

The Oregon Republican

COUNTY OFFICIAL PAPER.
DALLAS, SATURDAY, APRIL 9.

Republican State Ticket.

For Congress,
J. G. WILSON,
of Wasco.

For Governor,
JOEL PALMER,
of Yamhill.

For Secretary of State,
JAMES ELKINS,
of Linn.

For Treasurer,
MYER HIRSCH,
of Marion.

For State Printer,
KINCAID,
of Lake.

For Judge of 3d District,
R. P. BOISE,
of Polk.

District Attorney of 2d District,
POWELL,
of Linn.

Polk County Union Republican Convention.

By order of the Union Republican Central Committee of Polk county, the primary meetings will be held at the place of voting in each Precinct, at 1 o'clock p. m., Friday, May 13, 1870, to elect Delegates to the County Convention, to be held at Dallas, at 10 o'clock a. m., Saturday, May 14th, 1870, for the purpose of nominating a County Ticket, and the transaction of such other business as may properly come before such convention.

The several Precincts are entitled to send Delegates as follows:

Bethel	8	La Creole	2
Buena Vista	7	Luckiamute	4
Bridgeport	5	Monmouth	7
Jules	10	Salt Lake	3
Langdon	4	Total	59
Polk	4		
Jackson	4		

J. L. COLLINS, Chairman.
Dallas, Jan. 29th, 1870.

MODERN DEMOCRACY.

Another Blind-First Plank in the Democratic Platform—What does it Mean?

The Albany Convention resolved that we are unalterably attached to the principles of our republic as expounded by its founders. Now, while we claim no right to place a construction on the language of the above resolution that would pervert in any manner the true meaning intended by its authors, yet we have a just right, as the language is general and left undefined, to so construe it as to make it accord harmoniously with the well known record of the Democratic party. Were it not for the firm belief that hundreds of Democrats, in Oregon, are about to be grossly deceived by it in this most important political campaign, we should not take or use our columns to comment upon this first resolution.

Before going, then, to the law and the testimony, we assert that the resolution was conceived and brought forth by minds that heartily sympathized with rebels during our late national struggle for existence, and who hold, now as then, that this Government is simply a league between sovereign States, for mutual protection against foreign enemies only; and who hold that there never was, nor is now, power in the Government to coerce rebellious States; that the late war against traitors was a flagrant outrage upon the constitutional rights of the people against whom it was waged, who also believe that each State, being sovereign and independent of each other, has the right to judge, each for itself, any infraction of the Constitution by Congress, and of the mode and manner of redress. And further, they hold to this pernicious and dangerous doctrine, that whenever the Congress of the United States shall pass a law, which, in the judgment of the people of any one of the States, is not in accordance with their construction of the Constitution and against their particular interests, that they not only have the inherent original right, but that the only appropriate remedy is nullification. Now, we are aware that this proposition, or assertion, strikes most harshly the ear of thousands of honest men who are to-day identified with the Democratic party in this State. We believe these men, so placed, are there from the simple reason that they are

constantly imposed upon and kept entirely in the dark, by the untiring efforts of those men from whose bosoms the above resolution emanated.

Now, to the facts: At the close of the Revolution, in 1784, the leading men of the colonies at once divided into two factions. One advocated the doctrine in which he had been educated; that man was not capable of self-government; that the people must always have a head, in other words a great leader or king, and that they had fought the Revolutionary war not for the purpose of throwing off entirely a monarchical form of government, but because their sacred and equal rights had been almost totally disregarded by the rules of the mother country. The other party believed man competent to govern himself, or favored a government by the people. The result was a government based upon the articles of confederation, which was considered a compromise between the two factions. For about twelve years the people of the thirteen colonies lived on and struggled hard to establish a national reputation, but the experiment was a failure. Something had to be done. Washington expressed his fears that all the blood and treasure, so freely and heroically spilled and spent, had been poured out in vain. Finally a convention was called to revise the articles of confederation.

When convened, with the father of our country at its head, they saw at once the form of government must be entirely changed, and, as a sequence, the old articles must be entirely disregarded, and consequently the first resolution passed by the convention was:

"Resolved, That it is the opinion of this convention that a national government ought to be established of a Supreme Legislative, Judiciary and Executive."

The convention proceeded to propose that form of government to the people of all the States, and agreed upon the present Constitution, upon which the new government was to be based, and if so ordained by a majority of all the people of nine of the old colonies or States, then, the existing government, formed by the confederation, was to be abolished and entirely changed by substituting for it a new government, where the only sovereignty should rest with the people.

