THE BEAVER ARGUS

IS PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY in the old ARGUS building, on THIRD STREET, BEAVER, PA., at

TWO DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

Single copies of the paper will be furnished, in wrappers, at *five cents* each.

Communications on subjects of local or general interest are respectfully solicited. To insure attention, letters of this kind must invariably be accompanied by the name of the author, not for publication, but as a guaranty against imposition.

Letters and communications should be addressed to

J. HEYARD, *Editor & Proprietor.*

THE BEAVER ARGUS.

Vol. 49--No. 47. Beaver, Pa., Wednesday, November 20, 1867. Established 1818

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Advertisements are inserted at the rate of $1.00 per square for first insertion, and for each subsequent insertion 50 cents. A liberal discount made on yearly advertisements.

A space equal to TEN lines of this type measured is a square.

Business Notices set under a head by themselves immediately after the local news, will be charged *invariably* ten cents a line for each insertion.

Marriages and deaths announced free of charge.

The publisher reserves the right to change advertisements from one place in the paper to another whenever it is desirable to do so.

Advertisements should be handed in before Monday noon to insure insertion in that week's paper.

The Letters.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON.

Still on the tower stood the vane;
A black yew gloomed the stagnant air;
I peered athwart the chancel pane,
And saw the altar cold and bare.
A clog of lead was round my feet,
A band of pain across my brow;
"Cold altar, Heaven and earth shall meet
Before you hear my marriage vow."

I turned and hummed a bitter song
That mocked the wholesome human heart;
And then we met in wrath and wrong.
We met, but only meant to part.
Full cold my greeting was, and dry;
She faintly smiled, she hardly moved;
I saw with half unconscious eye
She wore the colors I approved.

She took the little ivory chest—
With half a sigh she turned the key;
Then raised her head with lips compressed,
And gave my letters back to me.
And gave the trinkets and the rings,
My gifts when gifts of mine could please;
As looks a father on the things
Of his dead son, I looked on these.

She told me all her friends had said;
I raged against the public liar.
She talked as if her love was dead;
But in my words were seeds of fire.
"No more of love;—your sex is known:
I never will be twice deceived.
Henceforth I trust the *man* alone—
The *woman* cannot be believed!

"Through slander, meanest spawn of hell,
(And *woman's* slander is the worst,)
And you whom once I loved so well,
Through you my life must be accurst!"
I spoke with heart, and heat, and force,
I shook her breast with vague alarms—
Like torrents from a mountain source,
We rushed into each other's arms.

We parted. Sweetly gleamed the stars,
And sweet the vapor-braided blue;
Low breezes fanned the belfry bars,
As homeward by the church I drew.
The very graves appeared to smile,
So fresh they rose in shadowed swells;
"Dark porch," I said, "and silent aisle,
There comes a sound of marriage bells."

The Supreme Court.

Philadelphia and West Chester Railroad Co., vs. Mary E. Miles. Eastern District. Error to Common Pleas of Philadelphia Co.

AGNEW J. It is admitted that no one can be excluded from carriage by a public carrier on account of color, religious belief, political relations, or prejudice. But the defendant asked the Court to say *that if the jury find that the seat which the plaintiff was directed to take, was in all respects a comfortable, safe, and convenient seat, not inferior in any of these respects to the one she was directed to leave, she could not recover.* The case, therefore, involves no assertion of the inferiority of the negro to the white passenger; but conceding his right to be carried precisely on the same footing with a white man it assumes it to be not unreasonable to assign places in the cars to passengers of each color. The simple question is, whether a public carrier may, in the exercise of his private right of property, and in the due performance of his public duty, separate passengers by any other well defined characteristic than that of sex. The ladies' car is known upon every well regulated railroad, implies no loss of equal right on the part of the excluded sex, and its propriety is doubted by none.

This question must be decided upon reasonable grounds. If there be no clear and reasonable difference to base it upon, separation cannot be justified by mere prejudice. Nor is merit a test. The negro may be proud of his service in the field as a defender of his country. But it was not thought indefensible to separate even white soldiers from other passengers. There is a clear and well founded difference between the civil and military character, and the separation of soldiers from citizens implied no want of equality, but a sound regulation of the right of transit.

