THE OREGON SENTINEL.

ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING.

B. F. DOWELL, Proprietor.

SUBSCRIPTION—For One year, in advance, Four Dollars; if paid within the first six months of the year, five dollars; if not paid until the expiration of the year, six dollars.

ADVERTISING—One square (16 lines or less) first insertion, Three Dollars; each subsequent insertion, One Dollar. A discount of fifty per cent will be made to those who advertise by the year.

☞ Legal business received at current rates.

OSBORN & SESSIONS,

PURCHASING AND COMMISSION AGENTS,

☞ Merchant St., San Francisco, Cal.

Being an extensive experience, in both Wholesale and Retail trade, we feel confident that to COUNTRY MERCHANTS visiting a resident agent, or to an occasional purchaser, we can offer superior indugements.

Particular attention given to collections, the purchase and sale of Legal Tender notes, Gold, Stamps, Sewing Machines, etc., or other transactions requiring the services of experienced and reliable agents.

Purchases will be made for cash only—except in cases of special agreement to the contrary.

Geo W. Osborn,

formerly with CANFIELD, PIERSON & Co., Wholesale dealers in fine clothing, San Francisco.

E. C. Sessions,

formerly with C. R. GOODWIN, & Co., Wholesale Grocers, San Francisco; also, Bunnell & Wade, Jacksonville, Oregon.

REFER BY PERMISSION TO

A. WISE, Successor to Adams, Wise & Co., Importers and Jobbers, Boots, Shoes, Hats, Caps, etc., San Francisco.

J. F. HAZELTINE & CO., Importers and Jobbers, San Francisco.

LEVY BROTHERS & CO., Importers and Jobbers, Clothing, San Francisco.

LEVY & FRANKLIN, Wholesale Dealers, San Francisco.

SCHELL & CO., Importers and Jobbers, Clothing, San Francisco.

Umpqua Academy!

THE Trustees of Umpqua Academy have thoroughly repaired the building, and it is now ready for school. The Winter Term of 22 weeks will commence Nov. 27th, the Spring and Summer Term, 1st Monday in May, 1866.

RATES OF TUITION Per Quarter:

Primary Department	$ 5 00
Secondary do	6 00
Higher English	7 00
Ancient Languages, Drawing and Painting, each, extra	3 00
Music	10 00
Use of Instrument	3 00

Tuition in private families.

F. F. ROYAL, Principal.

M. CLARA SMITH, Ass't Teacher.

GREAT

SPORTSMAN'S EMPORIUM.

THE undersigned respectfully informs his friends and the public, that he has opened in San Francisco, where he will find a full assortment of fine and common double-barrel guns, revolvers of all different patterns, pistols of the latest patterns, and all kind of ammunition; such as, cartridges, caps and wads, also, powder flasks, shot flasks, hunting bags, of every sort and size.

All orders will be filled with promptness, neatness and dispatch. The manufacturing of gun rifles will be done at the shortest notice, and in the most approved style.

Grateful for past patronage, I respectfully solicit a continuance of the same.

JOHN MILLER.

September 9th, 1865. tf.

BARTLETT & Co.,

FORWARDING AND COMMISSION

MERCHANTS,

Fire-Proof Warehouse Main Street,

RED BLUFF.

IN RESUMING THE FORWARDING business we beg leave to offer our thanks for the very liberal patronage formerly bestowed upon the late firm of Hinchman & Bartlett, and promising the same prompt and faithful attention to business entrusted to our care, that characterized the business transactions of the late firm, we respectfully ask a share of public patronage.

C. A. FISHER & BRO., Jacksonville,
BERGGREN & CASEY, Yreka,
C. E. HANDY & CO., Yreka.

Red Bluff, April 7th, 1866. apl14tf

NOTICE to FARMERS.

J. ROW IS NOW PREPARED to receive all kinds of Produce on Commission and Storage, on the most reasonable terms. For particulars, call at his Fire Proof store, corner of California and Oregon streets.

March 9th, 1866. mar10tf

YREKA FOUNDRY

— AND —

MACHINE SHOP.

CASTINGS of all kinds executed at the shortest notice. Wrought or Cast Iron work manufactured from the best material. All kinds of Brass Work. Gurney and Babbit's metals for sale. Cash paid for Old Iron.

