

The Democratic Watchman.

BELLEFRONTE, PA.

FRIDAY MORNING, FEB. 7, 1868.

United States Supreme Court—Case of Col. W. H. McCardle—Arguments of Judge Black and Senator Trumbull.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 17.—In the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of McCardle, this morning, after the termination of some other business, Mr. Black, the counsel of McCardle, called the attention of the Court to his motion in this case to fix an early day for the argument. He said that Senator Trumbull, who had some objections, had been waiting to make them, and he (Mr. Black) desired to hear them. Mr. Trumbull said he knew no reason why the case should be advanced, and an early day assigned for the hearing of it. The matter had been brought before a military commission for trial; but the Act of Congress had suspended the proceeding, and he was now out on bail. No harm could come to him or any one by letting the case stand without a decision for a year or two. Mr. Trumbull took up the written reasons filed with the motion and answered them severally. He said this was not, properly speaking, a criminal case; it was a habeas corpus. The other two reasons, instead of being grounds to sustain the motion, were strong against it. They alleged that the United States are interested in the question, and that it concerns the rights and liberties of every American citizen—that this shows that it is a political case, and the Court should not voluntarily take upon itself responsibilities of that kind. Mr. Trumbull did not expect or desire the Court to shrink from its duty, but he believed that it should not go aside from its regular course to seek occasions for deciding questions like this.

Judge Black replied. He denied that this was a political case. It was purely judicial. "It has come," said he, "in the form of a legal appeal from the Circuit Court for the District of Mississippi, and it comes here with technical regularity. I represent no body but my client, and ask for the vindication of his rights and respect his law." The Attorney-General makes no opposition. If Mr. Trumbull comes in to take up the case for a political party, I submit that he is out of his proper place, for the Senator should know that in the courts of the country we practice law not politics. A glance at the record will show you that the relator was accused of a criminal offense, arrested without any judicial warrant, held for a long time in close custody and then brought before what they may call a Military Commission, organized to convict him. He could not foresee his doom, for if they could try him they could hang him. His friends got a writ of habeas corpus. He was brought before the Circuit Court, and was remanded, but the Judge, manifestly in doubt, facilitated the appeal in a way which showed his own desire to yet decide by the court of last resort. Have you not told that this is not a criminal case?

Mr. Trumbull—"I did not say so; I said the habeas corpus was not a criminal proceeding."

Mr. Black—"Certainly it is not, but the nature of the case does not depend on the form of the writ, neither is a writ of error a criminal proceeding, but a writ of error like habeas corpus may bring a criminal case into this Court. Judge Black continued, we ask that you bear the case now. It is not at the foot of the list. By the statute law of the land, by the immemorial custom of the Court, and by your own written rules made so lately as last year, it stands at the head of the docket, and claims your immediate attention. As a criminal case, the act of Congress says you shall hear it in preference to others that are pending, but the preference always was conceded to such cases. No criminal case was ever allowed to be stayed off or put by on the ground that civil cases, whether older or later, should be heard first. Such has been the universal practice of this Court for more than three quarters of a century. In all the Courts, State and Federal, the rule is to give criminal cases the preference. Your administration of criminal justice cannot afford to wait. If the accused party is guilty, and the proceeding against him is legal, the highest interests of society require that it should be speedily without delay. If he is lawfully prosecuted by a tribunal that has no jurisdiction, or if he is suffering from the false judgment of a Court which has authority to try him, he must be immediately relieved. Relief postponed is not relief at all. In no case can any Court permit the sword of public vengeance to be doubtfully suspended over the head of a citizen for an indefinite time. But there is another reason which would induce you to take this case up immediately even if it were at the foot of the docket. In the exercise of your great power, you do not merely decide cases, you lay down rules for the conduct of others who may find themselves in like condition. You never give a naked judgment. You accompany it with the reasons, so that all men may know how far they are within the principles you sanction. You are the great teachers of the people in regard to those things which concern their temporal salvation, and in proportion as you perform that duty, well or ill, in that position are you fit or unfit for the high places which you fill. Here is a subject on which your lessons are most especially needed. This is not the only Military Commission that has been set up. In all that large region of country from the Potomac to the Gulf of Mexico, Military Commissions have become so much the fashion that they have almost entirely superseded courts and justice. They inflict all manner of punishments. Three men are now held by them under sentence of death, and hundreds are languishing under their orders in various kinds of imprisonment. Every officer who is or may be engaged in carrying out these proceedings is deeply interested in knowing, as soon as possible, how the law regards him. From the President and the General in the army down to the lowest Jack Ketch in their service, it is to the last degree important that they should know when they have a man whether their act is justifiable homicide or felonious murder. If

