

AMERICAN CITIZEN.

"Let us have Faith that Right makes Might; and in that Faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it"—A. LINCOLN.

VOLUME 4.

BUTLER, BUTLER COUNTY, PENN'A, WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 1867.

NUMBER 32

CURIOS MEDLEY.

By the lake where drooped the willow,
Row, row, row!
I want to be an oarsman,
And jump Jim Crow!

An old row-stroke on a hickory limb,
None named him but to praise,
Let me kiss him for his mother,
For he smelt the Schweitzer base.

The minstrel to the war has gone,
With his fiddle on his knee;
He waked to hear the window shriek,
There's a light in the window for thee.

A frog he would a wading go,
His hair was curled to bill,
He used to wear an old gray coat,
And the sword of Bunker Hill.

Of in the still night,
I want for liberty I plead,
I want to know till morning,
With Peggy by my side.

I am dying, Egypt, dying,
Summ'd up you cry;
Know how to die a noble death,
To break away the blue-tail'd fly.

The boy stood on the burning deck,
Whose flag the English checked for Troy,
One of the few immortal names,
His name was Pat Malley.

Mary had a little lamb,
Her fleece was white as snow,
She took it to school with her,
And she spectacles were gold.

Lay on, lay on, MacArthur,
Spain waxes not little here below,
And I'm to be the day of the May,
So kiss me quick and go!

RECONSTRUCTION.

In his closing speech on the reconstruction question, Mr. Stevens takes occasion to say that the Republican majority in Congress "has agreed that the States lately in rebellion are conquered territory." Immediately advanced the theory, then peculiarly his own, that the Southern States, having engaged in an insurrection which became in time magnified to the proportions of a rebellion, and so powerful as to command the recognition of belligerent rights, became for all practical purposes a foreign power, subject in case of ultimate defeat and overthrow to all the liabilities of a conquered enemy, with no other rights than those allowed by the laws of war, the laws of nations and the laws of humanity. So far as we can recollect, he advanced this theory and argued for its recognition with but little sympathy either in or out of Congress. It was regarded generally as dangerous ground, and as a theory revolutionary in its character. The Republican party generally accepted the fact that rebellion had placed the Southern States outside of practical relations with the Union, and insisted that on general principles the work of restoration and reconstruction should be committed to Congress; but Mr. Stevens stood alone at first in maintaining that the rebellion had consummated the work of secession so far as the liabilities of the States to the government were concerned, and that they are in consequence of the failure of the rebellion conquered territory. The difference between Mr. Stevens and those of his party who opposed him was just this—he insisted that our arms had conquered a government, owing, by its own repeated declarations, no allegiance to the United States; they maintained that we had merely suppressed a rebellion, which by its magnitude and long continuance had disordered and confused the political relations of the States that had engaged in it. Mr. Stevens' view, if correct, would make these States, as to all political purposes, conquered territory, and entirely devoid of any connection with the Union, and would simply warrant Congress by order and government to those States under constitutional restraints and restrictions.

According to Mr. Stevens' view, the constitution could impose no restraint to congressional action, that instrument being a compact between States and not applying to territories, no matter how acquired. No direct issue was ever made between these opposing theories. Reconstruction was allowed to progress independent of theory but governed by necessity. Congress legislated upon the subject not on the basis of any particular theory, but as circumstances demanded, and the necessities of the country required. The result of it all is unquestionably a practical recognition of the soundness of Mr. Stevens' view. On no other ground can the legislation of Congress be justified. It implies a total forfeiture of rights by the rebellious States and assume a sovereign power in Congress to govern, direct and control them so long as they remain in their present condition. Mr. Stevens' assertion therefore is warranted by the facts of the case. He is equally correct when he says that we would have had but very little trouble in reconstructing the government had we recognized the principle at the outset. Once concede the Southern States to be conquered territory and the whole problem is solved. The supreme power becomes lodged in Congress and no other department of the government can interfere with its exercise of that power. That power extends not only over the political relations and conditions of the territory, but by the laws of war, and subject to them, is made to embrace even the lives and the property of its people. Reconstruction as applied to them would mean simply admission as States, just as any other territory is built up into States, and by the same power.

