M'KEAN COUNTY DEMOCRAT.

VOL. 4. SMETHPORT, M'KEAN COUNTY, PA., SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1862. NO. 9.

M'Kean County Democrat,
PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING,
By J. B. OVIATT,
SMETHPORT, M'KEAN COUNTY, PA.

OFFICE, S. E. CORNER OF PUBLIC SQUARE.

TERMS: - - - - $1 50 in Advance.

Rates of Advertising.

Column one year	$35 00
½ " "	20 00
¼ " "	12 00
1 " six months	20 00
¼ " "	12 00
One square of 12 lines or less, 3 insertions	1 50
Each subsequent insertion	25
Business Cards, with paper	5 00

Rule or figure work will be double the above rates. Twelve lines Brevier type, or eight lines nonpareil, is rated a square.

☞ These Terms will be strictly adhered to. ☜

Business Directory.

HYDE HOUSE,

A. J. Osgood Proprietor. Ridgway, Pa. This Hotel is new and furnished in modern style, has ample accommodations, and is, in all respects, a First Class Hotel.
Ridgway, Elk Co. Pa. May 24, 1860

ELDRED HOTEL,

John Weir, Proprietor. This house is situated half way between Smethport and Olean. A convenient an commodious house, attentive and obliging attendants, and low prices.
Eldred, May 17, 1860.

A. D. HAMLIN,

Surveyor, Draftsman Conveyancer, and Real Estate Agent. Smethport, M'Kean county, Pa.

WILLIAM WILKIN,

Practical Mechanic, Millwright, Bridge-builder, &c., Port Allegheny, M'Kean county, Pa.

J. L. BROWN,

SURVEYOR, DRAFTSMAN, CONVEYANCER and Real Estate Agent; Office, Williamsville, Elk Co., Penn'a.
—REFERENCES—
Chapin & Boyle, Esq'rs., ... Ridgway, Pa.
Hon Thomas Struthers, ... Warren. Pa.
W. S. Brownell, Esq., ... Smethport, Pa.
Hon. A. I. Wilcox, ... Buena Vista. Pa.

OSWAYO HOUSE,

E. J. Barnes Proprietor. Ceres Pa. This House is fitted up in a substantial and comfortable style, and every attention will be paid by the proprietor to the comfort and taste of his guests. June 3, 1861

FOBES HOUSE,

Fronting the Public Square, Olean, N. Y. James M. Miller Proprietor. The Fobes House is entirely new and built of brick, and is furnished in modern style. The proprietor flatters himself that his accommodations are not surpassed by any hotel in Western New York. Carriages run to and from the New York and Erie Rail Road. 38-tf.

BYRON D. HAMLIN,

Attorney at Law, Smethport, M'Kean County, Pa., Agent for Messrs. Keating & Co's Lands Attends especially to the Collection of Claims; Examination of Land Titles; Payment of Taxes, and all business relating to Real Estate. Office in Hamlin Block.

E. BOUGHTON ELDRED,

Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Smethport, M'Kean County, Pa. Business entrusted to his care for the counties of M'Kean, Potter and Elk will be promptly attended to. Office in the Court House, second floor.

DR. L. R. WISNER,

Physician and Surgeon, Smethport, Pa, will attend to all professional calls with promptness. Office in Sartwell Block, second floor.

THING & MILLER,

Wholesale and Retail Dealers in Staple and Fancy Dry Goods, Carpeting, Ready Made Clothing, and General Furnishing Goods, Boots and Shoes, Wall and Window Paper, Looking Glasses &c. At Olean, N. Y.

JOHN C. BACKUS,

Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Smethport, M'Kean Co. Pa., Will attend to all business in his profession in the counties of M'Kean, Potter and Elk. Office over C. K. Sartwell & Brothers' Store.

HACKNEY HOUSE,

Corner of Second and Liberty streets, Warren, Pa. R. A. Barnes, Proprietor. Travelers will find good accommodations and reasonable charges.

LARABEE'S HOTEL,

R. Larabee, Proprietor,—Allegheny Bridge, M'Kean Co, Pa. This house is situated about nine miles from Smethport on the road to Olean, and will be found a convenient stopping-place.

