raymond, Francis B. Cutting, Daniel Dickinson and Geo. Oplake, and dispersed at a late hour. Mr. John Wentworth, who was in front and near the guard, was pressed back by the crowd, and would arrest him if he did not keep still. Wentworth dared him to try it, with a loud voice, and then said: "You have murdered Lincoln, and now you want to destroy Johnson."

The reports to the Radical press state that no such meeting as yesterday transpired at Governor's Theatre and in front of the White House, has ever before been held in public in the North. Robert Johnson, the President's private Secretary, and his wife, Mr. Patterson, Senator-elect from Tennessee, were present and occupied prominent positions at the theatre. Lincoln was denounced by one speaker, and the sentiment was cheered. Taken in connection with the subsequent speech of the President, the proceedings of the day have been beyond all precedent the most disgraceful ever witnessed in the country, and cannot with the least regard for truth be stated in a milder way.

A severe department was directed at the speech of the President, and the proceedings of the day have been beyond all precedent the most disgraceful ever witnessed in the country, and cannot with the least regard for truth be stated in a milder way.

President Johnson has had the same effect upon the Abolition party of Oregon that it has had upon the same party at the East—that is, it has irretrievably divided the Radical and Conservative factions.

So far, the two leading organs, the Oregonian and the Statesman, are the only ones which have spoken out emphatically upon the subject, and the two are as wide apart in sentiment as Sumner and Johnson.

The Oregonian, as a matter of course, sustains the Radicals in Congress, and the Statesman makes a most urgent appeal in behalf of the President.

The organ in this place is decidedly Radical, and so we opine will be the Journal at Eugene. The Sentinel will follow whichever side its owner thinks will pay best, without regard to principle or party or faction, or his own convictions.

The Oregonian assails the President most venomously, and loves to rake up all the old stories about his drunkenness on the 4th of last March, and other such matter as it declared was "treasonable" and "disloyal" for any Democratic paper to give utterance or place to, only a brief time back. It seems to forget that Abolition dogma that the Executive is the "Government," and ignores the existence of that other Abolition theory that, "no loyal citizen will assail the policy of the President."

The Statesman, on the other hand, accepts the fact that Seward, Dennison, and other members of the Cabinet sustain the President, as a sufficient reason to warrant it in doing the same thing.

In this State, as the two representative organs of the respective factions have come out in such implacable and irreconcilable antagonism, so will the factions they each represent, occupy and maintain equally antagonistic and irreconcilable positions.

The proper conduct for Democrats to pursue in this extraordinary political crisis is manifest. Our principles are firmly established and thoroughly understood.

We have simply to cling to them with the same undeviating devotion and unflinching resolution which has during these past few terrible years characterized the true Democracy of the country.

Mr. Johnson is not the President of our choice; we had no agency in placing him in the position through which he succeeded to his present exalted office. He is an apostate to Democracy, and unworthy of full trust or fellowship among us. He has committed usurpations of Executive power destructive of the rights and liberties of the States and the people, and some of the most vital provisions of the Constitution, and of the dearest privileges of the citizen he yet continues to withhold, by the strong hand of unwarrantable military power. Democrats cannot unqualifiedly endorse the conduct of an Executive who thus plays the Despot; they cannot approve of his whole policy merely because a few special or general actions of his tally with the line of their cardinal faith. What Democrats can consistently do, however, and what we are very sure, they will do, is—to approve of every act of the President's which is in accordance with the genius of our principles, in conformity to the Constitution, and in harmony with Democratic theories. To do this is enough. We do not, as Democrats, worship any ruler, or blindly follow the lead, or servilely bow to the dictation of any man, however exalted a public station he occupies. We bestow the mood of approbation only where it is deserved, and only upon the particular act which challenges that bestowal. It would be dangerous if not slavish to do more than this, in any instance, and particularly in the case of Mr. Johnson, who has committed so many bad or questionable acts, and performed so very few good or wise ones. We have no cause to desert any principle because either an enemy comes, or a transient relative to it, and we can very clearly approve the act without endorsing the actor. So can we endorse an act, and sustain the Executive in that particular act, without extending to him also approbation and support in general terms.

nominated: General Nathan Kimball, for Treasurer, Colonel Truesler, for Secretary of War, McCurdy, for Auditor, and D. K. Williamson, for Attorney General. The resolutions declare full faith and confidence in the President and his Cabinet, and in the Union majority of Congress, and pledge support to each of them in all wise and lawful legislation to restore authority in the South. The following were among the resolutions:

Resolved, That in Andrew Johnson we recognize a patriot true and tried, and we will support him in all Constitutional efforts; but we demand that the President also express entire confidence in Congress.