A twelve months' experience has done more to make Congress of one mind on this important subject than all of Mr. Stevens' arguments, unanswerable as they were. Instead of standing alone as he did at first, he is supported by nearly all who then opposed him. The events of the last year has justified his predictions, and the country regards his views as completely vindicated.—*Franklin Repository.*

MAXIMILIAN.

MONARCHY IN MEXICO.

Responsible Government for France.

THE EXECUTION OF MAXIMILIAN.

An English Defense of Juarez.

A telegram from Paris, of the 9th of July, evening reports: In to-day's sitting of the Legislative body the Mexican question was discussed.

M. Thiers said—The Mexican question has ended without any good results to France. Our compatriots remain exposed to greater losses than ever, our commerce with Mexico is ruined, and the prestige of our greatness is compromised in America. Even in Europe the Mexican imbroglio has hampered our attitude towards the great revolution accomplished in Germany. The lesson of this unhappy expedition is that control and opposition are necessary. The Mexican expedition was approved by no one in France, but was nevertheless undertaken and continued for several years. There are two ways of understanding monarchical government. The first is the rule of a prince with irresponsible ministers, who merely execute the orders they receive. The second is a prince governing with responsible ministers, who have to submit their views to him as the head of the State, and can, if necessary, lean upon a representative Assembly which is able to oppose the Ministers, both, however, dependent upon public opinion. This is the form of monarchy towards which we must advance as speedily as possible in the interest of the government and the country.

Perfect silence prevailed in the Chamber during this speech.

M. Granier de Cassagnac defended the Mexican expedition.

M. Jules Favre stated that the real idea of the expedition was the subversion of the Mexican Republic and the establishment of a throne in Mexico, but this intention had been concealed by the government. The French troops ought to have brought back Maximilian, and thus have saved France from the stain of blood which will rest upon her. [Noisy interruptions.]

M. Rouher protested strongly against the words of Mr. Favre.

MAXIMILIAN'S EXECUTION.

EARL DERBY'S ANNOUNCEMENT TO THE ENGLISH PEERS.

In the English House of Lords, on the 9th of July, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe said that, seeing his noble friend at the head of the government in his place, he wished to put to him a question of considerable interest, and to which he had given him private notice. It related to the Emperor Maximilian and the alleged unhappy termination of his career. He wished to ask his noble friend whether the government had received any official account of the Emperor Maximilian's death, and whether, if the government had received it, it was their intention to move that the House should take any notice of the event, and propose that he should offer their condolence to her Majesty on what must be to her a subject of so much affliction? There was another subject to which he wished for a moment to direct the attention of his noble friend, and that was the continued detention of the Abyssinian captives.

The Earl of Derby said he had only just received from his noble friend a private intimation that he intended to ask two questions. He would be obliged if he would postpone the one relating to the captives in Abyssinia. With regard to the other question, which concerned the fate of the Emperor Maximilian, he had to state that he had received within the last few hours a telegram from Paris which unhappily showed that there could be no longer any doubt upon that subject. That telegram was as follows:

FROM MR. FANE.
PARIS, July 9—1:30 P. M.

Moustier has just received a telegram from the French Minister at Mexico, dated 27th of June. It reports that the Emperor Maximilian was shot on the 19th, in spite of every effort made to save him; the tone of the victorious party was defiant towards all foreign powers, including United States; they refused to give up the Emperor's body; the French Minister was preparing to depart with his legation, but although hitherto unmolested, he thought he might be detained as a hostage for the surrender of General Almonte.

Earl Derby continued: My Lords, I must say that I share in all the feelings of your lordships—(cheers)—at this most unnecessary, most cruel and barbarous murder, which must excite horror in every civilized country. (Cheers) It is a murder purely gratuitous, and so far from producing any beneficial effect, can only add to the miseries of which that unhappy country has been for so many years the subject, and I fear it is only too probable that it will have to sustain similar miseries for many years to come. I hope my noble friend will excuse me at the present moment for declining to give any opinion as to whether your lordships will be invited to express your feelings on the subject by any public act. Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe said that, as a member of the House, he begged to state that he would bring forward some resolution on the subject in case her Majesty's government existed for inviting an expression of opinion from the House with regard to the matter. Lord Hodesdale hoped the noble viscount would give public notice of his

question, and not give it privately, as he was in the habit of doing. The giving of private notices prevented every other of the questions brought forward, although they might feel an interest in them. It was extremely inconvenient that notices were not given publicly. It might induce noble lords to come down to the House and take part in the debates. [Hear, hear.]