FARMERS' VALLEY HOTEL,

By T. Goodwin. This house is situated about five mile from Smethport on the road to Olean. Pleasure parti and others can be accommodated on the shortest notic

W. S. BROWNELL,

Dealer in Dry Goods, Groceries, Crockery, Hardware, Boots, Shoes, Hats, Caps, Glass, Nails, Oils, &c., &c. East side of the Public Square, Smethport, Pa.

EMPORIUM HOUSE,

Shippen, M'Kean Co., Pa. N. L. DYKE, Proprietor A commodious and well-furnished house. Strangers and travelers will find good accommodations.

PORT ALLEGANY HOUSE,

Enoch B. Dolley, Proprietor, at Port Allegany, McKean County Pa. This Hotel is situated at the junction of the Smethport and Allegany River roads, nine miles east of Smethport.

To Those Interested in Mining and Mineral Lands:

W. H. BARNES offers his services for the examination of Mineral Lands in M'Kean and Elk counties, and will give his opinion as to the VALUE OF MINES, &c. Those engaging his services will receive all necessary and reliable information. Residence at the Bunker Hill Mines.
Sergeant, M'Kean Co., June 30, 1859.

S. C. HYDE,

Attorney-at-Law, Smethport, M'Kean co., Pa. Collections promptly attended to. Feb 14, '

BENNETT HOUSE,

Smethport, M'Kean Co., Pa. R. S. Mason, Proprietor —opposite the Court House. A new, large, commodious and well-furnished house.

GEO. H. MASON,

Dealer in Stoves, Tin Ware, Japanned Ware, &c., west side of the Public Square, Smethport, Pa. Custom work done to order on the shortest notice, and in the most substantial manner.

DENTISTRY.

Dr. M. A. Sprague would respectfully announce to the citizens of Smethport and vicinity, that he has fitted up an office, and is prepared to attend to all business in his profession. Artificial teeth inserted upon scientific principles, and so as to preserve the natural expression of the face. All operations in Dental Surgery done in a skillful manner. 10t

A. J. MOURSE.

Dealer in Stoves, Tin Ware, Japanned Ware, &c., west end of the Public Square, Smethport, Pa. Custom work done to order on the shortest notice, and in the most substantial manner.

B. F. HACKETT.

Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Shippen, Pa.; will attend the Courts of Potter, McKean, and Elk counties. Prompt attention paid to Collections. Office, East end Fall Block—Second Floor.

W. H. BAKER

Dwelling, East Side of the Public Square, Second Door North of the Democrat Office Smethport, Pa. Dealer in Watches Clocks and Jewellery. Repairing neately Executed and Warranted.

DR. W. Y. M'COY,
SOUTH-EAST CORNER MAIN STREET,
Smethport, Pa.

THE CONTSETED SEAT.

THE REPORTS.

The following is the Report of the majority—eight Republicans—in the matter of the contested seat between Henry J. Myers and John Busbey. This Report, according to a rule of the Legislature, has decided the case:

MAJORITY REPORT.

After a laborious and patient examination by the Committee, of a great mass of testimony, in depositions and documents, and every opportunity being given to the respective parties fully to develop their case, the Committee determined as follows, viz:—that two votes were rejected by the election officers in said county, which should have been counted for the Contestant, and which would make the number of votes for him to be 2655; that there were received and counted for the Contestant by the election officers, ten votes which were illegally received and counted—which being rejected would make the true number of votes that should have been returned and counted for him 2645; that there was rejected by the election officers of said county one vote which should have been counted for the Respondent, (John Busbey) which would make the number of votes for him 2656; that there were received and counted for the Respondent two votes which were illegally received and counted, and which being deducted from his vote, would make the true number of votes which should have been returned and counted for the Respondent, a majority of nine votes over the Contestant. A majority of the Committee, therefore, report, that the said John Busbey had the greatest number of legal votes, and ought to be admitted to his seat as a member of the House of Representatives of this Commonwealth.

Signed

J. A. Happer,	Wm. Wendle,
P. Frazer Smith,	Wm. Henry,
W. V. Aall,	Wm. Hutchman,
R. G. McClellan,	E. M. Schrock.

The following is the report of Dr. Early, the only Democrat on the Committee:

MINORITY REPORT.

To Hon John Rowe, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania.