This proposition or constitution was put out and held up before the people. All could see it; all could read it. Its advocates and its enemies mounted the rostrum with eagerness and energy. The former, with Washington at their head, to defend it, and the latter to defeat it. The contest, taken altogether, was probably the most spirited and able of any ever witnessed on the continent. Its defenders and friends succeeded. The Constitution was ordained and established by the people to be the fundamental law of the land. The government was changed from a confederation, existing by contract between sovereign and independent States, to that of a nationality, with the sovereignty held by the States as such, surrendered without reserve to the people in the aggregate; to be exercised by a majority of them as they had ordained in the instrument just adopted, and as they should think best for the general welfare thereafter, for all time.

That this was the object of the framers of that instrument, and the nature of the changes proposed thereby is shown by proofs too numerous to mention here. We give but one: When the Constitution was agreed upon in convention it was sent to the Continental Congress accompanied by a letter signed by Washington himself, an extract from which we reproduce: Said Washington, "It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these States to secure all rights and independent sovereignty to each and yet provide for the interests and safety of all. Individuals entering into a society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. In all our deliberations on this subject we kept steadily in our view that which appeared to us the greatest interest of every true American, the Constitution of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence."

But soon after the adoption of that most sacred charter of the liberties of the American people, some of the very men who opposed its adoption and who were enemies to it, set to work their

gigantic intellect, shrewdness and wit, to so construe the instrument as to defeat the object for which it was framed and adopted, and thus retain the old form of government under the confederation, or create a political hobby upon which they could easily ride into power and position. Then came the resolutions of '88 and '90, placing a construction which entirely changed the government under it as intended by its makers and defenders, back to the very form that the Constitution was intended to abolish. That construction was adopted by a faction in this country, and by them insisted upon to be the true one from that day to the present. That construction found an able defender in the person of John C. Calhoun, but when that statesman undertook to enforce the construction and heresy, by means of nullification, Old Hickory was President and Calhoun soon found it out, and a timely retraction saved himself the unpleasant task of pulling hemp. Webster, with an unequalled power of mind, stood a firm pillar in the Senate in defence of constitutional liberty. Mainly, by the efforts of these two, among the greatest minds that ever lived, an iron heel was placed upon the revolutionary construction that buried it in undistinguished ruins for thirty years.

But during all this time, the youth of the South, at least a great number of them, were secretly educated into this political heresy, until finally, in 1860, when the advocates of that construction and the universal and perpetual spread of slavery having managed to get possession of our national Capitol, the archives of the Government, the President, the Cabinet, our army and navy, forts, arsenals, dock yards and the Democratic party throughout the land. They appeared before the American people with Breckenridge and Lane as their standard bearers, declaring that unless their construction was now accepted by the election of those men they would secede from the Union, peaceably if they could or forcibly if they must.

The election came. Lincoln, whose name is immortal, was elected. These constructionists made good their word. The war note was sounded and an army of rebels, with all the advantage we have mentioned, made war on the Government, while Buchanan, he being one of these constructionists, was proclaiming from the White House that he had searched the Constitution in vain to find the power to coerce rebellious States. War, did we say; no, a cowardly attack on Anderson's little patriotic band at Sumpter. The great loyal heart of this nation was fired, irrespective of party, and the time of sifting came.

And now, as the record shows, every politician, both North and South, who did not go into the Union organization against rebels, and who took sides with the constructionists and with Buchanan, organized themselves into what we term the modern Democracy, the chief corner stone of whose faith was slavery and State supremacy. This is no new doctrine, for it was always held and maintained as the true dogma by that faction of the Democratic party, and now, the leaders of this modern Democracy, mad over their defeat in the war, and thirsting for political power, so they may satiate their desire for revenge by first humbugging the people and then gain at the ballot box what they lost by the bullet. In proof of this we refer all thinking, reading and honest Democrats to the records of the Democratic members of Congress as reported in the *Globe* for the year 1860, and during the war.

To show that the principle involved in the 1st resolution of the Albany platform has always been the bone of contention in this Government, and also its true meaning and to show that the line so plainly drawn between the friends and enemies of the Constitution and Republican institutions, has not been confined to the legislative branch of our Government, but that the Executive and the Supreme Court have kept up constantly the same line of demarcation, we quote the following which are only a few from the many that might be produced. Mr. Justice Wilson, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention, made use of strong language in the Pennsylvania

debates on its adoption.

He said: "We were told that the convention, no doubt, thought it was forming a compact or contract of the greatest importance. It is a matter of surprise to see the great leading principles of this system still so very much misunderstood. I cannot answer for what every member thought, but I believe it cannot be said they thought they were making a compact, because I cannot discover the least trace of a compact in the system. There can be no compact unless there are more parties than one. It is a new doctrine that one can make a compact with himself. The convention was making contracts; with whom? I am unable to conceive who the parties could be. The States governments made a bargain with each other. That is the doctrine that is endeavored to be established by gentlemen in the opposition; their State sovereignties wish to be represented. But far otherwise were the ideas of the convention. This is not a government founded upon compact. It is founded upon the power the people. They express in their name and their authority, we, the people, do ordain and establish, &c."