QUEEN VICTORIA'S OPINION.

[London July 9] correspondence of Manchester Guardian.]

On Friday there is to be a discussion on recent events in Mexico. Mr. Otway brings forward a proposal that our Minister, Mr. Scarlett, should be recalled, in order to mark this country's reprobation of the execution of Maximilian. Lord Stanley, it is said objects to being forced into taking such a step, which would no doubt be the avowal of a policy at variance with that impermissible neutrality which he has always advocated, and which so far he has practiced. Other members of the cabinet take more of the old Pitt and Sidmouth view; and it would not be difficult, in the present ill-humor of the Tory party, to blow up an anti-royalist flame.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that this movement, should it take place, is in any way inspired by the Court. The Queen, it is understood, lends no countenance to hot or hasty counsels professing resentment against the republicans of Mexico. She is too well read in constitutional principles to suffer her sympathy for Maximilian's widow to cloud her judgment as to the wisdom of her course, and the impolicy of our showing our diplomatic behavior by the deplorable events he himself precipitated. The Queen, like her sagacious uncle Leopold, regretted that he should have gone to Mexico; and that, having gone, he should have tarried his brief reign by the fatal acts of October, 1866, regarding prisoners of war. Mr. Scarlett may have leave of absence for a year, without his absence doing any hurt to British interests in Mexico; and if at the end of that time Juarez shall be able to re-establish the form of government which we recognized up to 1864, when our plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Wyke, returned to Europe, we shall then be free to accredit some one else as Minister to Mexico. But for Parliament to sit in judgment on events with which England has nothing to do, and to break off diplomatic relations on account of them, is a course which the majority of the House of Commons is very unlikely to favor.

NO AUSTRIAN REPRISALS.

Referring to the telegraphic announcement from Vienna that Admiral Tegethoff is to proceed to Mexico to claim the body of the Emperor Maximilian, and that an Austrian squadron will accompany him, the *Paris Debates*, of July 9, declares that the second part of that assertion appears to it completely inadmissible. No squadron, says the *Debates*, is wanted to bring back a coffin. The mission of the conqueror of Lissa, with a strong force sent into Mexican waters, would seem to announce the intention of chastising Juarez and his partisans. We most heartily wish that means could be found to capture the bands which seized and put to death the brother of Francis Joseph; but is this the thing possible? On the other hand, would there not be as much injustice as barbarity in bombarding Vera Cruz, and thus punishing, for the Emperor's murder, the town which remained longest faithful to the empire? Austria will doubtless understand, just like France, what is the most prudent course at the present day—namely, to entrust to the ambitious gladiators of Juarez themselves the task of chastising each other, and of exterminating themselves, turn by turn, in a sanguinary anarchy. Alas! why did we not adopt that policy towards Juarez and his accomplices a little sooner?

JUAREZ'S DEFENSE—ENGLISH JUSTIFICATION OF THE MILITARY EXECUTION.

[From the London News, July 10.]

It is only too easy to account for and excuse the distressing exaggeration into which some of our contemporaries who conspicuously applauded the attempt of the Emperor Napoleon, to found a vicarious empire in Mexico, and others who habitually practice upon the ignorance, the credulity or the forgetfulness of their readers, are descending upon the deplorable execution of the Archduke Maximilian of Austria. These journals appear to imagine that when they have called President Juarez a "savage" and an "assassin," sentenced him to the execution of the civilized world and of posterity, and invoked the retribution of the United States Government—of all Governments in the world—on the head of the man who has at last succeeded "in clearing the Western world of an invading army and of an alien monarchy," history will accept their suppressions and distortions of the truth and their hollow declamation as a conclusive verdict upon a series of transactions of which the court martial at Queretaro is the last and most lamentable. Without surprise, but not without regret and shame, we find English journals vising with the *Montevideo* in veracity and with the *Constitutionnel* and *Patrie* in expressions of remorse which read like the crimes he ordered and paid for.