The right of the carrier to separate his passengers is founded upon two grounds—his right of private property in the means of conveyance and the public interest. The private means he uses belongs wholly to himself, and implies the right of control for the protection of his own interest, as well as the performance of his public duty. He may use his property therefore in a reasonable manner. It is not an unreasonable regulation to seat passengers so as to preserve order and decorum, and to prevent contacts and collisions, arising from natural or well known customary repugnancies, which are likely to breed disturbances, by a promiscuous sitting. This is a proper use of the right of private property, because it tends to protect the interests of those he carries. If the ground of regulation be reasonable, courts of justice cannot interfere with his right of property. The right of the passenger is only that of being carried safely, and with a due regard to his personal comfort and convenience, which are promoted by a sound and well regulated separation of passengers. An analogy and an illustration are found in the case of an inn-keeper, who, if he have room, is bound to entertain proper guests; and so a carrier is bound to receive passengers. But a guest in an inn cannot select his room or his bed at pleasure; nor can a voyager take possession of a cabin or a berth at will, or refuse to obey the reasonable orders of the captain of the vessel. But, on the other hand, who would maintain that it is a reasonable regulation, either of an inn or a vessel, to compel the passengers, black or white, to room or bed together? If a right of private property confers no right of control, who shall decide a contest between passengers for seats or berths? Courts of justice may interfere to compel those who perform a business concerning the public by the use of private means, to fulfill their duty to the public; but not a whit beyond.

The public also has an interest in the proper regulation of public conveyances for the preservation of the public peace. A railroad company has the right and is bound to make reasonable regulations to preserve order in their cars. It is the duty of the conductor to repress tumults as far as he reasonably can, and he may on extraordinary occasions, stop his train and eject the unruly and tumultuous. But he has not the authority of a peace officer to arrest and detain offenders. He cannot interfere in the quarrels of others at will merely in order to preserve and inforce his authority as the servant of the company, it must have a power to establish proper regulations for the carriage of passengers. It is much easier to prevent difficulties among passengers by regulations for their proper separation, than it is to quell them. The danger to the peace engendered by the feeling of aversion, between individuals of the different races, cannot be denied. It is the fact with which the company must deal. If a negro take his seat beside a white man, or his wife or daughter, the law cannot repress the anger or conquer the aversion which some will feel. However unwise it may be to indulge the feeling, human infirmity is not always proof against it. It is much wiser to avert the consequences of this repulsion of race by separation, than to punish afterwards the breach of the peace it may have caused. These views are sustained by high authority. Judge Story, in his Law of Bailment, stating the duty of passengers "to submit to such reasonable regulations as the proprietors may adopt for the convenience and comfort of passengers as well as for their own proper interests," says, "the importance of the doctrine is felt more strikingly in cases of steamboats and railroad cars." S. 691 *a*; see also, S. 476 *a*. Angel on Carriers, S. 528; 1 American Railway Cases 393,394.

The right to separate being clear in proper cases, and it being the subject of a sound regulation, the question remains to be considered is, whether there is such a difference between the white and black races within this State resulting from *nature, late* and *custom* as makes it a reasonable ground of separation. The question is one of difference, not of superiority or inferiority. Why the Creator made one black and the other white, we know not; but the fact is apparent, and the races distinct, each producing its own kind, following the peculiar law of its constitution. Conceding equality, with natures as perfect and rights as sacred, yet God has made them dissimilar, with those natural instincts and feelings which He always imparts to His creatures when He intends that they shall not overstep the natural boundaries He has assigned to them. The natural law which forbids their intermarriage and that social amalgamation which leads to a corruption of races, is as clearly Divine as that which imparted to them different natures. The tendency of intimate social intercourse is to amalgamation contrary to the law of nature. The separation of the white and black races upon the surface of the globe is a fact equally apparent. Why this is so, it is not necessary to speculate, but the fact of a distribution of men by race and color is as visible in the providential arrangement of the earth as that of heat and cold. The natural separation of the races is therefore an undeniable fact, and all social organizations which lead to their amalgamation are repugnant to the law of nature. From social amalgamation it is but a step to illicit intercourse, and but another to intermarriage. But to assert separateness is not to declare inferiority in either—it is not to declare one a slave and the other a freeman; that would be to draw the illogical sequence of inferiority from difference only. It is simply to say that following the order of Divine providence, human authority ought not to compel these widely separated races to intermix. The right of each to be free from social contact is as clear as to be free from intermarriage. The former may be less repulsive as a condition, but not less entitled to protection as a right. When therefore, we declare a right to maintain separate relations as far as reasonably practicable, but in a spirit of kindness and charity, and with a due regard to equality of rights, it is not prejudice nor caste, nor injustice of any kind, but simply to suffer men to follow the law of races, established by the Creator himself, and not to compel them to intermix contrary to their instincts.

