

Montrose Democrat.

A. J. GERRITSON, Publisher.

MONTROSE, PA., TUESDAY, JAN. 23, 1866.

VOLUME XXIII, NUMBER 4.

BUSINESS CARDS.

ST. CHARLES HOTEL,
SCRANTON, Luzerne co., Penn'a.—PENN AVENUE.
J. W. BURGESS, Proprietor.

DR. E. L. GARDNER,
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON, Montrose, Pa. Office
over Webb & Butterfield's Store. Boards at
Searle's Hotel.
(May, 1865.—17)

C. O. FORDHAM,
MANUFACTURER OF BOOTS & SHOES, Montrose,
Pa. Shop on Main street, on corner below the Post
Office. All kinds of work made to order, and repairing
done neatly.
Jan. 1865.

STROUD & BROWN,
FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE AGENTS, Office
over the Post Office, Montrose, Pa. All business
attended to promptly, on fair terms.
Bellefonte, Pa. CHARLES L. BROWN,
E. L. STROUD.

LAMBERTON & MERRIMAN,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, No. 304 Market street,
Philadelphia, Pa. Will practice in the several
Courts of Luzerne and Susquehanna Counties.
C. L. LAMBERTON. E. L. MERRIMAN.
Dec. 4, 1865.

DR. E. L. BLAKESLEE,
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON, has located at Brooklyn,
Susquehanna co., Pa. Will attend promptly to all calls
with which he may be favored. Office at M. Baldwin's
July 11—17

ROGERS & ELY,
U. S. AUCTIONEERS,
for SUSQ'A and Luzerne Counties.
Brooklyn, May 10, 1865.—17*

G. Z. DIMOCK,
Physician & Surgeon,
Montrose, Pa.
Office over the Post Office. Boards at Searle's
Hotel.

DR. D. A. LATHROP,
MAY be found at the Keystone Hotel.—Room No.
23. (Montrose, Jan. 16, 1865.)

JOHN SAUTTER,
RESPECTFULLY announces that he has pre-
pared to cut all kinds of Garments in the most
fashionable style, and warranted to fit with elegance
and ease.
Shop over I. N. Bullard's Store.
Montrose, Nov. 23, 1864.

C. S. GILBERT,
Auctioneer,
Licensed according to Act of Congress.
Address, Great Bend, Pa.

H. BURMIST,
DEALER in Staple and Fancy Dry Goods, Crockery
Hardware, Iron, Stoves, Drugs, Oils, and Paints,
Boots and Shoes, Hats and Caps, Fine Buffalo Robes,
Groceries, Provisions, etc., New Milford, Pa.
April 21, 1864.

WM. H. COOPER & CO.,
BANKERS.—Montrose, Pa. Successors Post, Cooper
& Co. Office, Lathrop's new building, Turnpike-st.
D. W. SCHEIDT, D. W. SEARLE.

MCCOLLUM & SEARLE,
ATTORNEYS and Counsellors at Law.—Montrose, Pa.
Office in Lathrop's new building, over the Bank.

PETER HAY,
Licensed Auctioneer,
Auburn Four Corners, Pa.

A. O. WARREN,
ATTORNEY AT LAW, Bonny, Back Pay, Pension,
and Exemption Claims attended to. feb
Office first door below Boyd's Store, Montrose, Pa.

M. C. SUTTON,
LICENSED AUCTIONEER, Friendsville, Susq's co.
Jan. '64.

DOCT. E. L. HANDRICK,
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON, respectfully tenders his
professional services to the citizens of Friends-
ville and vicinity. Office in the office of Dr. Lect.
Boards at J. Horford's. July 20, 1865.—17

H. GARRATT,
DEALER in Flour, Feed, and Meal, Barrels, and Drives
Salt, Timothy and Clover Seed, Groceries, Dry
Beans, Fruit, Fish, Petroleum Oil, Wooden and Stone
Ware, Yankee Notions, &c. &c. Opposite Railroad
Depot, New Milford, Pa. Feb 24, 1865.—17.

