

For the Democrat.

## A History of the Great Struggle in America between Liberty and Despotism.

Scarcely had the American government been established, before its great founder was called upon to suppress a rebellion against the laws. Gen. Washington in 1794 issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of Western Pennsylvania to desist from opposition to the government, and called out the militia to aid in quelling the rebellion. When, therefore, in 1861, the party in power undertook what they termed the suppressing of a rebellion in eleven States of the Union, they had an example and precedent for their guide in that great undertaking. Washington himself had furnished them with all the rules and regulations in such a warfare, and all the requirements of the Constitution and laws in such an emergency. He addressed the officers and soldiers of the army before they set forth on their errand of duty, and explained to them what the Constitution and laws forbade, as well as what they commanded and required them to do.

He says to them: "Every officer and soldier will constantly bear in mind that he comes to support the laws, and that it would be peculiarly unbecoming in him to become in any way the infractor of them; that the essential principles of a free government confine the province of the military, when called forth on such occasions, to these two objects: 1st, To combat and subdue all who may be found in arms in opposition to the national authority. 2d, To aid and support the civil magistrates in bringing the offenders to justice. The dispensation of this justice belongs to the civil magistrates; and let never be our pride and our glory to leave the sacred deposit there inviolate!"

Under these expositions by the Father of our country of the Constitution and laws thereof, where does the Republican party now stand? They stand as convicted traitors and rebels against the American government. They have trampled under foot all the "essential principles of a free government," and adopted all the principles and practices of the most despotic governments of the earth. Gen. Washington clearly defines the lines between the two. "The essential principles of a free government confine the province of the military to fighting with the weapons of war. This is their province; to maintain the boundary line of their authority in a free government. They have no authority to pass over the lines which bound their own province, and invade the province of the civil magistrates. In stepping beyond the line of military jurisdiction, which Washington defined for them, and where he also confined them, they became themselves infractors of the Constitution and laws, and rendered themselves amenable thereto."

Only in despotic governments can the people be placed under military authority. Cromwell divided England into military districts and ruled by the sword. The consequence was that the people of England welcomed Charles II to the throne with rejoicings, preferring the rule of a king to the rule of an army. Caesar, Cromwell, and Robespierre were military despots. Not such was Washington, and the other founders of the American government. They had the example of these tyrants before their minds, and they resolved to found one free government, where the people should never be cursed with military despotism. The Washington was the commander-in-chief of that army, and might have substituted military for civil authority, he says to the soldiers: "In our free government the dispensation of justice belongs to the civil magistrates, and let it be our pride and our glory to leave the sacred deposit there inviolate!"

Ah! it has been the pride and the glory of the so-called Republican party to invade the sacred deposit of justice; to trample the civil magistrates of the dispensing powers which the framers of our free government had entrusted to their keeping, and hand them over to the military, which they had solemnly forbidden to touch them. What profanation of sacred law! What violation of solemn admonitions! What usurpation of unlawful power! What wilful treason against the freest and best government on earth, to thus subvert and transform it into the worst! After trying in vain to bring the President to accept a military dictatorship, they now propose to complete the overthrow of our free government by placing 10,000,000 of American people entirely under military authority, and thus change it into a military despotism.

Were Washington now President of the United States, would he permit the Republican party thus to trample the liberties of the people in the dust, after fighting eight long years to wrest them from the hand of tyranny abroad? Let the following letter be the answer. When the rebellion was quelled, on account of which the army was sent forth, Washington wrote to the commanding officer as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, 27th March, 1795.

TO MAJ. GEN. MORGAN:

Dear Sir:—It has afforded me great

pleasure to learn that the general conduct and character of the army have been temperate and indulgent, and that your attention to the quiet and comfort of the Western inhabitants has been well received by them. Still, it may be proper constantly and strongly to impress upon the army that they are mere agents of the civil powers, and that out of camp they have no other authority than other citizens; that offenses against the laws are to be examined, not by a military officer, but by a civil magistrate; and that they are not exempt from arrests and indictments for violations of the laws."