Need we protest that there is not a man with a heart in his breast, of what ever political party or opinion, who contemplates with the profoundest pity the tragic destiny of a prince endowed with all the charms and graces of character which in private life won the love of friends and public life engage the

loyalty of nations? Assuredly if there be any political party, or any portion of the press of Europe, which has a peculiar right to condemn and deplore an act of vengeance and the loss of a rare opportunity and example of mercy and forgiveness, it is the Liberal and Democratic party, who, in 1848, abolished the punishment of death for political offences—it is that portion of the European press, which, in 1861, dissuaded the unfortunate Archduke Maximilian from offering himself as the dupe and the victim of the Emperor Napoleon's dreams and designs. Those dreams and designs depended for their fulfillment on the disruption and subversion of the American Republic, and the recognition by force of arms of the slaveholding Confederacy; at the best of untold calamities, for the greater glory of the second empire. Our Tory contemporaries are at least consistent; they have seized the occasion of this catastrophe in Mexico to renew their complaints of the shortsighted policy of the liberal English government which declined to lend the blood and treasure of this country to that Napoleonic "idea" which consented, indeed, to join with France and Spain in demanding of the Mexican government the payment of certain money claims, and the punishment of outrages committed, not by the acts of President Juarez, but by the promoters of a Mexican empire—by Marquez and Miramon and their accomplices—but declined, thanks to the honesty and prudence of our Minister accredited to President Juarez, and to the commander of our naval forces, supported by the Spanish General (Prim) to break [after the fashion of the French General at Rome, in 1849] the convention of Soledad, and to convert a limited and defined expedition into an illegitimate, immoderate and ruinous adventure, begun in perfidy, and fated to disaster. Let the official rhetoricians in the Corps Legislatif, if by any means they can, pretend to disguise, if they can, the full and absolute responsibility of their master for that enormous conspiracy of factious priests, palace jobbers, imperial agents and adventurers, and Mexican outlaws, against the independence of the United States, under cover of a crusade against the anarchy of Mexico.

Hundreds of innocent French families have paid the penalty of that magnificent romance in the blood of their children and in "bonds" not worth the paper they were printed on. The claims of French creditors. The Mexican empire has cost France forty millions sterling; and, according to the *Montevideo*, the last state of Mexico is worse than the first. The French army not only did not extinguish civil war in Mexico; it exacerbated and inflamed every domestic faction in that distracted country; it brought civil war and left civil war behind. Is that we take leave to ask, the part of independent English journals to absolve the real authors of this immense calamity, because Maximilian referred his honor to his safety, and declined to take shelter with his deceivers and betrayers? The true history of all these transactions remains to be written, and we believe the materials for writing it are in sure hands, and will be submitted in due time to the judgment of the civilized world.—That "black spot" in the splendid piece of imperial success, which even M. Rouher confesses, will not be wiped out.

THE PRISONERS PHOTOGRAPHED.

[From July 9] correspondence of London Star.]

By a steamer arrived at Southampton on the 24, a photograph has reached Paris, which was executed at New Orleans, of a drawing taken in the prison of Queretaro, representing the Emperor, Miramon, Mejia and the Prince of Selmsalm, in the convent of Las Capuchinas. The Emperor, in plain clothes, is writing at a table, whilst the Prince, in a braided palise and Russian boots, stands next to him.

MIRAMON LIES ON THE ONLY MAT IN THE ROOM.

Mejia in uniform, is wearing a naval cap, is smoking. Through an open door two Mexican officers are to be seen, who watch the prisoners day and night.

LETTER FROM THE EMPEROR.

It is stated on good authority, says the *Pal Mail Gazette*, that the letter of condolence on the death of the Emperor Maximilian addressed by the Emperor Napoleon to the Emperor of Austria, was to the following effect: "I send you the expression of my condolence on the dreadful news of the death of the Emperor Maximilian. My grief is the more lively because I feel the responsibility of the painful part I have had in this misfortune. But God, who penetrates our hearts, knows that I never had any

other object than to extend to those distant places the influence of our civilization. In doing this I have found no nobler or more worthy intercourse than your Majesty's unfortunate brother."