Summons.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF DEL NORTE } ss.

IN THE JUSTICE'S COURT OF CRESCENT Township, in and for the County of Del Norte. The people of the State of California send greeting to Wm. LEACH—

You are hereby summoned to appear before me, at my office in the Township of Crescent, in the County of Del Norte, on the 30th day of July, A. D. 1866, at 10 o'clock a. m., to answer unto the complaint of George Kingsbury, who sues for $244 00 with interest thereon at the rate of two per cent per month from October 1st 1862, being the balance claimed to be due on your note of hand, dated April 9th, 1862, when judgment will be taken against you for said amount, together with costs and damages, if you fail to appear and answer.

To the Sheriff or any Constable of said County greeting: Make legal service and due return hereof.

Given under my hand this 10th day of April, A. D. 1866. F. KNOX,

Justice of the Peace.

GO TO THE CITY DRUG STORE and buy your blue stone.

THE OREGON SENTINEL.

VOL. XI. JACKSONVILLE, SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1866. NO. 18

REV. J. S. SMITHS' SPEECH Reviewed.

TRIUMPHANT REFUTATION Of Every Proposition!

Sophisms & Assertions Compared with the Actual Facts.

READ! READ!

And judge for yourself!

Rev. J. S. Smith, Democratic candidate for the U. S. Senate, is now canvassing this State, and the *Statesman* reviews his speech (which is pretty much the same everywhere,) at Salem in a very able manner. We give place in our columns, and ask those who heard Mr. Smith in Jacksonville, last Saturday, to read it calmly and considerately, and decide for themselves whether he is or is not striving to blind the people as to their own best interests and the welfare and prosperity of the nation.

There is not in Oregon a more dangerous enemy to public liberty, or a more effective instrument of slavery and Jeff Davis Democracy, than the man whose name heads this article. He has been put forward as the champion of that party, which now seeks to accomplish by the ballot what the Southern confederacy failed to secure by bullet and bayonet. And inasmuch as he has been invested with the championship of secession Democracy, we propose to investigate his speeches from time to time during the canvass, as often as he shall make one within our reach.

He begins by telling the people how very honest, truthful and candid he is, and labors to create the impression that he would not deceive any one, or misrepresent any fact, for any consideration. The old rule should always be applied to such cases—distrust the man who swears to his own honesty, and ask for proof. Instead of being "candid Jo. Smith," "honest Jo Smith," as his copperhead strikers delight to call him, Mr. Smith is the most specious, sophistical, uncandid, and demagogical public speaker we have ever listened to; and we intend to prove this statement before we get through.

We have heard Mr. Smith make two speeches; or, more properly, we have heard him deliver the same speech twice—once at Jefferson and again at Salem. The following are his points:

1st. Since the Southern rebellion broke out, a great deal of prejudice has been created against the Democratic party.

2. The Democratic party has governed the nation from its formation to the breaking out of the war.

3d. Is it probable that any new and untried party could do as well as the old—the farmer illustration.

4th. The war commenced under Lincoln.

5th. It was not necessary to abandon Democracy in order to support the Government.

6th. Division into parties does not involve weakness.

7th. Lincoln and Johnson's administrations have expended more money than all former administrations, in the aggregate; that it had been disbursed through the hands of Republicans alone—none but Republicans could get any office or contracts from these administrations; and this vast sum of money, about *five thousand* million dollars, constituted a vast corruption fund, which although it may not have been used directly for that purpose, yet the effect of its expenditure was to break down the Democratic party.

8th. The party was not broken down under all these circumstances, *and therefore it must be founded on truth and correct principles.*

9th. The three fifths argument, to-wit: If the Democrats are all traitors, and the South are all traitors, then three fifths of the American people are in favor of overthrowing the Government which they maintain; but that as it is not overthrown therefore Democrats cannot be traitors.

10th. Treason has been put down; rebels all back heart and hand; we ought therefore to take them in—the "Prodigal Son" argument.

Who would have believed that the single word "copperheadism" could have been divided into so many *"heads"* and tails?—for modern Democracy, better known as "copperheadism," is the sum and substance of the above ten divisions. Permit us to reply briefly.