ABEL TURRELL,
DEALER in Drugs, Medicines, Chemicals, Dye
Stuffs, Glass Ware, Paints, Oils, Tanned, Win-
dow Glass, Groceries, Fancy Goods, Jewelry Per-
fumes, &c.—Agent for all the most popular PATENT
MEDICINES.—Montrose, Pa. ang 17

DR. WM. SMITH,
SURGEON DENTIST.—Montrose, Pa.
Office in Lathrop's new building, over
the Bank. All Dental operations will be per-
formed in good style and warranted.

P. LINES,
FASHIONABLE TAILOR.—Montrose, Pa. Shop
in Phoenix Block, over store of Reed, Warren
& Foster. All work warranted, as to fit and finish.
Cutting done on short notice, in best style. Jan 20

JOHN GROVES,
FASHIONABLE TAILOR.—Montrose, Pa. Shop
over Chandler's Store, on the Public Avenue.
All orders filled promptly, in first-rate style.
Cutting done on short notice, and warranted to fit.

WM. W. SMITH,
CABINET AND CHAIR MANUFACTURERS.—Foot
of Main street, Montrose, Pa. ang 17

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS, BOUNTY, AND BACK PAY.

THE undersigned LICENSED AGENT OF THE GOV-
ERNMENT, will give prompt attention to all
claims entitled to his care. Charges low, and infor-
mation FREE.
L. F. FITCH,
Montrose, Jan. 14, 1865.

SOLDIERS' BOUNTY, PENSIONS, AND Back Pay!

THE undersigned LICENSED AGENT OF THE GOVERN-
MENT, will give prompt attention to all claims
entitled to his care. No charge unless successful.
Montrose, Aug. 20, '65. J. B. MCCOLLUM.

NOTICE!
THE subscriber hereby respectfully gives notice that
he has taken pleasure to auctioneer in the County
of Susquehanna, and offers his services to the public—
charges reasonable; and all calls will be promptly
attended to.
LUTHER ELDERD,
Chambers, March 3, 1864.

SPEECH OF SENATOR COWAN, OF PENN'A.

In Reply to Senator Sumner of Massachu-
setts, in defence of President Johnson.

(From the Congressional Globe, Dec. 21.)

Mr. COWAN.—Mr. President, I am not disposed to allow the speech of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) to go to the country without a very brief reply. If that speech be true, and if it be a correct picture of the South, then God help us; then this Republic, this Union, is at an end, then the great war which we waged for the Union was a folly; then all the blood and treasure which we have expended in that war in order to restore ourselves to companionship with the people of the South have been equally follies. But, Mr. President, is it true? Or is not this a series of *ex parte* statements made up by anonymous letter writers, people who are down there more than likely stealing cotton, people who are down there in the enjoyment of place and power, people who are interested that the disturbed condition of things which exists there now shall always continue because they make profit of it? Is there any man who has had any experience in the trial of causes, any man who knows anything about the nature of evidence, who does not know that the honorable Senator could have sent his emissaries into any one county in the lately rebellious States, and gather the expressions of knaves and fools and discontented, single ideal people, far more than he has given us in this speech?

We are told here of the exceptional instances of bad conduct on the part of the people of the South. Why, what a large volume it would take to hold all that? If a man were to go about anywhere in the loyal States and hunt up what he might suppose to be treasonable expressions, heretical expressions, how many could he find? And yet we are treated to all this here as it was the whole of the evidence in the case. One man out of ten thousand is brutal to a negro, and this is paraded here as a type of the whole people of the South, whereas nothing is said of the other nine thousand nine hundred and ninety men who treat the negro well. One man expresses a great deal of dissatisfaction at the present state of affairs, and that is paraded here while nothing is said of the other ten thousand men who are contented to accept it and make the most of it.