Is it any wonder that Gov. Curtin and the other leaders of the party in power think that "if Gen. Washington should rise from the grave he would not dare, and if he did dare, that he would not be equal to the task of settling for this great people, the logic and the lessons of their war?" Gen. Washington would not be the man to do this; oh no, certainly not. The soldiers of the army are to do it, and when they have concluded what are the true lessons of the war, Gov. Curtin says "they have the power to compel the government to obey them." Gen. Washington, and all the other great statesmen sink into insignificance before the mighty voice of the surviving soldiers of the Republic."

Now, what are the reasons for the Republican party assuming such a revolutionary position? Why do a band of robbers or of criminals of any grade form a grand "league" to protect themselves from punishment against the laws? If Washington should now rise from his grave, or if the principles of a free government are ever again restored—if these traitors do not wholly destroy the Constitution and establish despotism in its stead—the "arrests" and the "indictments for violation of the laws" would be so numerous that Fort Lafayette, Fort Warren, Fort Mifflin, Fort Delaware, and all the other dismal fortresses and dungeons which they have turned into American bastilles, and filled with the innocent victims of their lawless power, and wicked revenge, would not be able to hold the guilty wretches who, under the pretext of preserving the Union, have been fighting for Cromwell, for Caesar, and for Robespierre, instead of Washington.

Did not Washington, who made these laws, mean to have them obeyed, and if disobeyed, that punishment should follow their violation? Therefore the whole Republican party who have given their sanction to the "arbitrary arrests" and military trials during the four years of war, would be treated by Washington as a band of conspirators against the government. The Constitution which he established so views them. In the eyes of the law they are traitors. The Supreme Court has pronounced them such. These laws mean say, "If the law stands in the way, so much the worse for the law."

The Republican party rely upon the army to carry out their plans in the complete overthrow of our free government. So in the reign of Cromwell, Hume says: "The only support of the faction which had violently usurped the government was an army of 50,000 men. The precise number which Congress offered President Johnson to make himself another Cromwell. Hume continues, "This army still maintained that all those enormous violations of law and equity of which they had been guilty, were justified by the success with which Providence had blessed them; and they were ready to break out into any new disorder wherever they had the prospect of a like sanction and authority. They declared it necessary that their enemies should be punished, and at last claimed a right of remodeling the whole government, and settling the nation."

To England and to Cromwell's army, Gov. Curtin turned to find his example and precedent. As for Washington, he might as well never have been born as to any influence he has exerted over this Republican party. They have passed by all the years of America's greatness and glory under the government of Washington, and crossed the ocean to bring England back to rule America! George III, Cromwell, Henry VIII—any king, tyrant, or despot, but no longer will they submit to the mild sway of the principles of the Father of our country. Cromwell's army declared it necessary that their enemies should be punished, and proceeded to punish them. Washington says, "The essential principles of a free government confine the province of the military to the use of the weapons of war. That out of camp they have no more authority than other citizens, and they are not exempt from arrest and indictment for violation of the laws." This government by its Constitution is made a free government.

One of these traitors in the Republican party says, "The Constitution was not made in the interest of treason," and yet Washington laid down these rules in a case of treason. This traitor (Tremaine) says: "I would prefer to break the Constitution and save the country, rather than to save the Constitution and destroy the country." The country, with these traitors, means the Republican party. "If the South reject the offer of the Republican party it must be forced upon them. As to a second rebellion, let them try it. At the first tap of the drum, an army

composed of veteran troops, believing that traitors must be punished, would proceed to punish them, and this time it would be effectually done—done without the intervention of President, or Congress, court, jury, or military commission."

And Congress now proposes to turn the Southern people over into the hands of such a lawless army, and rule as Cromwell ruled by the sword. The same consequences must therefore follow the same measures. "From the too eager pursuit of liberty," says Hume, "England fell into absolute slavery." Such a fate, the Republican party are trying to bring upon our once happy America!