The undersigned, a member of the Committee to which was referred the contested election case of Myers vs. Busbey, begs leave to submit the reason which influenced his refusal to sign the Report adopted and presented by a majority of said Committee.

Mr. Busbey claimed to have received 2655 votes, and that Mr. Myres had received 2653 votes, and that he was entitled to his seat by a majority of 2 votes.

It appeared in evidence before us, and to the satisfaction of the whole Committee, that two votes were illegally cast and counted for the said John Busbey, to wit, in Capt. Pfeiffer's Company, voted by two minors, Adolphus Ruther and Thomas J. McLain. It was also established, to the satisfaction of the whole Committee, that 2 votes were rejected for the said Henry J. Myres by the officers of the election, which should have been counted for said Myres, to wit, a vote polled in Huntington township, having the name of John Busbey erased and the name of *H. J. Myres* written instead thereof, and rejected because it was not *Henry J. Myres*; and a vote polled in Oxford township, which was rejected from the count by the election officers, because along with the other Democratic candidates for the several offices, upon the same slip, was included that of "President Judge, Robert J. Fisher"—which, deducted from votes for Busbey above described, would have changed the result, and given the said Henry J. Myres a majority of 2 votes over John Busbey, the sitting member.

A majority of the Committee, however, agreed to count 2 *ballots*, found in the box of the 18th district, composed of the township of Butler, each of which contained the name of John Busbey, which, from the testimony, in the opinion of the undersigned, were so deceitfully folded together as to be in direct violation of the 73d section of the Act of 2d July 1839, which directs that such tickets shall be rejected and not counted among the votes.

The Committee refused to reject a vote cast for John Busbey in the 18th eistrich, composed of the township of Butler, by George Shultz, who, according to the testimony of his own father and that of himself, was over the age of 22 years when he voted, had never paid a State or county tax, and at the preceding election had voted on age.

The Committee also refused to deduct a vote cast by Lewis Berkley for John Busbey, in the 4th district, (Huntington township,) whereas it clearly appeared from the testimony of said Lewis Berkley, as from that of others, that he never had been naturalized, and, if anything, had done no more than to declare his intention to become a citizen. And it further appears from the testimony of said Burkley, that that was his first vote in said township—that he had resided in the township a little over a year—that his vote was objected to because he was not a naturalized citizen—that he produced no naturalization papers, although the same were demanded at the polls,—thus voting in direct violation of the provisions of the Act of 2d July, 1839.

The undersigned concurs with the majority of the Committee in the rejection of the votes of Sylvester Rider and Franklin Kuhn, who, according to the testimony, voted for Henry J. Myres—were above the age of 22, and never had paid a State or county tax. It is alleged by Respondent that a ticket polled in the boro' of Gettysburg, having his name on it as a candidate for Assembly, and that of Robert J. Fisher for President Judge, was rejected from the count by the officers of the election. This specification was not sustained. It was proved that a ticket having the name of John Busbey for Assembly, and *Thomas E. Cochran* for President Judge upon it, was rejected.

Inasmuch as the Contestent was rigidly confined to the specifications in his petition, so also should the Respondent to have been confined to the specifications in his answer—and yet, the majority of the Committee included this vote among those counted for John Busbey—notwithstanding the variance between the specification and the proof. The undersigned will not raise a technical objection in this case—but, believing that the vote was improperly rejected by the officers of the election, concurs with the majority in allowing it to Mr. Busbey.

It was further arleged on the part of the Respondent that a certain Charles Dorsey was an illegal voter, and that he had voted for Henry J. Myres. From the testimony, it clearly appears that he had no right to vote—but it also just as clearly appears that instead of voting for Henry J. Myres, the said Dorsey voted for John Busbey. Therefore said vote should have been deducted from the count of John Busbey—and not as was done by the Committee, subtracted from the count of Henry J. Myres.

Respondent's answer further represents, that one John Gilliland was not a resident of Adams county, but a citizen of the State of Texas, and that he voted for Henry J. Myres. Whereas it clearly appears from the testimony, that said Gilliland had been a citizen of Pennsylvania prior to his removal to Texas—that he returned to Pennsylvania, and at the time he voted for Henry J. Myres, had been in the State of Pennsylvania over six months, with no intention of leaving the State—that he had been assessed and owned a farm in said county—and paid a State and county tax. Having thus regained his citizenship, and being otherwise properly quallified, his vote, in the opinion of the undersigned, should not have been rejected by the Committee, as it was, but counted for Henry J. Myres.