1. Prejudice against Democracy.

1st. Mr. Smith complains that prejudice has been created against his party since the rebellion broke out. That is true in one sense. It would have been better to have complained that your party had become odious; that the name of Democracy, instead of being an honor, as in the days of Jackson, was now a word of reproach—dishonorable, yea infamous. But did you inform your hearers of the reason of this? As you did not, we will. When the Southern States, the Democratic States passed their ordinances of secession, withdrew their representatives in Congress, commenced to arm their militia, to capture by force of arms the U. S. forts and property in the South, you Democrats of the North *did not* condemn the action of "your Southern brethren," but you commenced to cry "compromise" long before Mr. Lincoln took his seat, and long before the Republican party had the power or opportunity to do any unfriendly act, even if so disposed. You not only failed to condemn this secession movement, but some of you, as for instance Mr. Fay, whom you now support for Congress, claimed that secession was "a divine right." Instead of condemning secession, you fell back on the Resolutions of 1798-99, just as did Jeff. Davis in one of his messages, after being made President of the Southern Confederacy, as a justification of the Democratic doctrine of State sovereignty. You not only refused to condemn secession as a party, but when the flag of your country was fired upon and compelled to surrender to the rebels at Fort Sumpter, you then raised the cry of "No coercion"—no constitutional power to make war against a State, and all that stuff. Was not that the argument of Buchanan's last message? was not that the argument of Jo. Lane in the Senate? was not that the cry of every Oregon Democratic newspaper, and the argument of every man on your ticket? You cannot deny that. The honest masses of the people, seeing your party take such a stand, and seeing that Mr. Lincoln assured the South in his inaugural message that he was their friend, and that he would not do them harm, but protect them, said to themselves: the South has no cause for secession and rebellion, and if the Democracy intend to excuse these revolutionary proceedings, and refuse to say "No" to their Southern brethern, then we must conclude that the Democracy intends to become the aids and abettor of secession, a partizan reason, and the secret enemy of the Union. This was your course, and this the reason why your party became odious and hateful to every loyal man. You know, Mr. Smith, that if Democracy had been true to the teachings of Jackson, and had loved the patriotic opposite of such Democrats as Stephen A. Douglas, Andrew Johnson, John A. Dix, Edwin M. Stanton, Lewis Cass, Jas. Holt, John A. Logan, B. F. Butler, and David Tod, it never would have become odious or unpopular. But you preferred your party to a wise course of action in maintaining the Union, and hence Democrats were hung and burned in effigy, just as B. Hayden and others justly served old Jo. Lane *over* at Dallas. Not content with withholding your support and encouragement of the constitutionally elected President when the Government seemed to be tumbling to pieces, you commenced to abuse, oppose and denounce him, when he made any effort to put down the rebels in arms. You dare not deny that. Northern Democracy virtually made itself the left wing of the rebel army. At your National Convention at Chicago, you declared as the opinion of your party, that the war to maintain the Union was a *failure*. In doing this, at the very darkest hour of our trouble, did you not plainly say to the rebels, "Hold on there; the Union men cannot overthrow you; hold on, we will stop the war, and you will get your own terms yet."

Did you not say to our own brave soldiers in the field, to every one from Gen. Grant down to the privates in the rank, "You have *failed*, you can't whip the South, you are too weak, your labors are useless, your blood is worthless, you can't do it?" Did you not say to foreign nations, "It is the opinion of the Democratic party of the North, numbering one million eight hundred thousand men, that the war is a failure, the South can not be subdued; you are justified in recognizing the Southern Confederacy as an independent nation, and our American Union as dissolved?" Will you dare deny, Mr. Smith, before any intelligent audience, that such is the plain meaning of your Chicago Platform? and in thus saying and acting, did you not become the *aiders* and abettors of treason and rebellion? You cannot deny these plain conclusions, and this is why you will not refer to the platforms of your party during the past four years. You, Mr. Smith, know better than you acted; you laid down your conscience and manhood at the behests of a political party in sympathy with traitors; and now that you find yourself justly classed with traitors and betouled with the slime of treason, it is no concern of ours. You cannot escape the just and impartial judgment of either the present or the future. Foreign nations, classed your party as the friend of the rebels, and the rebels themselves counted upon your counteracting efforts in defeating the efforts to maintain the Union. As thou hast made thy bed, so lie in it. And that is the way your party has been prejudiced in the minds of the people. It justly deserves all the odium which the English language can furnish words to express.