What, then, are we to do? We are to suppose that the people of the Southern States lately in rebellion have common sense; and when their utterances are in accordance with what is common sense and the dictate of their own interest, we have a right to presume it to be true. But according to what we have just heard everything that has come from the people of these States, and from their public bodies, from the representatives of these people, is to be taken as false; and why? Because some cotton agent, some correspondent of a radical newspaper in the North, some office holder who has been making a profit of the state of things there chooses to say it is all false! The heresy of States rights is not destroyed there, the honorable Senator says. Have we not heard from almost all the public men of the South that that question was put to the arbitrament of the sword; that they have lost, and that they submit? Have they not acquiesced in the abolition of slavery—that thing of all others which was the last, in the opinion of many, that they would submit to? But still further guarantees are wanted; and are not told what they are. What are they? What is wanted? Everybody admits that the negro ought to have his natural rights secured to him. I believe all the moderate, conservative men of this Chamber are fully agreed that every man should have his natural rights secured—the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the protection of property, limbs and reputation; that he should have the right to sue and be sued, and to testify in courts of justice. The negro has not hitherto been allowed in the Southern States to testify in courts of justice, and why? Because he was a slave, and if I had been a citizen of the Southern States when slavery prevailed there, I would have resisted his right to testify in courts.

A witness, like a voter, ought to be a free man; he should not belong to another man. What chance would a litigant have against the master of slaves, if the slave could testify? It seems to me that the slaves ought not to testify for the same reason that the wife ought not to testify either for or against the husband. Would you ask a negro to testify against his master, to go back to that master and be subjected to his ill will because of his testimony? Would you allow him to testify for the master against a party on the other side? Certainly not. But now this state of things has passed away. Now the people of the Southern States themselves, so far as I understand them, are in favor of opening the courts to all these classes of people. And, sir, they must open them for their own security. I am willing to leave that to themselves, their own interest will compel them to allow all people to testify, unless they are

excluded by those disabilities that have heretofore excluded witnesses from testifying. If the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, and those who think with him, desire that these people should have the right of suffrage, why not say so broadly?

Mr. Sumner—I do say so. Mr. Cowan—Very well; that is so much that is clear; make it broadly; we may differ from him, but the people will decide. I am perfectly willing to acquiesce in their decision; I do not care which way it is; but the people will decide that question, and they will decide it promptly. If the honorable Senator from Massachusetts wants to hold the doctrine that these States are no States, that they are no constituent members of this Union, let him say so; there is a tribunal to which they can be referred. If he wishes to take issue with the President on these points, let the issue be made fairly and squarely, and it will be met. Thank God, in this Government, not like that of Russia, which he has eulogized, there is a power to whose arbitrament and award we can appeal, and who will settle this thing conclusively.

Now, Mr. President, I am for reconciliation. I want to have this Union restored; and a Union means a Union by consent, not by force. I would like to make friends of all the people with whom we have been at enmity heretofore. I do not want the contest to go on any longer. But are we to make friends with them, and are they to be reconciled to us, and are they to behave better by such speeches as have been made by the honorable Senator here, to day? I very much doubt it. I do not think that he will improve the condition of the Southern heart or the condition of the Southern mind, by thus parading these exceptional cases to the people of this country, and stimulating and exciting their angry passions more than they are now against this unfortunate people—unfortunate in every respect; unfortunate on account of the penalty which has followed those errors, and which they have suffered.

Mr. President, let us look at this testimony. The honorable Senator, as I said before, reads from anonymous letter writers, from cotton agents, and people of that kind. Now, it does so happen that we have some testimony upon this subject; we have the testimony of the President of the United States, not a summer soldier or sunshine patriot.

Mr. Sumner—I have not read anonymous letters.

Mr. Cowan—They are anonymous so far as we are concerned; and I commend the Senator's prudence in keeping the names of their writers from the public, because I have no doubt that if their names were shown they would not be considered of much importance. I very much doubt whether there is a single man among them who has ever wielded any thing more than a pen during the rebellion. But I say that we have the testimony of men of unexceptionable veracity; we have the testimony of the President of the United States, who was a Union man, and who was in favor of the Union at a time and in a place where there was some merit in it. I do not suppose that there was any great merit in being a Union man in Massachusetts. I suspect a man would have been very likely to get a lamp post if he had been anything else there; but the President of the United States was a Union man in the very thick and storm of the battle. He was waylaid while coming hither in order to attend to his official duties in this body. He has stood by the Constitution, by the Union, all the way through, steadily and firmly; and, as a compliment to him, the great party to which I belong, and to which he did not belong, and never pretended to belong, conferred upon him the office which, in the Providence of God, has made him President of the United States.