IMPERIAL DECREE TO THE AUSTRIAN NAVY.
[From the Gazette de Vienna, July 4.]
We have received for publication the following decree:

As a mark of gratitude and respect for the eminent services rendered by our august brother, His late Majesty the Emperor of Mexico, in aiding the development of the Austrian navy, whose superiority has been established by the achievements of many brilliant results, I hereby decree that the Austrian navy celebrate aboard its vessels a solemn mass for the dead, accompanied by the usual mourning salutes, and that for seven weeks the flag at the topmast be shrouded with crapes.

FOREIGN CHASTISEMENT UNCALLED FOR IN MEXICO.

[From the Journal des Debats, July 6.]

A telegram from Vienna announces that Admiral Tegethoff has been instructed to proceed to Mexico to recover the remains of the Emperor Maximilian, and rumor adds that an Austrian squadron will accompany the Admiral. The latter intelligence appears to us wholly inadmissible. No squadron is wanted to bring back a coffin. The mission of the conqueror of Lissa with a strong force into Mexican waters would seem to announce the intention of chastising Juarez and his partisans. We most heartily wish that means could be found to capture the bands which seized and put to death the brother of Francis Joseph; but is this the thing possible?

A COLD IN THE HEAD.—A Dr. Painon, of St. Foy, France, has discovered a new method of curing the malady of New England, cold in the head. Herewith is the prescription:

"It consists in inhaling through the nose the emanations of ammonia contained in a smelling bottle. If the sense of smell is completely obliterated, the bottle should be kept under the nose until the pungency of the volatile alkali is felt. The bottle is then removed, but only to be re-applied in a minute; the second application, however, should not be so long, that the patient may bear it. This easy operation being repeated seven or eight times in the course of five minutes, but always very rapidly, except the first time, the nostrils become free, the sense of smell is restored, and the secretion of the irritating mucus is stopped. This remedy is said to be peculiarly advantageous to singers."

BEAUTIFUL ANSWERS.—A pupil of the Abbe Sicord gave the following extraordinary answers:

"What is gratitude?"
"Gratitude is the memory of the heart."
"What is hope?"
"Hope is the blossom of happiness."
"What is the difference between hope and desire?"
"Desire is a tree in leaf, hope is a tree in flower, and enjoyment is a tree in fruit."
"What is eternity?"
"A day without a yesterday or to-morrow—a line that has no end."
"What is God?"
"The necessary being, the sun of eternity, the machinist of nature, the eye of justice, the watchmaker of the universe, the soul of the world."

SIGNIFICANT REPLY OF MAXIMILIAN.

—The following question was put to Maximilian during the trial:

"Are you willing to admit that you are responsible for all the strife that occurred in Mexico since the evacuation of the country by the French?"

"No," he answered. "Juarez is responsible for it all. After the departure of the French I sent a message to Juarez and proposed to him to proclaim a general amnesty, and to grant a full pardon to all who had been identified with me and the Imperial cause. Juarez refused this, and I had no course left but to remain and to do all in my power to protect a large proportion of the Mexican people."

"Did you take the note, and did you see Mr. Thompson, Jack?"

"Yes, sir."

"And how was he?"

"Why, he looked pretty well, but he's very blind."

"Blind! What do you mean?"

"Why, while I war in the room, he axed me where my hat war, and I'm blessed if it war not on my head all the while."

A REMEDY FOR INSECTS.—An experienced gardener says a decoction of the leaves of common chamomile is very disagreeable to all, and destroy several species of insects. Nothing contributes so much to the health of a garden as a number of chamomile plants dispersed through it. It is a singular fact that if a plant is drooping and apparently dying, in nine cases out of ten it will recover if you plant chamomile near it.

—Reports received from Rome represent the Papal Government much alarmed by the menacing attitude of the party of action under the leadership of Garibaldi. Many batteries around Rome are being restored and put into effective condition, and it is stated the Pope has made an appeal to the Emperor of the French for the protection of the Holy See.

—Almond About says "there are two things in this world which a man does not often find away from home; the first is good soup; the second is disinterested love."

—A lady about to marry was warned that her intended, although a good man, was very eccentric. "Well," she said, "if he is very unlike other men, he is more likely to make a good husband."

A HOPELESS STRUGGLE.