2. The Democracy, has Governed.

2d. Mr. Smith maintains that the Democratic party and Democratic principles have governed the nation from its beginning down to the year 1860; and therefore, in the 3d place, is it likely that any new and untried party will do better than we have already done, in point of progress and prosperity? This proposition is not true either in point of fact or principle. The first eight years of the Government was under the administration of General Washington, "the Father of his Country," and the succeeding four years under the administration of John Adams, neither of whom were disciples of the Jefferson school of politics. They gave the country such a start in prosperity that it was not in the power of Jefferson, their successor, to introduce any radical changes. From the organization of the Government down to 1860, the Democratic party held control of the General Government for forty years, and the Whig party for twenty-four years. But neither party can claim that its distinctive principles were manifested in the workings of the Government, except upon two questions—Slavery and the Tariff. The Democratic party has been distinguished for its devotion to the interest of slavery, while the Whig and opposition parties have been distinguished for their devotion to the interest of American industry. The Democracy is welcome to all the credit which slavery can give them; while the unexampled prosperity secured to the whole country by the protective tariff of Adams' administration, from 1825 to 1829, and which was repealed by the Calhoun free-traders of Jackson's first term, bringing general ruin and bankruptcy; and the great prosperity during Fillmore's administration, from '49 to 53, from the same good policy, which was in turn succeeded by the commercial crash of Pierce's administration, in 1857, produced by a like repeal, will ever remain as enduring monuments of the wisdom of a protective tariff, and the evils of Democratic British free trade. But Democracy did not always maintain control of the Government upon national principles, but by making bargains with the sectional interests of slavery, and the cotton planter, free-trade notions of the South. But if prosperity is proof of correct principles, then, Mr. Smith, let us contrast the growth and wealth of the Whig, Republican, Union States of the North with the Democratic States of the South, because the last three Presidential elections have decided it thus. The Democratic State of Virginia started in 1790 in the first rank, and came out in 1860 in the fifth rank; while the Union State of New York started in 1790 in the fifth rank, and came out in 1860 as the "Empire State." The Union State of Ohio started in 1800 in the eighteenth rank, and came out in 1860 in the 3d rank, passing all the slave States; while the Democratic State of Tennessee, with ten years the start of Ohio, started in the seventeenth rank, and came out in 1860 in the tenth rank. But the difference between the Democratic States and the Union States is more strikingly manifested in favor of the Union States in the subject of education and intelligence of the people, than in the growth of the States. Take the Census, Mr. Smith, and see the effect of Democracy in the South on the question of intelligence. We know you will not claim the New England States as Democratic States, and therefore we will exclude them.

3. The old party, not the best.

The Census shows that, in a population of three millions one hundred and thirty-five thousand, in the six New England States there are only eight thousand five hundred and forty-four of twenty years of age who cannot read; while, in a population of a little over seven millions, in the Democratic States of the South, there are *five hundred and forty-five thousand* adult persons who cannot read;—the ratio of ignorance being about one person to every *three hundred and forty-three* in the Union States, while there is one to every *eleven* in the Democratic States, who cannot read. Will not that do, on the subject of your kind of Democracy and its fruits, Mr. Smith? As the row of light houses show the mariner the line between the land and sea, in midnight perils, so we think the row of school houses sufficiently indicate the line between the Union and the Democratic States. We do not now have to try new and untried parties or principles in order to kick modern Democracy into oblivion. Our principles have been fully tried, and have always produced prosperity and happiness, no matter on what soil or under what administration. On this point we can with feelings of pride point you to all the *free* States of the North, which have finally and forever decided against your kind of Democracy.

4. When the war, Commenced.

4th. Mr. Smith's states that which is not true when he asserts that the war commenced under Lincoln. The record shows that all the Gulf States had passed ordinances of secession, and had met at Montgomery, Alabama, organized the Southern Confederacy, elected Jeff. Davis President, raised troops, organized the Southern militia, drove Major Anderson from Fort Moultrie, fired on the Star of the West steamship while attempting to reach Major Anderson, with men and provisions, at Fort Sumpter, captured all the U. S. arsenals and mints in the South—cash and all—before Abraham Lincoln had even reached Washington City.