they are engaged in the performance of a lawful duty it will surely be an infinite relief to be assured of it by a decision of this Court. The people ought to know it, too, so that they may learn to submit quietly to evils which cannot be cured. Then if they do not enjoy the blessings of liberty they will at least have the repose of despotism, which is perhaps the next best thing. But if it should be finally held that these commissions are all wrong and void, it is horrid cruelty not to say so at once. Would my learned brother, for any mere political consideration, encourage public officials to rush on in headlong ignorance at the risk of being branded as criminals in the future? If you decide hereafter that their acts are no protection to them against the charges of kidnapping, robbery, and murder, how will they feel towards those who prevented a decision in time to save them from those crimes? If they had been ordered to accumulate upon their heads for two or three years more, there will not be rain enough in the sweet heavens to wash them white again. This question, no doubt seems a very clear one to Mr. Trumbull, and he can doubtless make it as clear to the Court as it is to him. We suppose it at least possible that he may be mistaken. We know that the Constitution makes a court and jury the exclusive judges of guilt or innocence in every criminal case, and we know, also, that the Constitution was in full force about one year ago, for this court then said so in very plain and unmistakable language. But Mr. Trumbull and other jurists suppose themselves to have discovered an act of Congress passed since the decision referred to by which the Constitution is repealed, or, at least, they have learned that the American people have in some way lost the right of trial by jury. Now the presumption is a strong one to be seen that Mr. Trumbull is right and I am wrong. If he comes with his act of Congress, and I oppose him with the Constitution, and the principles of public liberty, the odds will be against me. Still he cannot say that the point is absolutely free from doubt, when he remembers that the Attorney-General, who stands officially at the head of the profession, and deserves to stand there, is against him *in toto*. The question cannot be clear in his favor, when the conviction of a lawyer like Mr. Stanbery is clear the other way. If it be doubtful, and that is all I ask you now to concede, it is incumbent to leave it unsettled when the case is before you in which all doubts can be resolved. I repeat that this is a judicial question merely. If by the suggestion that it is connected with politics, it is meant to say that you may be assailed and slandered for your decision by partisans, I admit it freely. That may be true in this case as it has been in many others, I cannot promise you exemption from a fate which the best men in the world have suffered when they performed their public duties honestly. That is the rough brake that virtue must go through. But if the statute laws, the rules and constant practice of this Court are not to be violated, the cause before you will be heard without more delay than what may be necessary for its proper preparation.

Judge Sharkey spoke briefly on the same side, enforcing what had been said by his colleague, and stating the condition of things in Mississippi as an additional reason for an early decision.

Mr. Hughes thought there was no reason in the circumstances of the case itself for taking it up soon, and the Court ought not to consider the extraneous facts which had been mentioned. The speech of Judge Black and the profound sensation manifested were in themselves enough to show that the subject was one which could not be handled without producing excitement. At all events, he hoped that full time would be allowed for counsel to consider their argument. It ought not to be hurried.