When Mr. James Brooks says that if he were President of the United States he would not allow Congress to impose upon him a law utterly subversive of the Constitution of the United States, what does he mean? Does he mean merely that if Congress passed a law over his veto he would refuse to execute it, or that, if he were required to execute a law which he considered unconstitutional, he would resign? If he means the latter, then President James Brooks would do precisely what the country would gladly see done by President Andrew Johnson. Everybody would be satisfied. But if he means the former, then he declares that he would, if possible, try to subvert the Government. In that case one of two things would happen.—Civil war or impeachment. The President would certainly be removed, or he must be able to remove Congress.

Mr. Brooks seems not to know that the will of the President is not the Government of this country. When laws are passed by Congress which he considers unconstitutional, he may object by his veto. When those laws are passed again over his veto, he must execute them or resign. And why not? Why are not two-thirds of Congress as likely to be right upon a question of constitutionality as the President? Mr. Brooks declaimed against the Reconstruction Bill as outrageous and infamous. But however bad it may be, could it possibly contain any proposition so monstrous as that the President's pleasure is the law?

The speech of Mr. Brooks and of Mr. Wood in opposition to the House bill revealed once more the melancholy inability of the opposition in Congress and the utter folly of the party which conduct it. They declare that the late rebel States as ever, and that the whole system of reconstruction is an unparalleled military despotism which strikes at the very foundation of the Magna Charta which the barons wrung from King John. Now this position is exactly the one upon which the President planted himself in his famous policy, which is as much a thing of the past as the gunboat projects of Mr. Jefferson. The Democrats do not seem to see that they are engaged in a hopeless struggle upon this point, for they are fighting with the common-sense of the nation.

We are occasionally informed by sane guineo Democrats that the Republican party is at an end, and that nothing is now between the Democracy and triumph. Nothing but the people. The Democratic leaders are constantly saying to the people of this country, "You have fought terribly; you have won a great victory; you are exhausted and want peace; give up all you have been fighting for and you shall live it!" They wish us to regard the war as a mere trial of strength, in which we have succeeded, and every thing remains just as it was. Now, if any thing is clear, it is that the common-sense of the people does not agree that every thing is as it was. They have resolved that the late rebel States shall be reorganized upon the terms which they may prescribe, and not upon such as those States themselves may choose. And this is precisely the point of divergence between the Democratic party and the people.

Until this question is settled there is and can be no other issue. But the policy of Congress being heartily approved by the country, every patriotic man will do what he can to promote it, with a view to the speediest restoration and the peace and prosperity of the Union.—*Harper's Weekly.*

ECONOMY OF MOWING MACHINES.—A gentleman of experience gives us his opinion that a good mowing machine will save a farmer upon an average one-eighth of his crop of grass, aside from the fact that "hay is done, much sooner, and thereby a great saving must be made. He says the average height of grass is about 16 inches, and that a machine mows, upon an average, two inches closer than the scythe, thus saving two inches of grass over the whole surface. If a man cuts forty tons of hay with a mowing machine, he saves five tons of hay, as he would have got but 35 tons with the scythe. Calling hay worth, upon the average, \$8 per ton, there is a saving of \$40 a year in hay, to say nothing of labor."

SALT FOR THE POTATO CROP.—I planted a few potatoes last spring, for an experiment. I soaked saw-dust in strong brine and put as much in each hill as I could hold in one hand. In a few hills with the soaked sawdust I put on one-half a teaspoonful of salt. I wished to find out if it would kill the potatoes. Where the sawdust was, without the addition of the salt, the potatoes grew very rank, the vines spread out on the ground, as there was not strength to hold them up; but when straightened up, some were nearly as high as my head. The potatoes were very large. I took but a few hills for a bushel. Where the salt was added they were not as large in tops or bottoms. It was evident that there was too much salt.—*N. E. Farmer.*

—It is reported from Topeka, Kansas, that the Osage Indians have taken the war path. Governor Crawford, of Kansas, has written a letter to Senator Ross on Indian affairs, in which he says 5,000 men have been killed the past year. He also says that no promises of peace are to be relied on, and strongly appeals to Congress for aid.

—A servant girl employed in the family of Henry Swaye, in Brooklyn, was burned to death by the ignition of a can of kerosene oil which she was injudiciously pouring upon a fire on Sunday. A gentleman and a lady who attempted to rescue the girl when they saw her in flames were severely burned about the face and hands.