Now, sir, you are told here that this man in his official communication to the Senate of the United States, whitewashes the condition of things down below. Yes, sir, "whitewash" is the word. The honorable Senator says that he will not accept the definition of "whitewash" given by the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from Wisconsin, but he has not told us what he means by the word "whitewash." It is not necessary that he should say what he means by that word. Everybody understands it. I suppose even his colored friends, in whom he takes so much interest, would know what the meaning of the word "whitewash" was. [Laughter.] He says that this man, who stood firm when everybody else faltered—this man, who stood almost alone in the midst of an enraged population, and in the very storm and strife of the worst civil war perhaps the world has ever seen—comes here to "whitewash." What does he mean except that the President of the United States, in an official communication to this body, comes here to lie; that is the plain English of it; comes here either to suppress the truth or to suggest a falsehood.

What does the President say? I will read what he says as a sufficient answer to what all these people down South report of the state of affairs there, and I do not find it necessary to deny thousands of instances of exceedingly heretical talk

that may have taken place, and of treasonable talk if you please; and I have no doubt that in a state of things unparalleled in the history of the world, heretofore, wrongs and outrages innumerable happen there; but that is not the question. The question is what is the condition of the mass of the people in the South; what is their disposition and tendency; not to love the North, not to love the honorable Senator from Massachusetts—because I very much fear that that will not be brought about soon unless there is a change in the temper of both parties—not to have hearts overflowing with love and gratitude to those who they think persecute and hunt them in their submission; who kick and strike at them after they are down, after they have cried "enough"—but the question is what is their disposition to obey the laws? What do we care about their hearts or their dispositions if they are obedient to the laws, and submit to the laws? Now they have submitted to laws which impose the heaviest penalty, for if they are traitors the law imposes the penalty of death and confiscation of estates by means of fine. I will read what the President says now of the condition of that people from the information he has received:

"In that portion of the Union lately in rebellion, the aspect of affairs is more promising than in view of all the circumstances could well have been expected." I think there is no candid man who will not endorse that sentiment. "The people throughout the entire South evince a laudable desire to renew their allegiance to the Government, and to repair the devastations of war by a prompt and cheerful return to peaceful pursuits."

Why should they not? To suppose anything else is to suppose that they are demoted. That they have no kind of common sense left; that four years of the most terrible war, and the most terrible punishment ever inflicted upon a people, have been without their lessons. It cannot be, Mr. President; it is not the nature of things that it should be.

"An abiding faith" on the part of this man who suffered from these people; who suffered from this war and the doctrine of secession, and the attempt to break the Union. He says, "An abiding faith is entertained that their actions will conform to their professions, and that in acknowledging the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, their loyalty will be unreservedly given to the Government, whose leniency they cannot fail to appreciate, and whose fostering care will soon restore them to a condition of prosperity."

And here, Mr. President, allow me to ask when in the history of this world or of the human family, has it happened that severity, cruelty, persecution, refusal to recognize common rights, has reconciled a people and pacified a distracted country; and when has it happened that clemency, leniency, as the President expresses it, has failed to produce beneficial results? Is it not necessary to go very far back for instances to show this. Look at the treatment of England toward Ireland. What has been the result of holding the people in a species of vassalage? A Fenian insurrection upon her hands now. After hundreds of years of attempts to dominate over that people. Look at Poland; look everywhere. And if it be necessary to see what clemency, what leniency and justice, and trust and confidence can do to restore a people once in revolution, take the conduct of Hoche in La Vendee. There, by the genius of one man, high enough to be above vulgar passion, statesman enough to look to the future, La Vendee was restored to France and is there now, part and parcel of it, with every recollection of the revolution effaced.

Says the President: "It is true that in some of the States the demoralizing effects of war are to be seen in occasional disorders"—these effects are to be seen in the North as well as in the south,—but these are local in character, not frequent in occurrence, and are rapidly disappearing as the authority of civil law is extended and sustained. Perplexing questions were naturally to be expected from the great and sudden change in the relations between the two races, but systems are gradually developing themselves under which the freed man will receive the protection to which he is justly entitled, and by means of his labor make himself a useful and independent member of the community in which he has his home. From all the information in my possession, and from that which I have recently derived from the most reliable authority, I am induced to cherish the belief that sectional animosities are surely and rapidly merging itself into a spirit of nationality, and that representation, connected with a properly adjusted system of taxation, will result in a harmonious restoration of the relations of the States to the National Union."