## Is J. Wilkes Booth Dead?

The Memphis Avalanche of Saturday has a lengthy article, in which it argues the probability of J. Wilkes Booth being still in the land of the living. The ingenuity of the epistle renders it worth a perusal. The Avalanche correspondent says:

The statement which appeared in your paper of Sunday last, in regard to the point as to whether J. Wilkes Booth still lives, calls to mind other publications that have heretofore appeared in print on the same subject. Allow me to call your attention to these, and also to some circumstances that would tend to support the idea of Booth's death being a fraud perpetrated on the public. Early in the spring of 1866 a letter was received from one of the West India islands, by a correspondent of a New York paper, stating that J. Wilkes Booth had been seen and recognized on the Island of Cuba, a short time previous to the writing of the letter. This letter was noticed by some, if not all of the Memphis papers. Not long after this publication a statement appeared in some of the papers of this country, to the effect that Booth had been seen in Europe, in one of the Italian States.

Some time last summer a man was arrested in Kentucky on a charge of horse stealing, and lodged in jail. If my memory serves me right, he gave his name as King. He wrote to Gen. Jefferson C. Davis, of the U. S. Army, stating that he desired to make a confession to him of importance to the country. Gen. Davis, accompanied by another officer of the army (a General) went to the prison, and the newspapers stated at the time that they occupied nearly an entire day, talking down in writing, the confession of the man. The newspapers also stated that the substance of the confession was that Booth was not the assassin of Lincoln, but that the man King committed the crime—that after the shooting of Lincoln he leaped upon the stage of the theater and passed out to the back door where Booth was with the horses.

The two rode rapidly to the residence of Mr. Seward. King dismounted and went in, and attempted to kill Seward. He then returned to Booth and the two made their escape through Maryland on horseback, and thence to Canada, and soon after they went to Cuba, where he separated from Booth in the spring of 1866, and came to Kentucky. He called the attention of the two Generals to the fact that no proof had ever been made, identifying Booth with the killing, except the testimony of Laura Keane, an actress, who, he stated, was a personal enemy of Booth. She stated she recognized Booth as the man who jumped upon the stage with the drawn dagger. King said it was not Booth, but him. He also said that Mrs. Surratt knew nothing of the conspiracy, and he gave information to the said official where certain papers could be found that would throw light upon the subject. All this has appeared in the newspapers heretofore, and may be taken for what it is worth.

Now, as one who is somewhat in the habit of looking closely into facts and the circumstances surrounding complicated cases, I propose to call your attention to certain facts that have an important bearing upon the whole question as to the probability of Booth not having been the man who was shot in the barn when Harold was arrested. The history of the matter, as given to the public at the time, is that Harold was arrested and Boston Corbett had shot Booth; they put the dead body in a wagon, and proceeded with it to Washington city, the news of their success having reached Washington before they arrived. Baker, the Chief Detective of the Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, went to meet the party who had killed Booth and captured Harold. Upon meeting them, Baker and Corbett took possession of the reputed dead body of Booth, and as they say, buried it in some secret place, that is known to no person living except Baker and Corbett, and they both took a solemn oath over the grave that they would never reveal the burial place. A large reward had been offered by the government for the apprehension of Booth, and this being the case, does it not seem most natural that if the man who was killed in the barn was Booth, that Baker and Corbett would have carried the body to Washington City, where the body, if that of Booth, could have been identified by thousands who knew him, and thus shown to all that the captors had shown themselves entitled to receive the reward.

Where is the testimony showing any

proof that the statement of Baker and Corbett that the body buried was that of Booth? It is not even asserted that Harold confessed that it was Booth. He stated that he was with Booth at the back door of the theater, but does not say that it was Booth who was killed in the barn.