Nor can we disregard the laws and customs of the State. Indeed these must be our guide, leaving it to the Legislature to correct the errors of the law, or its departure from that justice which should ever be its foundation. It is unnecessary to recur to the original condition of negroes as slaves in Pennsylvania, or to trace the legislation of the provinces distinguishing them from freemen. Nor need we, for the purpose of defining the *status* of the negro refer to the great law of emancipation in 1780, whose preamble, the most beautiful, just and expressive ever prefixed to a human statute, only professed to extend to the black race a "portion" of our own freedom.—We have a later and an authoritative guide, the solemn decision of this court in 1837, in the case of Hobbs vs. Fogg, 6 Watts, 553. The opinion comes from the pen of the late C. J. Gibson, and bears the imprint of his remarkable intellect. It is there shown from the laws, constitutions and customs of the State, and from a former decision of the High Court of Errors and Appeals, that the *status* of the negro never fell within the term "freeman" in the several constitutions; and that the emancipation act of 1780 did not elevate him to the citizenship of the State. And in 1838 the people of this Commonwealth, by an express amendment of their Constitution, drew the line directly between the white citizens and black inhabitants of the State. It is clear, therefore, that under the constitution and laws, the white and black races stand in a separate relation to each other. We find the same difference in the institutions and customs of the State. Never has there been an intermixture of the two races, socially, religiously, civilly or politically. By uninterrupted usage the blacks live apart, visit and entertain among themselves, occupy separate places of public worship and amusement, and fill no civil or political stations, not even sitting to decide their own causes. In fact there is not an institution of the State in which they have mingled indiscriminately with the whites. Even the common school law provides for separate schools when their numbers are adequate. In the military service, also, they were not intermixed with the white soldiers, but were separated into companies and regiments of color, and this not by way of disparagement, but from motives of wisdom and prudence, to avoid the antagonisms of variant and hostile races. Law and custom having sanctioned a separation of races, it is not the province of the judiciary to legislate it away. We cannot say there was no difference in fact, when the law and the voice of the people had said there was. The laws of the State are found in its constitution, statutes, institutions and general customs. It is to these sources Judges must resort to discover them. If they abandon these guides, they pronounce their own opinions, not the laws of those whose officers they are. Following these guides, we are compelled to declare that at the time of the alleged injury there was that natural, legal and customary difference between the white and black races in this State which made their separation as passengers in a public conveyance the subject of sound regulation, to secure order, promote comfort, preserve the peace and maintain the rights both of carriers and passengers. The defendants were therefore entitled to an affirmative answer to the point recited at the beginning of this opinion.

It only remains to add that this cause arose before the passage of the act of 22d March, 1867, declaring it an offence for railroad companies to make any distinction between passengers on account of race or color, and our decision pronounced the law only as it stood when the case arose, leaving the act to operate upon such cases as shall fall within its provisions. Indeed, the act itself is an indication of the legislative understanding of how the law stood before.

Judgment reversed and *venire facias de novo* awarded.

OUR NATIONAL FINANCES.

Views of Hon. Thaddeus Stevens.