There is a little more testimony yet, Mr. President, and it is worth while to consider, while we are here to take counsel and to know what we ought to do in the extraordinary situation in which we find ourselves, from whom will we take that counsel. Are we to take it from men, the purpose of whose life seems to be to wage war upon these people and their institutions?—Shall we take it from men

whom they hate personally and by name, and to whom it is almost impossible to suppose they ever will be reconciled, or in the nature of things, can be reconciled? Or are we to take it from the men who have not made this a personal war; who have treated it as a national war, and who in their conduct of it, have won the applause of both sections? The President says that part of his information has been received from Gen. Grant. Who is General Grant? Who is to be put in the scale with that sacred soldier, and whose testimony is to weigh down his? Is he "whitewashing" here too? Has he forgotten the position he occupies before the American people? With the highest military character of any man to day upon the earth, has he condescended to come here to deceive the Senate of his country, and to see about the condition of affairs in the south, which he has recently visited? Let us hear what he says, and listen with patient reverence to the utterance of a man of sense, a patriot, and a prudent man, who desires not to embroil, not to embitter, not to widen the gap that already exists between the two peoples, who ought to be fraternally united, but a man who desires to heal and to pacify; a man imbued with the spirit of Hoche when he went to La Vendee, and where he succeeded when others had failed. What does he say? It is not the tone or manner of the letter writer but it is in the manner of a man and a soldier.

"I am satisfied," says he; and when he is satisfied who dares say that he is not satisfied upon the score of honesty and good intent toward this Republic? "I am satisfied that the mass of thinking men at the South accept the present situation of affairs in good faith."

That is what General Grant says. Is that "whitewashing?" "The questions which have heretofore divided the sentiments of the people of the two sections—slavery and State rights, or the right of a State to secede from the Union—they regard as having been settled forever by the highest tribunals—arms—that man can resort to."

It is now said that they do not think so—that they are only pretending, and have a covert purpose of doing something hereafter about this thing, nobody can tell exactly what. Perhaps we will be told that they will not abide the result.

"I was pleased to learn from the leading men whom I met, that they not only accepted the decision arrived at as final, but that now, when the smoke of battle has cleared away, and time has been given for reflection, this decision has been a fortunate one for the whole country, their receiving like benefits from it with those who opposed them in the field and in council."

Why, Mr. President, the common sense of that last utterance is worth more as a testimony than that of a thousand scribblers who merely look at detached points of this great field. They have resolved to accept the decision as final; and, what we ought all to be glad to know, they have found that it is for their benefit. They have found too after the smoke has cleared away, that they are really in a better condition than they were before, that they have been relieved from the incubus which oppressed them for so long a time, and they are ready now to take their places in the Union, and alongside of the Northern States who have made liberty their great principle instead of slavery. Why should they not? If any man can give a reason why they should desire to keep up this strife longer, with their devastated fields, with their treasuries empty, with their society disorganized, I should like to hear it.

I therefore hope, Mr. President, that we may meet them in a different spirit; that we may show to them that we made this war, not to make them eternal enemies of ours; not to humiliate them, but to rescue them; that we made this war to go and get them out of the clutches of the bad men who had misled them into the gloomy realm of secession and rebellion; and that we intend after the great military victory that we have achieved, to achieve another by magnanimity and clemency in our conduct toward them.—That we will win them back to be as they were before—our friends and brothers—of the same race and the same lineage.

I hope, too, that this angry, irritating, and exciting mode of treating this subject, which is calculated to make us anything else than friends, will be discarded hereafter, and that we shall calmly and coolly, and in the spirit of the nation, (because that is the spirit of the nation,) examine this question, and do with it that which will be calculated to restore the old harmony and peace, and the old Union again.