Resolved, That it is the province of the legislative branch of the Government to determine the question of reconstruction.

These resolutions blowing hot and cold, without treating the subject to its merits, were the result of fears lest the Convention might commit the party before the general plan of action could be initiated elsewhere. The Convention was largely attended, and the Radical men were distinguished.

THE PRESS ON THE VETO.—The Chicago Tribune says: Since the closing scenes of the war and the horrors of the assassination of President Lincoln, no event has created so profound a sensation as the formal act by which the President has severed himself from the loyal party and united with its enemies North and South to face the Union is safe or the war fairly ended. The President's veto will at least have one good effect, namely: in according conclusive proof to doubting souls of Johnson's reconstruction, when the Radical party people laid down their guns and their arms, and convincing our citizens by the logic of the most ugly fact of the backsliding of their Chief Magistrate.

The Chicago Republican says: The country has been shocked to find that the President has vetoed an act which title might justly have been an act to force a bill of rights on that issue. It appears to the people from the decision of Congress. There is no doubt Congress will gladly and immediately accept the challenge and the people will sustain them.

The Chicago Times says: This veto is a severe blow to the country, and a good man may be able to see the country has been forced to a great calamity. This may be done by the President's new line of action, in which the well known principles of his life do not appear to be in his political associations. Will you, by your line, upon which you have not the views of the people, justify the rights which you can be said to have the right to the President's veto? We believe the President cannot and will never again with upon the issues of universal suffrage and death.

The New York Tribune says: We deeply regret the veto, and think the President will live in the history of his political associations. Will you, by your line, upon which you have not the views of the people, justify the rights which you can be said to have the right to the President's veto? We believe the President cannot and will never again with upon the issues of universal suffrage and death.

The New York Times says: The veto implies no essential difference of opinion between the majority in Congress on the one hand, and the President on the other. Many object of the bill and the President, but he seeks to reach the end arrived at by other and what he deems less radical agencies.

Chicago, Feb. 26.—The comments of the Union press upon the recent speech of the President have been most unkind.

The Cincinnati Gazette says: Not excepting the speech of Johnson on the occasion of his inauguration, it is the most disgraceful utterance of which there is any record, and we presume there is no high-minded man in the United States who does not feel ashamed of the performance.

The Boston Post, hastening like all the Democratic organs to the defense of the President, says: That as the opposition of some Government Republicans did not ignore Lincoln's veto, they will not ignore his veto, and will be inhibited by the wrath of radical Senators or editors.

The New York Times commends the President.

General News.

At the Democratic Convention, a rumor that preparations were being made to impeach President Johnson for mal-administration in office upon the specific charge of mismanagement under section four, article second, of the Constitution. The particular charge was that the President had refused to reconstruct the rebel States in the reconstruction of the rebel States.

The House has power to draw a bill of impeachment to be tried before the Senate, Chief Justice Chase presiding. The movers in the House are the President's friends, and the example may be made for all future Presidents.

Last Saturday Gen. Grant issued an order requiring military commanders in the South to report the names of the newspapers having a pernicious influence that the same might be suppressed by him.

Yesterday the President in effect revoked the order by allowing the Richmond Examiner to resume publication.

Cincinnati, Feb. 23.—A very large mass meeting was held in Congress on the 23d inst. for the purpose of electing a delegate to the Alabama, Ga., Feb. 24.—Alexander H. Stevens addressed the Georgia Legislature Feb. 23d, saying the great object of his life was now the restoration of peace, prosperity and union to the South, and that he would co-operate, and tell them that their first duty is the cultivation and exercise of justice under present afflictions; the chief among which he says are their being obliged to pay their proportion of taxes while denied representation, and their partial subjection to military rule, etc. He deprecated a discussion of past motives, declaring that Georgia must accept the results of the war; obey them in good faith in the future, and all must rally around the great standard bearer of the Constitution and Liberty—President Johnson.

Mrs. Jefferson Davis is at Mobile, the guest of Howell Cobb, and receives great attention.