In reply to a note addressed to him by a prominent banker of Lancaster, the Hon. Thaddeus Stevens gives his views at length on the finances of the country. We extract the following from his letter:

"Money! What is money? If it be a fixed, unalterable thing of intrinsic and known value, why does the constitution put it into the power of a legislative tribunal to create it and reassess it anew? It is all fancy.—Money is just what the law makes it, and you must take the chance that your Government make it wisely, and when made you fix your eye upon it and make your contract accordingly. I abhor repudiation or clipping the coin; and yet this action has, twice, or, I think, three times, by its legislation, reduced the price of silver, and made it pass to every creditor as well as debtor at the original price.

Who are these reasoners, who, with these facts in view, talk so learnedly of the laws of finance and the morality of human dealings? Whose consciences are so raw, and stick out so far from their excited covering that no pharmaceutist can heal their inward wound; no poultice can cicatrize it sufficiently to take from it its lasting plague after the malefactor shall have lain himself down in the hope of seeking rest in another world? Now let us come to the Government loan, and for a single moment consider it, which even without the monstrous doctrine of Greely & Cooke, is the most profitable investment ever made by money lenders, and is a monstrous swindle on Americans on the part of European capitalists. In what I say I would not depress that loan by a single dollar, for all the profit which it were possible for me to make by it; for it has done its service, and no more than its service, to the American Government, in the days of her need; and for such service it has been terribly rewarded by the nation. When I say this I do not begrudge the poor speculator or the rich capitalist who has entered the gold room a beggar and come out with a princely fortune, his earnings; that is not his folly, but the folly of the Government, which, though a hundred times warned, would never take heed. Would to God that my intellectual vigors might increase in proportion to my disease, that I might properly depict this important subject to the American people. But such a phenomenon will never again be found lo exist this side of Port Royal.

In 1860-61, when the war broke out, it was found that the then administration—for what purpose I will not undertake to pronounce—had left the country bare of all defensive weapons, and not only with an empty treasury but $80,000,000 in debt. The first few millions needed to equip our army and navy were easily borrowed, for our government had a very poor and shallow idea of the intensity of feeling of the independent belligerent with whom we had to deal. But it was soon found that all the energies of the nation were necessary to defend freedom from the plunderers, the robbers, the revolutionary cut-throats, our Southern brethren I think they are called, whom we had to deal with.—The next loan of $250,000,000 was readily taken by the Philadelphia, New York and Boston banks. But when Congress assembled the banks complained that the Treasury had so placed their loans, by aggregating them in the deposit banks, as to render, them, the lenders, unable longer to pay coin for them.—They, however, went on and paid them in currency at some discount, which cost the government some millions of dollars. Still, the Treasury was soon emptied, such was the enormous draft upon it for war material. Inquiry was then made of bankers and brokers by the Committee of Ways and Means, of which I happened to be chairman, as to the probability of obtaining a loan, and at what rate. The answer was discouraging, and did not give us reason to hope that we would be able to obtain sufficient money to carry on the war at more than eighty-five per cent., with interest at six per cent. on the loan.—The committe were unwilling to take eighty-five per cent. principal and receive the loan in a depreciated currency which would have probably brought it to seventy-five per cent. This was borrowing millions at so ruinous a rate that we looked around for other means. Two of us, Mr. Spaulding, of Buffalo, and myself, were in favor of issuing notes of the United States and, making them a legal tender, but receiving them at par for all transactions with the government, believing that they would pass at very nearly par for all the supplies of war material which the government might need; as all demand, both by the government and individuals, for anything but legal tender would thereby be taken away.—No reason could be seen why, to the extent of the demand in this country, which proved to be nearly the whole, they should go much below par. They would answer every purpose for which the farmer, mechanic, merchant, and manufacturer desired to purchase material. We remembered that in England for most of the time that specie payment was suspended, her bank notes were at about fourteen per cent. discount. After having repeatedly attempted to purchase loans at a less sum than what in coin would be about $40 on the $100, we urged the Secretary of the Treasury to give his consent to offering a loan and issuing therefore United States notes and making a legal tender. To this two members of the committee agreed, but the others, together with the Secretary, decidedly refused their consent, as he (the Secretary) had very consistently done in his report. The committee waited, again consulted the moneyed men of the country and found that no large loan could be obtained in coin except at a most ruinous price. They again importuned the Secretary for his consent, the committee having become a tie. A bill for the issue of $100,000,000 of legal tender had been drawn and offered by Mr. Spalding, and was allowed to remain in that position till February, when a Democratic member of the committee, reserving the right to vote against it, consented that it might be reported. In February, after severe opposition, it passed the House and was sent to the Senate. Then nothing was said about the currency in which either principal or interest were to be paid. No one, I suppose, doubted that the loans of the United States of every description were payable in the money of the United States of every description; but to change that aspect as it regards a portion of the fund, the New York money changers again made their appearance. Jew and Gentile mingling in sweet communion to discover some cunning invention to make in a day what it would take weeks for honest men to earn. They went directly to the Committee of Ways and Means, and asked that the interest should be made payable in coin, leaving the principal as it was. The Committee utterly rejected the absurd proposition of two currencies—two legal tenders—in the same empire and for the same commodities. They had once heard of such a transaction in Austrian bonds, which utterly destroyed their credit. The brokers then resorted to the Secretary of the Treasury.—He was more easily persuaded, and, it is understood, went with them to the committee of the Senate and pressed the change. The Finance Committee of the Senate agreed to it, and sent it back to the House with that amendment. The House rejected it, and the consequence was a committe of conference, and, as some bill was necessary, it resulted in the present law, making the debts of the United States, so far as regarded their interest, payable in a different kind of currency from the debt itself. One of the House committee proposed then, in order to raise a sum sufficient for that purpose, that the duties on imports should be paid in coin. That proposition prevailed, and the result was and is that interest on the national loan and the duties on importations are payable in one kind of money, called legal tender, and the principal in another kind of money, called legal tender, but made of a different material and of a different shape. Thus, as any one can see, the Congress declared that while she created two kinds of money, she had made them of unequal value and for different purposes.