All these acts of war, treason and rebellion were performed under the Democratic administration of James Buchanan.

5. Support the war; but not the Democracy.

5th. Mr. Smith says that it was not necessary to abandon Democracy in order to support the Government. We have already shown that Democracy did not support the Government during the war, and if his proposition is correct, we now want to know why the Democracy did not support the Government in putting down the rebellion. This is a part of the question which he slips over. We will readily agree that it was not necessary to abandon the Democracy or any other party, particularly, in order to help put down the rebellion; and if the Democracy of 1860 had been faithful to the teachings of Jackson, and to the advice of Douglas, Dix and others, it would have gone in one solid body against the rebels. But the party did not so act, and therefore it became necessary for "honest" men in the party to leave it, and unite with the Republicans in forming the Union party, just as Mr. Smith had stated; and the fact that "honest" men did leave the Democracy and go into the Union organization, when Democracy was forming excuses for the secession, is the very best proof of their honesty. J. S. Smith did not leave the Democracy in 1860; therefore J. S. Smith is not an "honest politician."

6. Parties.

6th. Division into parties does not necessarily involve weakness. That depends altogether on the character of the parties formed. For instance: if on a battle field one army is divided by its commanding general into two parties, for the purpose of making one party assail the front while the other assails the flank or rear of the enemy the two parties become mutual aids to each other. This was the case with the Democracy of 1860. The Breckinridgers assailed the front of the Union army by secession and open war in the Southern States, while their sympathizers in the North assailed the rear of the Union army, by advocating "compromise," "peace on any terms," "no coercion," discouraging enlistments, New York riots, and a war-a-failure platform at Chicago. Which of these parties did you belong to Mr. Smith?

7. Lincoln, and Johnson's expenditures.

7th. Please read the seventh and eighth points above. It may be true for aught we know that there has been more money expended by the Government in the last five years than for the whole time preceding, but it is certainly not true that it amounts to five thousand million dollars. The national debt very nearly represents the whole amount expended, and that does not amount to but about three thousand million. But, for the purpose of the argument, Mr. Smith's figures will suit us better than they do him. We now come back to the starting point, and ask, who made it necessary to expend this vast amount of money? There is but little doubt, but the Charleston Convention unanimously put forth Douglas as the Democratic candidate, he would have been elected. Democracy first divided among themselves, threw the victory to the Republicans and then made that constitutional victory the pretext for secession and rebellion. None but Democratic States seceded, none but Democrats went into the rebellion, and none but Democrats organized the Southern Confederacy. The Northern Democratic party, after the formation of the Union party, encouraged the rebels, as we have shown above, protracted the war for years, and made the expense larger by thousands of millions than if they had remained silent after the outbreak. Your Democratic President James Buchanan, could have strangled the serpent of secession at Charleston, without the expense of one hundred thousand dollars, if he had followed the noble example set by Andrew Jackson in 1832. But he did not, but encouraged the rebellion by his "no coercion" doctrine, which all you Democrats indorsed. We give therefore justice in charging the war and all its expense to the Democracy. Will Mr. Smith take the position that the soldiers (those gallant fellows he pretends to be so very grateful to) ought not to have been paid anything for fighting the rebels? If so, let him say so. But the money was disbursed by Republicans says Mr. Smith. He means members of the Union party, because he will not say that Stanton has not been a Democrat, or that Butler, or Rufus Ingalls, Quartermaster-in-Chief of the great army of the Potomac. But none but Republicans could get any office, says Mr. S. Here again he means Union men; because he will not assert that Stanton, Dix, Foster, Holt, Logan, Ted, Brough, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, McClellan, Hallock, and thousands of others like them, were not Democrats when the war began. Both offices and contracts were distributed upon the proposition that the recipients were loyal persons and devotion to a maintenance of the Union. Lincoln did not make Vallandigham a Major General, or call Fernando Wood into the Cabinet, or send Seymour to represent us in England, for the plain reason that these democratic gentry were doing all they could to weaken the Union armies and strengthen the rebels. In short, they were, by common consent of all good men of loss or traitors, and all those like Jo Smith & Co., who run on the principle of politics, were counted as enemies of the Union, and friends of the Southern Confederacy, and therefore not to be trusted. Would it not have been a wicked burlesque if Gen. Grant had selected his staff officers from the ranks of Gen. Lee? And this is but a fair illustration of the foolishness of Smith's complaint that democrats were not appointed to office. We defy Mr. Smith to show that any loyal man was ever subject to prejudice in the mind of Lincoln because he had formerly voted the Democratic ticket. In making this argument about the five thousand millions, Mr. Smith indorses the idea that it was a vast corruption fund to break down the democratic party, but when pinned down on the point, he weakens so far as to admit that such was its effect, although it may not have been its object. From this false premise, he argues that inasmuch as the democratic party has not been broken down by all this, *therefore* it must be founded on *truth and correct principles*. Now, Mr. Smith, if you were the "honest Jo Smith" which your friends claim for you, if you had been an honest reasoner, you would not have drawn such a conclusion; but you would have first stated the "truth and correct principles" upon which you claim your party to be founded, and then alleged that such principles could not be overthrown by such means named, and then because the means had been used, and the party had remained, therefore, it remains *known* of the *truth and correct principles named*. Instead of making a more inference that the party was founded on correct principles during the war, why did you not point to your platforms of principles upon which your party rallied during the war? You knew you could not go into your record during the war to sustain yourself, and therefore you sought to cover up, mystify and divert the attention of the people by that kind of sophistical reasoning. Now, to show you the utter fallacy of such an argument, let us illustrate; and, to make it interesting, let us take a subject familiar to Mr. Smith. He is a Methodist minister, and believes in an evil spirit called Satan, the Devil, or Anti-Christ. According to Mr. Smith's theology, this evil spirit has a power or kingdom in this evil world. He was let loose in the garden of Eden, and has been going around ever since, "like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." To put down this Evil one, the Saviour of mankind came into the world, and established the Christian religion, and commissioned men to go and preach it to all people. That was more than eighteen hundred years ago. Since that time, hundreds of thousands, yea millions, of men have been preaching and laboring to overthrow the power of Satan in the world. They have given their lives to the cause, and religious people have given many times more than five thousand million dollars, to put down Satan and his wicked works. But here, in the middle of the nineteenth century, after all this expenditure of money, and after over eighteen hundred years' constant warfare on the Devil, we find him as busy as ever throughout the world, inciting men to all manner of wickedness and crime, and all manner of vice and iniquity; *therefore*, (according to Mr. Smith's way of reasoning,) the kingdom of Satan must be founded on "truth and correct principles," and the old Devil himself cannot be such a bad spirit.