ABANDONS THEM.—The New York Herald has supported the reconstruction policy of Congress, and the Radical party until the hope for its doing anything for the salvation of the Union has passed. After alluding to the fact that history has justified the statement that the tendency of republican institutions is towards absolute monarchy; it says:

"Are we in the United States to be furnished another example? The events of the hour certainly point in that direction. The Radical Republicans, once the hope of the country, are no longer patriotic. The love of the party, it is now manifest, has extinguished the love of country. Come what may of the country, the Radicals must rule—such is their policy. Like a certain illustrious personage, they think it better to reign in hell than serve in heaven. Anarchy for a dictator—that is the future they are preparing for the country."

Mongrel organs are carrying on typically about the President obstructing reconstruction. Neither the President nor any one else has ever put a stone in the way of that infamous revolutionary measure—more's the pity. The trouble is the carpet-bags and niggers of the mongrel conventions—with their eight, ten, or twenty dollars a day—are in no hurry to finish up their "work." Pope, Sumner, Wilson, and others, tried to hurry them up, but the darks have found Radical expediency so pleasant and profitable, that, like the Rump Rade they desire to make their supremacy perpetual. The Radical leaders would gladly get rid of their mongrel agencies, if they knew how, and the country would gladly be rid of both.—Patriot & Union.

Green-back pay, or denial of the War Debt.

Every man who has reduced to scientific form the correct data of the debt contracted by the late war, understands that the only question practical, is between paying off the Bonds in the same depreciated currency in which they were contracted, and promising to be paid; and the denying of them, altogether. Of the two ways, we think it would be most for the interests of human liberty, hereafter, to deny that we ever contracted this war debt. The Government is but the "attorney, with special power," of the community perfect—the organized people of all the States in common. A majority of those States had no right to dispose, or coerce a minority of them. The war was *ad initio*, clearly unconstitutional. It is *ipso facto* denied—that of the Confederates, defending their States, according to our traditions of self government—and that of the Federals, seeking to "wipe out all those State lines," and reconstruct *en Nation* on the ruins of the several independent States.

The longer purse lay in the hands of the Federals, so, those hired many more soldiers than the Confederate States. Rather than fight it out, as Switzerland, and Portugal, and the Low Countries of Belgium and Holland did—and, thus, by persistent sacrifices, establish their right to govern themselves—the Southern States forced their gallant defenders to throw themselves on the mercy of their opponents. "Till the world ends, all well instructed lovers of Republican liberty will weep for the men who died, and who valiantly fought, for the Right of Local Self-Government in the Southern States. When the turbid waters of present events shall have settled into the calm and even stream of history, it will be recognized that there was a power of mean, sordid, and slavish feeling, among the *mongrel* men of the Southern States, or they would never have boarded their cotton and their other resources, as they did, and started the army that was defending them into grand exhibitions of savagery and of heroism on the part of the dead and living champions of free local self government, in the Southern States.

But, we do not, therefore, hold the South more guilty than the North, for having precipitated the late collision of unequal forces. Of the two, the Northern factiousness were the aggressors.—They fired the "first gun." The emissaries of New England "fired the first gun" in Kansas, with the Sharpe's rifle supplied from Puritan conventicles. On Southern soil, the "first gun" was fired by the hand under that execrable old horse-bief and murderer, John Brown, at Harper's Ferry.

Therefore, in justice, we see no reason why the impoverished people of the Southern States should be required to pocket the utter loss of the Confederate debt, and looter people, in the Northern States, who invested in bonds to sustain a war clearly unconstitutional and unlawful, shall be paid anything for their part in the vulgar rumpus!

Our exact meaning, we are going to express, here. We wish it understood that we put it now, on record.