For nearly two years the greenbacks were the most popular currency that was ever used in the United States, and had there been no other, would not have failed to buy every necessary commodity for every use, public and private, without the least complaint. And if it swelled the currency of the country, it also swelled the business of every kind, foreign and domestic, agricultural and manufacturing.—So also it swells the income of business men, and thereby vastly increased the revenue of the Government. No man was ever known to refuse any article which he had to sell, during all that time, for one of the greenbacks or certificates of loan of the nation. Under the easily excited imagination of the American public, and seeing a system of finance which no human folly had ever before witnessed, hopes were excited much more rampant than the lottery dealers or the faro players; and in the belief that a single turn of the card would bring up the holder's fortune, places were opened for the purpose of inviting speculation and dealing in this new system of gambling. Some became rich while others went to beggary—doubling and doubling the ventures to indemnify themselves; everything became exsited and inflated, from the commonest fabric to the most valuable estate. Thus the articles necessary to supply the war were vastly increased in price, while the honest Jews of the gold rooms, Shadrach, Meshack and Abednego, came out unsinged.

The violation of an undertaking to do or not do may be compensated in money. Sometimes the amount is liquidated by the parties and sometimes left to be fixed by a jury. In either event it is to be paid for in the money of the country—in this country in dollars and cents. No one ever supposed that the non-fulfillment of a contract is to be paid for in kind. A plaintiff recovers a verdict for $1,000, the non-payment of a farm; execution issues for $1,000 in money; and the defendant can tender the sheriff $1,000 of the legal tender of the country and he is obliged to take it in full payment of the debt. How inconsistent is that with the idea that the creditor can select his medium of payment! A man sells his property for forty horses worth $100 each, amounting in cash to $4,000; if the purchaser do not pay, and is sued for the debt, judgment is given against him for $4,000, not for forty horses. How would you execute a judgment given and an execution issued for forty horses? Indeed there is no breach of contract, either sounding in damages or in contract, which cannot be paid by tendering the amount assessed in a legal tender note.—As to the equity and morality of these transactions, I have never discussed them.