This was the plain reasoning of all the friends of the Constitution, and all those who advocate its adoption. The following is from the people of Virginia to their members of Congress:

"Government without coercion is a proposition at once so absurd and contradictory that the idea creates a confusion of the understanding. It is form without substance; at best a body without a soul."

This is the opinion held by the advocates of constitutional liberty at the commencement of our Government, and we hold it now to be the true principle. In the language of an eminent writer, we ask, "if the Constitution is a compact, what and how did the Union become a party? If a compact why is it never so denominated, but often and invariably in the instrument itself and in its amendments styled this Constitution? and if a compact why did the framers and people call it the supreme law? Even if it could be considered a compact in any sense before its adoption, the moment the people declared for it, it became an executed contract and at once stripped of all the elements of a contract to be performed by any party."

The enemies of the Constitution, when the same was before the people for action, admitted that, if adopted, it would establish the very form of government for which we now contend. In the Virginia debates, Patrick Henry said: "That it is a consolidated government is demonstrably clear. The language is, 'We, the people,' instead of we, the States. States are the characteristic and soul of a confederation. If the States be not the agents of the compact, it must be one great consolidated government of the people of all the States." The enemies and friends alike of that instrument admitted, in all the States at that time, as the record will show, that if it was adopted and ordained by the people as the supreme law of the land, then, under it, we should have a great national sovereignty, the people.

But soon after came this unfortunate construction of which we speak, and upon it the country became divided, and still is, and the only question today before the American people is whether we are a national government of the people, who alone are sovereign, or a confederation of independent States. If the former, and the people so declare it, then the great experiment to establish republicanism is a success; if the latter, a mournful failure.

The Supreme Court, as we have said, has always been divided on this all important question. Chief Justice Taney, and those members of the Court who held with him, agreed "that the powers of the general government are divided by the States, who alone are sovereign, and must be exercised in subordination to the States, who alone possess supreme dominion." On the contrary, Chief Justice Marshall and Justice Jay and other members of the Court, always held that this was a government by the people, and the reasoning of a majority of the Court, in the case of *McCulloch vs. Maryland*, was, "But when, in order to form a more perfect Union, it was deemed necessary to change the alliance of States into an effective government, possessing great and sovereign powers and acting directly on the people, the necessity of referring it to the people and deriving its

powers from them, was felt and acknowledged by all. The government of the Union, then, is emphatically and truly a government of the people. In form and substance it emanates from them. Its powers are granted by them, and are to be exercised directly on them and for their benefit."

This is the doctrine for which we contend, and we believe that three-fourths of the legal voters of Oregon hold the same; and when they shall understand that the intention of the 1st resolution in the Albany platform is to establish a contrary dogma, they will cast their votes against it irrespective of all other considerations and party name. This treasonable construction of the Constitution is held by all the leading Democrats and Democratic journals in Oregon. This we assert without fear of contradiction, and it is the essence of secession and disintegration that forms the base of all our national troubles, and is the only great pillow standing directly in the pathway to the permanent establishment of republicanism.

Now, to give our readers in this county proof of the above assertion, we quote the language of the *Polk County Times*, and also its correspondent, a resident of this county. In complaining of the course pursued by the *World*, a Democratic paper, the *Times* says:

"Now is not the *World* a singular Democratic journal? It has advised the party to acquiesce in negro suffrage; it has argued the payment of the swindling war debt in gold; and now it covertly ignores the true Democratic exposition of the Government enunciated by Madison, Jefferson and Calhoun." Its correspondent, from Monmouth, says: "The Democratic principle, as I understand it, is to recognize each State of the Union as independent, sovereign and equal in its sovereignty. This is why I am a Democrat."

Now, the doctrine taught by Jefferson, Madison and Calhoun, and opposed by Washington, Jackson, Hamilton and others, was the very construction of the Constitution which we claim is so pernicious and dangerous to our institutions, and is found in the resolutions of '98 and '99, and reads, "That the Federal States have a right to judge of any infractions of the Constitution, and that a nullification by those sovereignties of all unauthorized acts done under the color of that instrument, is the rightful remedy."

The Virginia Legislature, in 1829, resolved "That the Constitution of the United States, being a federative compact between the sovereign States, in construing which no common arbitrator is known. Each State has a right to construe the compact for itself." The Kentucky resolutions also declared, "That to the compact each State acceded as a State and is an integral party; that the government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the powers delegated to itself; but that, as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as the mode and measure of redress."