We are willing, for major considerations, to consider the result of the late battle, as a decree of the highest court. We are willing to take the ground assumed by Mr. Pendleton, and Judge Thurman, of Ohio, that the debt, *unlawfully* incurred, by "the Government"—the attorney of the people, organized in the different States, shall be paid—in the form and manner promised. We have a good many reasons for consenting to this. The poor States of the Church, in Italy, have always acted on the principle of paying the debts, even of the most corrupt usurpations. The exchequer of Pius IX., in this day, embarrassed, by his conscientious purpose of paying off the obligations incurred in the name of Rome by the infamous, Mazzinian horde, in 1848, we know the cases are not parallel. To make them so, the Confederates, as well as the Federal debt, in our late unhappy war, would need to be accepted. No Southern statesman has advocated what is not claimed.

But, when we accept Mr. Pendleton's compromise—so just and generous—of paying off the Bondholders in the same currency in which they paid for their bonds, and in which payment was promised—we here say, distinctly, that while we will faithfully carry out this compromise—generous to the Bondholders, it acted on—if it be not accepted, we will then turn all our influence, and use most potent arguments—*sure* to be accepted by a distressed people, for denying that the people owe one cent on this war debt!—Kreman's Journal.

NEGROES, ETC.—The phrase "colored people," sometimes used in the Democratic press has no meaning in it. We are all "colored people." Caucasians, Mongolian, etc., as well as Africans. We, Caucasians, are blunder brunettes, etc., etc. All "colored people," some light, as the Saxons, some dark as the Spaniards with Moorish blood in his veins. Negroes are no more "colored people" than we whites are. But a "negro" is a negro and nothing but a negro and a negro man differs more from a white man than a white man from a white woman. The negro has not any hair on his head—only wool; no brain, no head, no mouth, no eyes like a white man's; no shoulders, legs, nor feet, nor heels, nor shins, like white men's—and in other parts his anatomy, not fit for newspaper discussion, he differs in all respects from a white man. Thus, the negro is a negro—but ever respectfully to be spoken of as a negro—admirable in his sphere of life for which God made him, to be the servant of the white man, but odious and accursed, when, as in the South, he rides over the white man as his master.—N. Y. Evening Express.

BONDHOLDERS.—Who would not be a bondholder? You farmers, sell your farms and buy bonds, and count your gold. Sell all the factories, and turn into bonds all property, and live upon the interests. He works and toils by night and day, through rain or shine, to raise interest and some nabob who lives at ease on his toil. Make haste and buy bonds, and lie in shade.—Spectator.

Joshua Baker has been appointed Governor of Louisiana, vice B. F. Flanders, resigned.

Grant As He Was and As He Is.

When Lee surrendered the shattered remnant of his forces the rejoicing throughout the entire North was general and heartfelt. The masses were truly glad that the fierce strife which had made such a heavy and constant drain upon the blood and treasure of the nation was over. The return of peace and the immediate restoration of that Union, for the preservation of which such great sacrifices had been made, was confidently expected. The exultant joy of the people, unalloyed, except by the discordant curses of a few extreme Radicals who, even in the glad hour of our triumph, were heard denouncing General Grant for according generous terms to the vanquished. But the masses fully approved what he had done, and Abraham Lincoln gave to his acts the fullest official sanction. When Andrew Johnson exhibited an impulsive vindictiveness, after the assassination of his predecessor, he was opposed and restrained by General Grant. That action was noble and heroic. After Mr. Johnson had changed his views, so that they accorded with those of Mr. Lincoln and General Grant, the President and he continued to labor for the restoration of the Union with perfect harmony of sentiment. A tour through the South, taken for the express purpose of observation, convinced Grant that those who had been leaders in the rebellion were acting in perfectly good faith, and that the work of reconstruction on the plan originated by Mr. Lincoln and adopted by Mr. Johnson, was proceeding most prosperously. When asked for an opinion he freely expressed his views in favor of the policy of the President, and in opposition to that of the Radicals in Congress.