A colleague of mine in Congress, an excellent man and rich, asked me whether I supposed the United States loan of '81, made before the passage of the act, would be paid in coin or currency. I told him it might be paid in either by the express terms of the law, but that I did not know how the Secretary of the Treasury would treat it. He told me the next day that he had consulted the Secretary, who said he would pay it in coin, being then due. He haded invest $30,000 in legal tenders at a cost of $30,000, for which he received $60,000 in greenbacks or its equivalent in coin. A constituent of mine, within two months after the adjournment of the Congress that passed this law, informed me that he had guaranteed to a gentleman in Philadelphia, before the passage of the law, a judgment of $28,000 expressly payable in gold. The creditor demanded the money.—It was then worth about two or three times its nominal value. He went to him and tendered the amount in greenbacks. He refused to accept and issued execution, and the court set it aside and compelled him to take the lawful money of the United States which had been offered him. Whether the transaction was a moral or immoral one, every gentleman must judge for himself, and will judge according to his position. If a man be dealing for himself, with his own money I can understand his right to bestow the half or the whole of the sum upon his creditors, either under the fancy of generosity or honor.—But when he is acting as trustee for others and paying out the money of *cestui que* trusts and wards, it seems to me that there may be in morals, although not law, in a question about the difference.

It is but just to Mr. McCulloch here to say that he does not pretend that the principal of the five-twenties (as his late letter shows) is payable in coin, as the bonds are silent upon that subject, and as that conclusion is excluded by that very silence. It is just, also, to the Democratic party to say that when the question has been discussed in the House, no lawyer among them has set up such a foolish pretension; and when the bill was on its final passage the question was expressly asked of the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and as expressly answered by him that only the interest was payable in coin.—But every instrument speaks for itself, and when it is silent upon the subject of the currency, it is always made payable in *money*, which means the legal tender of the country. I fear, however, I am elaborating this point *ad nauseam*, unless a newspaper, editor or a county broker can enact laws and afterward enforce them. There is nothing short of the sheerest folly in this argument, and it will not be persevered in by those who have sufficient strength to carry them generally over the "asses' bride." Nay, more; I fear what I am going to state may set New York editors and brokers upon a dangerous rampage amid the flowery fields and golden images of Chiriqui and Golfonto; and yet I shall venture to say that if the United States chose to be faithless enough she could tender and pay not only the principal but the interest in legal tenders, although the latter is expressly contracted to be paid in coin. The law of legal tender means this or it means nothing. Let not this alarm any one, for no nation short of the basest Asiatics would ever think of such an act, however capitalists might ask trustees, guardians and administrators to violate the law and their sworn oaths to double the revenue which the public debter is to pay them.

What would be the difference in effect between the two modes of paying the public creditors—in greenbacks, as the loans fall due, or exclusively in coin—I once had a calculation made, when I brought in a bill to borrow greenbacks for that purpose. (Indeed, I brought in three bills, hoping to save two or three billions thereby.) But each session the rattle of the gold room was much louder than what I was pleased to call the voice of reason and what I still think deserved appellation.

THE LACROSSE DEMOCRAT boasts that it has next to *The Weekly Tribune*, the largest subscription of any political newspaper in the country. It has won this extensive patronage, by the most open, hearty, determined championship of the Rebel cause. It predicted and virtually demanded President Lincoln's assassination; it exulted, and still exults, over that fiendish crime; and it day by day denounces the National Debt as a huge, atrocious swindle, which is to be wiped out so soon as the Democracy achives power. Here is one of its latest utterances:

"Rebellion a crime." Liar in your throat, Phil Sheridan! Every hour justifies the acts of those who, from Bull Run to Richmond, through four years of battle and blood sacrifices and struggles labored, suffered, fought, died for the cause of civil freedom. Every passing day proves the soundness of their judgment, the wisdom of those who strove for independence. Every revolving year makes the 'lost cause' more sacred to the lovers of liberty, dearer to to the hearts of those who were faithful to it from its inception to its temporary fall."

—Such fulminations have given *The Democrat* a large circulation in this State, though it is printed on the banks of the Mississippi; and its patrons are steadily increasing.—*N. Y Tribune.*

MRS. LINCOLN is actually preparing to publish a book. Miss Olive Logan, the actress and writer, is assisting her in her literary labor.

The Loss and Gain.