We are thus particular to follow Mr. Smith out, on what some persons might think minor points, in order to show the deceptive, dishonest, and fallacious manner in which he reasons, and the means he takes to hoodwink and humbug the people.

9. Three fifths of the American people not traitors.

9th. Read this ninth point above. This is another piece of sophistry to prove that Democrats are not guilty of the charge of treason. The Constitution of the United States provides a way for electing a President; Abraham Lincoln was elected according to that way; but he was elected by less than the majority of all the votes in the United States, therefore, according to the Smith logic, as Lincoln was not a usurper, he must *have* been voted for by the majority. Nonsense. Lincoln was elected in the constitutional way. The Breckinridge democracy of the South raised the standard of rebellion, and, being the majority of that section, *forced* all the people of their section to succumb to secession and rebellion, but that did not make *all* the people of the South traitors, and nobody ever claimed that

W. O. BUCKNER. COL. FARREN.

EL DORADO

UNION CLUB ROOM.

Corner of Cal. & Oregon Sts.

THE UNDERSIGNED HAVING THOROughly refitted the above named saloon, solicit a share of the public patronage.

The best Wines, Liquors and Cigars will be served to customers.

BUCKNER & FARREN.

Jacksonville, April 13, '66. ap13tf

After the war broke out, the democratic party of the North sided with their brethren of the South; but these sympathizers in the North were the minority of the North, and, added to the original secessionists of the South, did not make in fact even a respectable minority of the whole people. Mr. Smith's error, purposely made, consists in representing that the Union men assert that all the people of the South are traitors, which they do not; and, further, he forgets to say that many our democrats voted for McClellan, upon the basis of McClellan's letter, who do not, and never did, and never will endorse your Chicago Platform. They are some of the "honest men," who being deceived by such fallacious logic as *yours*, have not yet found their way into their proper place, the Union party; but they will be undeceived, and will come over to the true faith.