New York, Feb. 21.—The Evening Express says: Back P. Butler has paid \$200,000 of New Orleans \$200,000 in gold, that was taken from their bank, together with all costs of legal proceedings, in the aggregate over \$150,000.

The Commercial's special dispatch says: The rumors of Cabinet changes appear well founded. Secretary Stanton's friends say he will not resign, but the President's friends say there must be a new Secretary of War.

Washington, Feb. 24.—Forney's paper makes a very bitter assault upon the President because of the veto. He says Johnson entertains traitors, and has received all sorts of delegations and answered them with "illogical and incoherent harangues." He also accuses him of "sedulously and treacherously preparing" for the present condition of the country.

Seward refuses to accept the Shamondah by that name, and insists that she is the British ship Sea King. The correspondence between him and the British Government is very irritating, and places the whole question in a very embarrassing position.

A tornado passed over Knoxville, Tenn., on the 24th, and blew down the railroad depot and thirty or forty houses. A great deal of other property was destroyed.

New York, Feb. 25.—The Tribune says: The House of Representatives has today taken measures to establish John Clubs throughout the city and State.

Henry Ward Beecher, in a speech, sustains the veto, but thinks negro suffrage ought to be guaranteed by an amendment to the Constitution, and secured by law. He also thinks the Southern delegations should be admitted to Congress.

Chicago, Feb. 25.—The Chicago Tribune says the country ought to be informed in relation to the recent veto of the President, and that the bill before it passed the Senate—perhaps we may safely add, before

it was introduced in Congress—was penned (pursoed?) by the President and received his approval. It was shaped and worded to meet his views. It is well understood by the friends of the bill that he had expressed his sanction and friendship for it.

New York, Feb. 21.—The Herald's Rio Janeiro correspondent says agents of the Southern Emigrant Association have been cordially received by the Emperor of Brazil. They are promised any quantity of lands, immediate citizenship, freedom of religion, control of municipal regulations and free importation for five years of all necessary articles.

Panama advices of Feb. 11th, per steamer Henry Clay, say a company of California miners had arrived en route to prospect the gold mines on the Isthmus. Rich discoveries are reported eighteen miles from Panama and two miles from the railroad.

DATES TO FEBRUARY 27.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

Washington, Feb. 20.—The following is the bill on the President's veto of the Freedmen's bill in the Senate: Ayres, Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Condit, Cresswell, Prescott, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Lincoln, Morrill, Morrill, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Tremain, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates—30.

Senator Sherman's Views.

Chicago, Feb. 27.—Mr. Sherman, in the Senate, yesterday spoke in favor of the President's reconstruction policy. He was in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States, and in favor of the President's veto of the bill for the re-organization of the rebel States.

LATEST DISPATCHES.

BY THIS MORNING'S STAGE.

DATES TO FEBRUARY 27.

The New York World says the President will open on the 27th inst. a grand reception to the President's resignation in the President's hands. F. P. Blair, Jr., is urged for the place.

It is reported that the President will endorse the President's speech—personal abuse and all.

Senator Dixon of Connecticut sustains the President.

At the President's last reception many attempted to open on the 27th inst. a grand reception to the President's resignation in the President's hands. F. P. Blair, Jr., is urged for the place.

It is reported that the President will endorse the President's speech—personal abuse and all.

Senator Dixon of Connecticut sustains the President.

At the President's last reception many attempted to open on the 27th inst. a grand reception to the President's resignation in the President's hands. F. P. Blair, Jr., is urged for the place.

It is reported that the President will endorse the President's speech—personal abuse and all.

Senator Dixon of Connecticut sustains the President.

At the President's last reception many attempted to open on the 27th inst. a grand reception to the President's resignation in the President's hands. F. P. Blair, Jr., is urged for the place.

It is reported that the President will endorse the President's speech—personal abuse and all.

Senator Dixon of Connecticut sustains the President.

At the President's last reception many attempted to open on the 27th inst. a grand reception to the President's resignation in the President's hands. F. P. Blair, Jr., is urged for the place.

It is reported that the President will endorse the President's speech—personal abuse and all.

Senator Dixon of Connecticut sustains the President.

At the President's last reception many attempted to open on the 27th inst. a grand reception to the President's resignation in the President's hands. F. P. Blair, Jr., is urged for the place.

It is reported that the President will endorse the President's speech—personal abuse and all.

Senator Dixon of Connecticut sustains the President.