That General Grant was honest in these his earlier acts no one can doubt. He had no temptation then which could have induced him to disguise or conceal the truth. He unquestionably acted and spoke from sincere convictions. What a change has since come over him! Tempted by the alluring prize of a Presidential nomination, he has submitted to be made the tool of a gang of disreputable Radical politicians who are willing to hazard the best interests of the nation for the sake of the spoils of office. Too weak to decline the coveted prize, he lacks the agency to see that he throws away all chance of securing it. The moment he allows himself to be placed upon a Radical platform his wonderful reticence has not been a shield to him. He no longer fully consented to allow himself to be used by the Radicals than he was involved by them in a labyrinth of dirty political trickery from which he did not come forth without the loss of honor. He was not only compelled to abandon the views he had so long honestly held, but he was forced into a corner from which he escaped only by deceit and what looks much like downright lying.

The revolution in popular feeling is wonderful. The man whom all men revere but a short time ago has fallen very low in popular estimation. The recent conduct of Gen Grant cannot be defended. No man who is prepared to estimate what is truly honorable can feel that he has acted the disagreeable part of a political trickster. The reputation which he won as a soldier has been sadly tarnished, and, if he should be the candidate of the Radicals, he cannot expect to be treated with any greater consideration by his opponents than Chase or Wade would be. He will carry the votes of those who approve of the platform on which he stands, and not one more. The Democracy do not fear him. They feel perfectly confident that he can be beaten, and they will have the advantage of having him pretty well used up before the campaign is formally opened.

All that is needed to secure our success in the exercise of proper sagacity in selecting candidates. The coming battle is to be fought upon the living issues of the present year, and we should take care that nothing be done by us to enable our enemies to divert the minds of the people from the great questions which are stirring the popular mind to its profoundest depths. Our candidates should be men whose personal and political record cannot be assailed. We must strip ourselves of every impediment in the coming race. If we do so, our success is absolutely sure.—Lancaster Intelligencer.

THE BONDHOLDERS' CANDIDATE.—It is understood that the bondholders of the country, led by Jay Cooke and A. T. Stewart, will make a strong effort to have the Mongrel convention at Chicago nominate General Grant for the Presidency, and it is said that Grant has written to Stewart, saying that he would accept the nomination. Whether this is true or not, the people should understand that whoever is nominated by the influence of the bondholders will be biased to their interests. There is a distinct and important issue between the people and the bondholders. The people desire the payment of the national debt in greenbacks, and the taxation of all property alike; while the bondholders are only want the debt paid in gold, but insist upon exempting a vast amount of the capital of the country from taxation. Upon this issue, among others, the people must enter the contest, and win; for their defeat would ruin the country, by producing a financial revolution beside which the panic of 1857 was a nothing.

Let the people everywhere investigate these matters, and make up their minds to support the men who will pledge themselves in favor of paying the bondholders in greenbacks, which are as good for those who roll in wealth as for those who "earn their bread by the sweat of their brows"—Ez.

Senator Doolittle opened his great speech against the pending Reconstruction bill in these words: "Mr. President, there is more involved in this measure than in any other all others, perhaps. I see in it a complete overthrow of the constitution in ten States of the Union. I see in it a practical dissolution of the Union. I see a republic, in form at least, still remaining north of the Potomac. I see an empire rising South of it. I see in it the realization of the vilest dream of Calhoun—a dual Executive—a President to execute the laws in the republic of the North; a military dictator, independent of the President, to make as well as execute laws in the negro empire of the South."

Congress and the Supreme Court.