The question of negro suffrage has been discussed and voted on in several States this fall, and the decision has been against it. What of that? Why, some say, the Republican party is broken down, ruined and undone forever, and nobody must ever say negro suffrage, or impartial suffrage, or intelligent suffrage again. This is a little too fast. The result does not support such a *coup de main*. Let us see. This is the first time the subject was ever submitted to a direct vote. The number of votes cast for negro suffrage, in the States where it was voted on at all, shows a progress of public sentiment in the right direction of confering the right, which is truly astonishing. Ten years ago, or five years ago, had the subject been introduced by any party, it would not have received one vote for every hundred given for it this year. If we were in favor of indiscriminate and universal suffrage we should feel greatly encouraged by the late elections. No new political question ever gained ground so fast.

But it must be further noticed that negro suffrage has not been the avowed doctrine of the Republican party. No national convention has indorsed it. And very few State conventions have taken it into their platform. A large proportion probably a large majority, of Republican journals have at least forborne to advocate it, while many have opposed it. That under these conditions it should have been defeated is far less surprising than that it should have received so large a vote when it was brought into the canvass. The elections, therefore, instead of showing that this specific question has lost ground, proye conclusively that it has gained ground. All the hold it has on public opinion has been gained, for until recently nobody embraced it.

But this is not all. The negro suffrage question is not the measure of the opinion and strength of the Republican party, any more than the defeat of a prohibitory law in Massachusetts was the defeat of the Republican party in that State. This party has not embarked its destiny with that question, any more than with the excise question, as shown with reference to both, in Ohio and Massachusetts, the party lines did not run parallel with either of them, even when these subjects were formally introduced into the canvass. Much more than are the interests of the party and of these subjects not identified in States where these questions were not introduced into the canvass. So that the defeat of negro suffrage in Ohio, in Kansas, or elsewhere, is no evidence of demoralization or enfeeblement in the Republican party—neither is those States nor much less in the other States of the country.—*Pitts. Com.*

[From the New York Tribune.]

How it was Done.

The Citizen, edited by a Democrat, gives the following glanced at the means whereby the vote was so swelled in our City at the recent election:

"It is notorious that the Tammany organization, utterly unscrupulous, and with uncontrolled access to the City Treasury, must have spent an aggregate of not less than $300,000 of private and public money in the recent contests. All the pay-rolls of the city departments for the past two months have been lengthened and strengthened by thousands upon thousands of sinecure 'inspectors' and other place-holders—assigned to nominal duty, but really with no other charge than to electioneer for the Tammany candidates. Apart from these sources of public or place-holding corruption, we have reason to know, beyond any question, that the friends of one single Tammany candidate subscribed and paid out in his behalf, and for his private benefit, in the late contest, a sum more than four times the aggregate of the entire sum in the hands of the Democratic Union treasurer for the conduct and organization of our entire campaign.

"It is notorious, also, that with the enormous money power thus placed under its control, there was an enormouse illegal or 'repeating' vote organized and registered in the Tammany interest—say not less than from 17,000 to 20,000 fraudulent votes—of which not less than from 10,000 to 12,000 reached the ballot-box in favor of the Tammany candidates: the remainder being either scared off by the activity and early arrests of the police, or being unable, from sheer lack of time between sunrise and sunset, to vote in as many election districts as they were registered in—one case having been trustworthily reported to us of a man who was registered in no less than 58 election districts! Holding these facts in view, let us now consider and review what was the fate of our candidates."

H. B. CLAFLIN & Co., of New York, during 1866 sold $73,000,000 worth of dry goods—the largest year's business of any wholesale house in the world. The firm consists of Mr. Claflin and E. E. Eames and E. W. Bancroft.

THE *Illinois Statesman*, (Democratic,) published at Lacon, Ill., has placed at the head of its columns "For President of 1868 Clement L. Vallandigham, of Ohio." He is our favorite candidate—for the Democratic nomination.

JERRY BLACK is playing broker in pardons at Washington. He procured the pardon of the noted counterfeiter, Johnson. This is now the pleasant work of leading Democrats, letting criminals loose on the community.

GENERAL SCHOFIELD has replied to the charge against him of keeping open the polls after the two days directed, and founds his defense on the intent of the law, which directs that all the votes possible should be polled.