This, then, is what we claim is meant by the first resolution in the Democratic platform—that the State authorities are supreme; that they have a right to nullify a law of Congress whenever, in their opinion, it is unconstitutional. President Jackson said that "nullification is secession," and if this theory is correct then the war was all wrong, and the national debt a fraud and ought to be repudiated. We appeal to honest Democrats who we know denounce this heresy, and ask how long will you be deluded? Ask your leaders and leading journals what means this first resolution, and if they will come out and talk English and tell you their real sentiments; we venture the assertion that they will declare that it means secession, repudiation and State sovereignty.

To the Democratic journals and stump orators of Oregon we make an appeal; Gentlemen, what means the first resolution? There is no disguising the fact that the founders of the government were divided upon this question. There was and is but two theories upon this question. Which do you mean? Tell the honest voters of your party. Do you mean as expound-

ed by those founders, who drafted and voted for the resolutions of '98-9, and as held by the authorities we have above quoted? Do you mean that this government is a creation of the States, who alone possessed absolute sovereignty, or do you mean that it is a great national government by the people in the aggregate, who are the sovereigns of this country, and that the States, when the Constitution was formed and adopted, surrendered their sovereignty as such to the people? Be honest, gentlemen; tell us the facts and let the people of Oregon know for once, fairly and squarely, what the issue is. Speak out, gentlemen; don't be timid, for we assure you we are prepared, and it is entirely convenient for us to prove every assertion that we have made, and quite as convenient for us to show up your record.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

W. H. TEAL,
Wagon & Carriage Maker,
Main Street, Dallas.

I HAVE ON HAND AN ASSORTMENT of Lumber Wagons, Express Wagons and Buggies of various kinds, ready for sale.

COME ON WITH YOUR CASH!

You all know what my wagons are; for I have been well patronized for the last TEN YEARS, for which I feel thankful. And the last year they went off like Hot Cakes. I am well prepared to do all kinds of work in my trade. I have in my employ the best Blacksmith in the County, who is prepared to do Shoeing in the best Style, on short notice, and every kind of blacksmith work done in a neat and workmanlike manner, and according to Order, at reasonable rates. Also Painting done to order. Bring along your old Wagons Buggies, and get them painted. W. H. TEAL.
Dallas, April 9, 1870.

DALLAS HOTEL,
CORNER MAIN & COURT STREETS,
Dallas, Oregon.

A. SHULTZ, : : : PROPRIETOR.

THIS HOUSE HAS RECENTLY BEEN refitted and rearranged, and it is now open for the accommodation of the traveling public, whose patronage is respectfully solicited. The TABLE will at all times be found well provided with every delicacy of the season, as well as the substantial, and our guests may rest assured of courteous and prompt attendance. The SLEEPING APARTMENTS will also be found clean, wholesome and comfortable. Meals will be furnished Travellers at all hours. Livery Stable opposite the hotel. A. SHULTZ.
Dallas, April 9, 1870.

CITATION.

TO ALL PERSONS INTERESTED IN the estate of Alonso Wood, late of Polk county, Oregon, deceased: In the name of the State of Oregon you are hereby required to appear in the County Court of Polk county, Oregon, on Monday the 23d of May, 1870, and show cause, if any there be, why the prayer of the petition of M. Rosendorf, Administrator of said estate, should not be granted; and an order made granting license to said Administrator to sell the following real estate, belonging to said estate, to-wit: Lot No. 1, in Block No. 11, in North Salem, Marion county, Ogn. J. L. COLLINS, Co. Judge.
Dallas, April 8, 1870.

MONEY! MONEY!!

ALL PERSONS HOLDING WARRANTS against Polk County, are hereby notified that I am prepared to pay the same, and that I will pay no interest thereon after the date hereof, this, April 9, 1870. R. M. MAY,
Dallas, April 8, 1870. Treas. of Polk Co. 6:4w

C. M. PARMENTER, F. J. BARCOCK,
PARMENTER & BARCOCK,
Manufacturers, and Wholesale and Retail Dealers in

Furniture,
Commercial Street, Salem, Oregon,
HAVE ON HAND THE LARGEST Stock of
Furniture,
Bedding,
Window-Shades,
Hollands, and
PAPER-HANGINGS

To be found in Marion County. All kinds of Picture Frames, Coffins and Caskets made to order on short notice and at reasonable rates. PARMENTER & BARCOCK.
Salem, March 23, 1870.

CAPITAL LIVERY STABLE.

In rear of the Capital Hotel Corner, SALEM, OREGON.

HORSES AND CARRIAGES TO LET on reasonable terms. Special attention paid to transient and boarding horses. BOOTH & PLAMONDON,
2-t Proprietors.

WOOL WANTED.

THE ELLENDALE MILL COMPANY will give the highest market price for wool, delivered at their factory in Polk Co. Their Store is also open, with a general assortment of Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, &c. 2-t