It is hardly worth while to dispute with Congress, as now constituted, any claim of power that it may set up. Men pushed by desperation to attain desperate ends by desperate means, are not to be reasoned with. Their passions, and not their understandings, lead and control them, and passion is inaccessible to arguments which address either the intelligence or conscience of mankind. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the bill to wipe out the territorial boundaries of ten Southern States and consolidate them into one province under the despotic rule of a single dictator, was carried in the House of Representatives by an overwhelming Radical majority; and there is too much reason to fear that the Senate will concur in a measure that is, in effect, not reconstructive of State governments, but destructive of the States themselves, territorially as well as civilly. But even that is not so audacious as the proposition to take away, practically, from the Supreme Court, its right to decide, when regularly brought before it, questions as to the constitutionality of an act of Congress. Where does Congress find its authority to do any such thing? Not in the National Constitution; for while the Constitution allows Congress to declare the *quorum* of the Court, it gives Congress no power to declare what number of that *quorum* shall have the power of decision. The power to determine how many Judges on the bench may sit in the trial of causes and transact the judicial business of the Court, is very distinct from a power to determine what majority of that *quorum* shall have a conclusive judicial voice in the adjudication of all cases within its legitimate jurisdiction, when properly presented for its decision. The Constitution says that "a majority of each House of Congress shall constitute a *quorum* to do business," but a bare majority of that *quorum* is allowed, save in a few specifically excepted cases, to prevail in all divisions of the Senate and the House. Congress cannot alter that law of its own organization and action; much less can it alter the law which has always prevailed in the practice of our American Courts, State and Federal, that a bare majority of a *quorum* of the former shall be decisive and final, except where an appeal lies to a higher tribunal. But there is no higher tribunal than the Supreme Court of the United States, and from the judgment of a bare majority of its judges there is no appeal. Moreover, it must be noted that if the claim of Congress to declare that two-thirds of a *quorum* of the Supreme Court shall be necessary to decide any question of law within its jurisdiction, a claim to require a unanimous concurrence of the Court in any judgment may be asserted by Congress with equal reason and authority. The logic of the case leads inevitably to this result; namely, that Congress may practically nullify the Court by making its decisions depend on an impossible condition. For all practical purposes and on grounds equally unassailable, Congress might as well assume at once, without circumlocution and duplicity, to legislate the Supreme Court of the Nation out of existence. In demanding that six judges in eight, or the whole eight, shall concur in order to declare the unconstitutionality of an act of Congress, that body is only imitating the fool who once attempted to make two watches go exactly alike. Human minds are incapable of such unanimity in their ratiocination and conclusions, and it is but fair to presume that a legislature, which would impose such a rule of absolute, or nearly absolute accordance, upon a judicial tribunal, in all cases involving the legality of its own acts is secretly conscious that its acts are unlawful and must be condemned if brought to the test of a free, independent, and honest Court.—Sunday Mercury.

Note It.

It is a fact worthy of careful note and remembrance that all the civilians spoken of by the Democracy for their Presidential nomination were conspicuous for their opposition to the Government during the rebellion and their sympathy with the traitors. No other kind of a civilian is once dreamed of as their candidate.—Omaha Republican.

Well, that's pretty cool coming from the source it does. What constituted "the government" in those days, Mr. Republican? Especially do we ask this question of you "truly loyal" men who clamored so loudly for proscription—aware that Lincoln was "the government," and wanted every man hung who "prated of the Constitution"? What was the government then? What was the government now?

O, you miserable Lincoln-poop, you know not of what you write. There is not in the ranks of the Democratic party to-day a man whether of high or low degree, who is a true Democrat, that ever was, or is now, opposed to the Constitutional government of the United States.

The Hon. gentleman, whose name, in all human probability, will be presented by the Democratic party as their candidate for the Presidency, will be one who has been true to the constitutional government of the fathers—an honest man—a gentleman of the highest moral worth, and a democrat no buffoon, thief, or human butcher. Who will be the Radical candidate?

The Judges Rebuke Geary's official Impertinence.

Governor Geary, in his late message, had the impudence to call to account the Judges of the Court of Quarter Sessions of Philadelphia, because they had in some instance, seen fit to reconsider and modify sentences after the expiration of the term at which they had been imposed. The Judges feel so indignant at this intermeddling, by Geary, with what did not concern him, that the matter was considered on Thursday, the 16th, with a full bench, the Grand Jury being present. Judge Allison delivered a lengthy and able opinion on the subject, in which he alluded to the Governor intermeddling with the Judiciary in rather severe terms. We insert the following paragraphs of his opinion, viz:

That which we except to, is the manner in which the Governor has sought to intermeddle with a coordinate department of the government of the State, which has the highest authority for the exercise of its powers, and for the performance of its duties which exists by the will of the people, as embodied in the Constitution of the State. The Governor of Pennsylvania can claim no superior authority for his acts, as the head of the Executive power of the Commonwealth over that by which the Judges hold their office, and by which they perform the duties which belong to it.