The paper stated that after Gen. J. C. Davis received the confession of the man King, he forwarded it to the Secretary of War. Since that time, the public has learned nothing of the matter, and the question is, what has become of King? and if the papers which he referred Gen. Davis to have been found, what light do they throw on the subject? The matter is now supposed to be in the hands and under the control of Mr. Stanton. Now who could be benefited by the death of Lincoln? Certainly not the Confederates, for the war was over.

The public was told by the newspapers of the time, and particularly those of the radical party, that on the day of the night of the assassination, Mr. Lincoln had called and held a Cabinet meeting, and at said meeting Mr. Lincoln had informed the Cabinet that he intended to issue a proclamation declaring the rebellion at an end, placing the Southern States in the same relations as occupied by them towards the United States before the war, and also granting general amnesty and pardon. It was also said that Secretary Seward, indorsed the position of Mr. Lincoln, although not able to be at the Cabinet meeting. Suppose such a proclamation had been made by Lincoln, would it not have been a death blow to the radical party? They would have been deprived at one blow of the power of reconstructing the South or of interfering in the internal affairs of the States. That party would have dropped dead, and the Union would have been put upon its former basis, except as to the existence of African slavery in the Southern States.

The radicals would have been prevented from overriding the Constitution, and in fact, that party would have been powerless, inasmuch as slavery had been abolished, and there would have been nothing to feed their dupes upon. But Lincoln was killed the night after he had expressed himself in regard to the proclamation. It is probable the people of the U. States, would like to know why the Secretary of War and a radical congress permitted or directed Baker to receive the greater portion of the reward offered for the apprehension of Booth upon such slim testimony, when Mr. Stanton had it in his power to force Baker to produce the dead body, being the superior officer and master, so to speak, of the creature Baker? Why was Baker brevetted Brigadier General by Mr. Stanton, soon after Booth was said to have been killed?

Although the Kentucky man tells General Davis that he murdered Lincoln, and this fact was made known to Stanton, we hear no noise made about it. Congress has not appointed a committee to investigate the affair. The question presents itself, what has become of the man who confessed to have killed Lincoln and tried to murder Seward? The whole matter in regard to him seems to have been hushed up in some way. It might be of some interest to the public to know what has become of King? Is he still in Kentucky, in prison waiting his trial as a thief? Or has the War Department taken charge of him? When the dispatch from General Davis, in regard to King's confession, reached Stanton, what order was given in regard to him, and why has he not been tried before a Military Commission, or a Court for the murder?

They hung a woman, who said: "on the gallows she was innocent; why don't Stanton have this man hang who says, 'I murdered Abraham Lincoln?' While all the radical papers and stump speakers and Congressmen are charging that Jeff Davis was implicated in the assassination plot, why don't they say something about the way Stanton allowed this man Baker to put away the dead body? Or cry aloud and groan heavily because Stanton don't hang King? Why is it that no attempt was made upon the life of any one but Lincoln and Seward, who, it is stated, agreed to the proclamation granting amnesty to all? You will observe I accuse no one; but there is such a fog floating around this whole matter, that I, for one, would like to be able to see more clearly through it.

A letter was received recently at the Post Office at New Hanover, this country, that was "long, long, long on the way." It was mailed at Gettysburg, in 1860, and was only a few days less than seven years in reaching its destination. Where it had been loitering all the time deponent saith not, but it is probable that it had been sticking fast in some way in one of Uncle Sam's mail bags. The writer was a student at Pennsylvania College, and the letter was a response to an invitation to preach a "trial sermon" at the Lutheran Church at Swamp, which church charge was then vacant. An answer was requested, but as the answer never came, the trial sermon was never preached. The writer, Rev. A. R. Horne, formerly of Quakertown, Bucks county, is now we believe in charge of a Lutheran congregation at Williamsport, Pa.—*Montgomery Ledger.*

## The Chinamen and their Customs.

A correspondent of the New York Times, writing from Shanghai, gives the following interesting items concerning life in China:

The climate of this part of China at this season is truly delightful. Cool enough to make the sunshine pleasant, without being actually cold; the air not too dry, and yet with no sign of rain, it is just such weather as one might wish to live in all his life. Our sportsmen are having a noble time of it, and return from the pleasures of the field with well filled game bags and empty shot pouches. Probably there is no country in the world, not possessed of poaching laws, where, in so dense a population, game is so abundant. In different directions, within twenty-five miles of Shanghai, may be found pheasant, woodcock, quail, snipe, pigeon, rabbits, hares, and water fowl; while a journey of two days to the mountains in the region of the Ta Hu Lakes, will bring the sportsman into ample stocks of deer and wild bear. The fact is, that though in proportion to the whole extent of territory, the population of China is denser than that of any other country, there are still various tracts—some larger, some smaller—of land totally untilled, and the mode of cultivating many of the crops is peculiarly favorable to the production and preservation of game. The cotton plants, for instance, are left standing after the bolls are picked off, and the many bamboo plantations are filled with heavy undergrowth of grasses. The Chinese are altogether unappreciative of the delicious flavor of game birds, preferring the domestic duck; but they snare them in great quantities for sale in the foreign market. The Celestial mind has hitherto been unable to solve the mystery of why a foreigner should tramp about the fields all day with a gun on his shoulder to obtain that which at a very small outlay, he could purchase in the market, remaining quiescent at home; and the wondering country people have concluded that the Yang Kwie Zze like to be shot, for which reason, having snared a lot of pheasants, they put them into a bamboo cage and pepper them plentifully with iron shot, causing the non-hunting foreign devil, who buys his game, to break his teeth and indulge in much profanity.

The superstitious ignorance of this singular people was very beautifully illustrated during the past summer. If you pluck the feathers of a chicken you will observe, as doubtless most of your housekeeping readers have done ere this, at the extremity of each wing a little projection from the line of the pinion, as if the wing were split into a fork, with one line longer than the other. Singular as it may appear, this peculiarity has passed unnoticed by the Chinese until the present year, when, being for the first time discovered the entire population, in fear of some impending evil, abandoned the eating of chicken, and in Hankow fowls ordinarily worth six dollars per dozen could be purchased readily for one. Imprecations foreigners like myself, feasted on the tenderest of spring chickens were thankful while the owners of establishments for the artificial hatching of duck eggs realized fortunes by the sudden demand which arose for their products.

## A Bad Mistake.

We think the Senate will in course of time find out that it is now doing a very foolish thing in rejecting so many of the appointments by the President to civil offices of men who have rendered gallant service to their country in the late war, merely because they are supposed to be friendly to the President's policy of reconstruction. The rejection of Gen. Swift, for the Boston Naval Office, the rejection of Gen. Couch for Collector of the Port of Boston, the rejection of Gen. Pratt, of Brooklyn, the rejection of Gens. Edgum, Curtis, and many other soldiers, whom the President had appointed to positions in public service, looks as if the Senate's confirmation was entirely dependent on the fact of the appointee being an opponent of the Administration and an adherent of Thad. Stevens. We have had a deal of banter about appointing soldiers to civil office. A great deal of political capital has been made out of it, and not a little of it by the very men who are now urging on these rejections. They are acting foolishly in the case, and that, too, in a matter which the people will not fail to observe and remember. Since the rejection of Gen. Couch as Collector of Boston, we observe that the President has nominated an eminent civilian, the historian Bancroft, for the post. No one will be sorry to see Mr. Bancroft confirmed, but no one will rejoice at the rejection of the officer whom the President first nominated, and who rendered such eminent service upon many occasions during the war.—*N. Y. Times, Rep.*

A Western farmer being obliged to sell a yoke of oxen to pay his hired man, told him he could not keep him any longer.

"Why," said the man, "I'll stay and take some of your cows in place of money." "But what shall I do," said the farmer, "when my cows and oxen are all gone?" "Why, you can work for me, and get them all back."