10. The traitors should not be admitted.

10th. Treason has been put down, says Mr. Smith, and the rebels are all back *heart and hand*, and now we ought to receive them as the returning prodigal. This is not true either. Although the rebellion has been put down, treason is almost as defiant now as ever. It has lain down the musket, but now demands the ballot. Alexander H. Stephens, the most conservative of any of those who voluntarily rendered aid to the Southern confederacy, has stated before the Reconstruction Committee that his opinions, and the opinions of the South generally on the abstract question of State sovereignty have not undergone much change. We are compelled to believe Mr. Stephens, and when he makes this statement, we are willing to believe that he is ready to give us the hand; but we are not satisfied that he gives us the "Southern heart" with it. The rebels do not come back as the penitent prodigal. "They have not only wasted their substance" in riotous living," but they have wickedly, maliciously, and traitorously wasted Uncle Sam's substance in "riotous living." They have done the Government all the harm they could, and only ceased killing and murdering their brothers, whom they left with scorn and contempt five years ago, because they were overpowered. They admit that they are disarmed, but flatly tell us "their opinions have not changed much." They give up the Confederacy at present, but, according to Gen. Thomas's testimony, they hope that the day and opportune circumstances will yet arrive when they can rise up again to renew the work of carnage and bloodshed. No indeed, Mr. Smith, they do not possess a single one of the many claims for sympathy which the returning, penitent prodigal offered an indulgent parent.

We have thus gone over briefly the ten points named above. Mr. Smith's arguments on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, the Civil Rights Bill, and the Taxing Bonds question, are similar to those of all the other copperhead stumpers, and will be discussed and replied to as space and opportunity offer, from week to week. The arguments enumerated above, and brought forward by Mr. Smith, are the exclusive property of that gentleman, and will doubtless be reproduced by him throughout the State, as opportunity offers. We believe that a careful reading of our replies to Mr. Smith will satisfy any unprejudiced mind that he deals more in sophistry than in reason, more in clap-trap humbug than in facts and logic. He is a very smooth speaker, and appears to be a most courteous debater, and tells his story with such an appearance of candor and honesty, as is well calculated to deceive. He is a chronic office-seeker, but not having the confidence of the O'Meara *regime*, they will not consent to trust him, while they continue to use him from year to year to do the drudgery and "thankee" jobs for a corrupt and unscrupulous party. His principles are no better than those of Fay or O'Meara, but his professions are *immense*.

TOO TRUE.—The Shasta *Courier* is responsible for the following:

"Between Yreka and Jacksonville, Oregon, there was a wedding last winter—just about the time of the deep, severe snow, when Dr. Pelham and others of our citizens were corraled in that cold country. The families of the respective parties to the marriage were in attendance, and the party was rather after the old fashioned style, made up of neighbors, their wives and babies, and everybody that happened to be stopping anywhere in accessible distance. It was a pleasant affair, but all like, a similar assemblages, it dispersed, and the bride retired to her chamber, first having whispered to the fond groom: 'Don't come up for half an hour.' This being a first request, he obeyed, waited the time anxiously, nor let the hand of the ticking clock pass by a second the limit, ere he was gone to her with whom his life was joined. He rapped gently at the bridal chamber door, and receiving no reply, entered unbidden, and saw his wife lying on the bed, arrayed in night gear of purest white, presenting a picture of beauty, taste and loveliness beyond comparison. One step further, a closer look, and the blood rushes back to his heart—she was dead! Loudly calling for help, father, mother, sisters, bridesmaids, all—all the household rushed to the room. The mother discovered that her daughter still breathed; but horror upon horrors! there lay the empty vial from which the fatal draught had been taken. Messengers were dispatched for physicians; the patient was rubbed and sprinkled, and hopes were entertained of her revival, symptoms looking favorable. At this juncture some one picked up a piece of folded paper from a table, on which was written in the delicate hand of the fair bride;

"'Be not alarmed, dear husband. Feeling that the occasion would be too much for my nerves, I have taken chloroform.

YOUR OWN WIFE.'

"A moment more and the room was not so populous."

A COMPANY at Oregon City are about commencing the manufacture of the goods made at the factory at that place into clothing.