It was, therefore, as unbecomingly as it was unwise; because it is a usurpation of authority for the Governor, in his message to the legislature, to arraign the Judges of this Court for the performance of their judicial acts, as though he was either authorized so to do or competent to form a correct legal judgment upon the question of the power of this Court to reconsider a sentence after the expiration of the term at which it was imposed—both of which propositions we deny.

We feel that we have additional cause of complaint in the fact that the Governor has misstated the case as he knew it to exist, in that he omitted all mention of that which was most material; that upon which the whole question hinges, and without which, it is not pretended, nor has it ever been claimed, that the power to reduce a sentence after term could be exercised. That which the Governor does not state, although fully advised of its existence, is the fact that in every case in which sentence was reconsidered, a *rule to show cause* was entered at the term, and that the question being left open and undetermined, was carried over, to be finally disposed of at a subsequent day.

The Supreme Court of the United States will soon have occasion to give a similar rebuke to the Rump Congress, for interfering with the judiciary.

No Work.

From all parts of the country we hear that work is being suspended, or that wages are being reduced. This is as we expect it would be. The great cry of enterprise was but a blind to enable the adventurers to carry through their speculations, and the reckless use of our credit has brought us into a debt which is almost crushing in its weight. Promises to pay are not money, and unscrupulous schemes to make money, and are not business, no matter how much show and bustle are made. And we are but at the beginning of the trying year, we must go over. During the period of inflation everything went on swimmingly, we had as easy and as merry a time as the wildest spendthrift. But the day has come when our debt must be paid, and to no that, ever to keep the interest down, we must deny ourselves part of the comforts of life. For many of the barest necessities will be hard to get.—With no work, or with little to do, and that badly paid, how can the laboring man buy meat, coffee, tea, sugar and butter at prices doubled when compared with those before the war? He must do without these things which he has looked upon as necessary to him. The causes of this condition of affairs are plain; they are the violations of the well defined policies of the Democratic party, to which we must return. These consist of a wise and strict economy of the public treasury—a certain and valuable currency, and the simplest administration of the government consistent with its safety. We must return to specie payment, reduce the expenses of the government, let the Southern people control themselves and their system of labor, that they may bear their burden of the public expense, and use our labor in the channel where it will yield a reliable revenue. We must take the government out of the hands of the trading politicians, and business from the control of the speculators.—Lucerne Union.

WHAT WE ARE TAXED FOR.—We have been taxed half a million of dollars, within the last year, to build school houses for the negroes in the South.

We have been taxed two millions one hundred and fifty-seven thousand dollars to organize the negroes of the South into loyal leagues and get them to the polls to vote for revolutionary conventions in the South.

We have been taxed eight hundred thousand dollars to pay the expenses of negroes to ride about the South on the different railroads.

We have been taxed to pay one million five hundred thousand dollars for food for negroes and Bureau agents in the South.

We have been taxed twenty-five thousand dollars to pay school teachers for teaching negro children in the South.

These are a few among the many things we have been taxed for under the Radical reconstruction policy in the South.

When forty-two millions more are added as the military expenses attendant upon that policy, the people may begin to understand why they are crowded for money, and why taxes are oppressive.—Detroit Free Press.

A verdict was rendered against Gen. James B. Steedman, of Ohio, in the United States Court at Knoxville, Tennessee, a few days ago, for a cool \$25,000, for the false imprisonment of Isaac T. Trigham, and for the forcible seizure of property during the war while Gen. Steedman was in command of Chattanooga.