## Meerschaum.

The mineral meerschaum is well known to be a hydrated silicate of magnesia, with two equivalents of water. The variety most valued is compact, susceptible of being wrought, and receiving a beautiful polish. It is almost exclusively employed in making tobacco pipes and cigar holders. A strange announcement has been put forth that it may be substituted for the sub-nitrate of bismuth in choleraic diseases. Deposits of meerschaum are very rare, which accounts for its high price. Some veins, however, are found in the Paris basin at Chenevier; in the environs of Madrid, but these are of little value compared with the article from Asia Minor, being too soft and fragile. The mining of meerschaum is carried on largely at Kiltchick, in Anatolia; the kind found there, though soft and greasy to the touch when fresh, becoming hard and white in the fire. Some obscurity still exists as to the mode of preparing the crude meerschaum; nevertheless, it is known that the crude earth is kneaded and pressed into molds, the article being then dried in the sun and hardened in the fire. It is then boiled in milk, dried anew and polished. The pipes thus molded on the spot, are, however, little in demand, those wrought in Germany or Belgium being much more esteemed. The meerschaum which is to be exported is prepared in Konie, molded into blocks, dried and slightly baked. After cutting out, the manufacturers are in the habit of submitting the pipes to a preparation with wax, spermaceti or paraffine. The chips are powdered, formed into a paste with water, dried and hardened in the fire. The pipes made from this waste material are, however, of an inferior quality the first baking to which the material was originally submitted having produced slight flitting, which renders subsequent cohesion difficult to produce.

The manufacture of meerschaum artificially has been the object of many researches. The following method gives very good results when operated by an intelligent and skillful chemist. It is found simply upon the double decomposition of soluble alkaline silicates by sulphate of magnesia. One pound avoirdupois of sulphate of magnesia is dissolved in about a quart of water. Two quarts of a solution of soluble silicate, of density 1.25, is poured into this—both liquids being about 1.70 degrees Fahrenheit. The product is a gelatinous precipitate, which is long washed, first with boiling, then with cold water, until all alkaline sulphate is removed, then poured into a stone or zinc trough and dried at a temperature of not over 100 Fahrenheit. The mass thus reduced is compact, friable, and very similar to the natural meerschaum, and is susceptible of being manipulated and manufactured in the same way as the latter. For some years M. Wagner has obtained good results by a different method. He incorporates with one part of casine (?) six parts of calcined magnesia, and one part of oxide of zinc. Upon drying this mixture there results a material of a lustrous whiteness, very hard, susceptible of being cut and polished, and which perfectly simulates the natural meerschaum.

## An Anecdote Worth Preserving.

A Paris correspondent guarantees the following:

A Frenchman, a prisoner in Edinburgh, having managed to escape, took refuge in the powder magazine. When the authorities wished to seize him, they found him sitting on a barrel with a lighted match, and threatening to blow up the town. The authorities reflected prudently, and the result of their deliberations was that it would be better to starve the Frenchman out. But they reckoned without their prisoner, who loved good cheer and was determined to live well. In consequence he called out that he would blow the town to pieces if he did not get three meals a day; he would write out the bill of fare. Sawney encumbered, and the demands of the prisoner went on increasing. Sometimes he had a serenade under the window; then a review of the garrison, afterwards a sham fight, in which the troops representing the French army beat the Highlanders. At last he exacted that every Sabbath morning, before breakfast, the Lord Provost, in full uniform, should make his appearance and read him an address. This lasted until the allies entered Paris.

## The Devil to Pay.

This phrase doubtless originated in a printing office, on some Saturday night's settlement of weekly wages.

"John," says the publisher to the book-keeper, "how stands the cash account?"

"Small balance on hand, sir."

"Let's see," rejoins the publisher, "how far will that go towards satisfying the hands?"

John begins to figure arithmetically—

so much due to Potkins, so much to Typhus, so much to Grubbe, and so on, through a dozen dittos. The publisher stands aglance.

"Here's not money enough by a jug full. No, sir; besides, there is the devil to pay."

The new hotel at Erie, the Reed house,

when completed, will cost \$300,000.