A jury having been sent out on a plain case of assault and battery, where the evidence clearly convicted the prisoner, came into court with the intelligence that they were unable to agree. The court inquiring how they stood, and what was the cause of disagreement? One of their number stated that it was his misfortune to be associated with eleven of the most obstinate, ignorant, beetle-headed men he ever saw—they were all for conviction, while he was unanimous for acquittal.

Singular Blunder.

The Printing Bureau of the Treasury Department at Washington recently made a blunder of such a stupid character that it is a wonder it was not discovered by some one of the many attached in time to save the reputation of the establishment.

The careless and slovenly manner in which they do things in the Printing Bureau would ruin any job printing office in the United States in six months. Think, for instance, of them striking off, I do not know how many thousand dollars, but as much as they wanted, at any rate, of ten cent fractional notes, and then discovering, when the work was completed, that in the engraving the word "cents" had been omitted, and that the bill might mean ten mills, ten cents, ten dollars, or \$—a, just as might be agreed upon between the holder and the redeemer of it. It had tens all over it, but the word "cents" didn't once occur.

The *faux pas* was not discovered until the greater part of the notes had been paid out of the Department. An attempt is now being made to call in the erroneous issue, but the work proceeds very slowly.

The head of the Printing Bureau is Mr. Clark, about whom a Congressional Investigating Committee told so many naughty stories a year and a half ago.—But there seems to be some hidden virtue in him that made him invulnerable.—[Cf. correspondence Cincinnati Commercial, (Republican.)]

Two Oratorical Specimens.

Speaking extemporaneously is rather difficult until you get used to it. A young lawyer in New Hampshire, who had never yet had a case in court, was invited to deliver an oration on the occasion of the dedication of a new bridge. It was a fine opportunity of establishing his reputation.

He did not prepare himself, for he had an idea that that was un-lawyer-like, and that a lawyer must be able to speak any number of hours in a style of thrilling eloquence at a moment's notice. He stood upon the platform, and amid the profound attention of his hearers, commenced as follows:

FELLOW CITIZENS: Five and forty years ago, this bridge built by your enterprise, was part and parcel of the "howling wilderness." He pauses for a moment.—"Yes, fellow-citizens, only five-and-forty years ago, this bridge, where we now stand, was part and parcel of the howling wilderness." Again he pauses. [Cries of "Good, go on." Here was the rub.] "I hardly feel it necessary to repeat that this bridge, fellow-citizens, only five-and-forty years ago, was part and parcel of the howling wilderness—and—and I will conclude by saying that I wish it was part and parcel of it now!"

Another orator who we have heard tell off in appealing to the "bone and sinew," said:

"My Friends—I am proud to see around me to-night, the hardy yeomanry of the land, for I love the agricultural interests of the country! and well may I love them, fellow citizens, for I was born a farmer—the happiest days of my youth were spent in the peaceful avocations of the sun and soil. If I may be allowed to use a figurative expression, my friends, I may say, I was raised between two rows of corn."

"A pumpkin, by thunder," exclaimed an inebriate chap just in front of the speakers stand.

Too Extravagant.

In our opinion the pay of legislators at Harrisburg as increased by themselves from \$700 to \$1000 for services rendered is entirely too high.

The West Chester Record says that one thousand dollars for fifty-two days service this year, with postage stamps thrown in ad libitum, is certainly a "little" too steep, especially as the pay in other States is only from \$2 to \$4 a day, for sessions running from fifty to one hundred and thirty days.

We think with the Record, that the Republican members of the Legislature, should set an example by cutting down the unnecessarily high salaries. Retrenchment should be the order of the day in every department of government. We urge our exchanges to refer to this extravagance and frown it down.—*Rep. Ex.*

The following story is told of the Rev. Dr. Morse:

At an association dinner a debate arose as to the use of the rod in bringing up children. The doctor took the affirmative, and the chief opponent was a young minister, whose reputation for veracity was not high. He maintained that parents often do harm to their children by unjust punishment, from not knowing the facts of the case. "Why," said he, "the only time my father ever whipped me was for telling the truth." "Well," retorted the doctor, "it cured you of it, didn't it?"

A boarder at one of our city boarding-houses, on being asked how they live there, replied that the hash is rather doubtful, but the beef was "bully." This dubious indorsement failed to attract a new boarder.