It is further alleged by Respondent, that Geo. Beighley, Nathaniel Nairy and Samuel Linn were persons of unsound mind and *crazy*, and that they voted for Henry J. Myres. The deposition of a physician was produced before the Committee, to show that the persons named were not entirely sane, and that he considered them of unsound mind—but this physician gave no professional or good reason for entertaining such belief. On the other hand, it was proven by those in constant intercourse with them, that they were trusted to go from place to place—to execute commissions—that two of them were aged, and for that reason physically infirm—that their votes were received by the election officers without objection—and that they had the good sense to ask for the Democratic ticket,—and yet these three votes were deducted from those enumerated for Henry J. Myres. The undersigned has yet to learn of the existence of any law which would warrant or authorise the distranchisement of any such voters. In the opinion of the undersigned, the evidence upon which these votes were rejected was not sufficient to warrant any inquisition in finding that the persons named are lunatics—much less to deprive them of the right to vote. The law erects no such standard as disqualification. Such evidence would annually interfere with the organization of this House.

The majority of the Committee also erroneously rejected, in the opinion of the undersigned, from the votes for Henry J. Myres, the vote of Henry Snyder, who voted at the polls for the District of Oxford township, on the ground that he was a non-resident. The evidence shows that he was seperated from his wife—that she lived in Hanover borough, York county—that he lived in Oxford township, Adams county, where he had been regularly assessed—the District in which he voted and his legal residence.

It was further alleged, in the answer of Respondent, that Emanuel Zeigler, of E., had not paid taxes. However that may be, the evidence does not show for whom he voted, and therefore the undersigned cannot agree with the Committee, who have deducted that vote from the count of Mr. Myres.

In the case of Solomon Powers, to whom it was objected that he had not paid taxes, it is clear from the testimony of Henry Culp, the collector, who produced a memorandum showing that Powers had paid the required tax—and yet said vote was thrown out and deducted from the count of Mr. Myres on the ground that the memorandum was *in pencil*, although identified and sworn to by the Collector himself.

It was further contended in the answer of Respondent, John Busbey, that the votes polled by citizens of Adams county, in the Company of Capt. Chritzman, who had volunteered in support of the Government, were illegal.—With the majority of the Committee, the undersigned concurred in giving no heed to this objection but argued that all the votes of that company should be included in the return, as they were cast for candidates respectively.

The undersigned, in view of the foregoing facts, is brought irresistibly to the conclusion that the Report of the majority is erroneous, and that Henry J. Myres was legally elected to a seat in this House by a majority of the qualified electors of Adams county: and to present the result clearly, he makes the following recapitulation, retaining, for the reasons fully hereinfore set forth, in the count or return for Henry J. Myres, the votes polled for him by John Gilliland, Geo. Beighley, Nathaniel Nairy Samuel Linn, Henry Snyder, Solomon Powers, and without passing upon that of Emanuel Zeigler, of E., as neither the majority nor the undersigned had any knowledge for whom he voted.

By the returns, John Busbey had		2655, vote.
Add vote rejected in Gettisburg because the name of John Busbey was on the same general ticket with President Judge,	1	
	2656	
From these deduct		
Votes of Adolphus Rather and and Thos. J. McLain, minors in Capt. Pfeiffer's Company,	2	
Ticket deceitfully folded together in Butler township,	2	
Vote of Geo. Shultz in Butler township,	1	
Vote of Charles Dorsey,	1	
" of Lewis Berkley, an unnaturalized citizen,	1	
	— 7	
Which would leave Mr. Busbey		2649 votes.
Henry J. Myres, by the return had		2653 votes.
Add vote in Huntington township, rejected by the officers of election because the initials only of Mr. Myres, christian name were used,	1	
Vote in Oxford township, rejected by the officers of election because upon the same general ticket was the candidate for President Judge,	1	
	— 2	
	2655 votes.	
But deduct from this the vote of Sylvester Rider and that of Franklin Kuhn,	2	
	2653 votes.	

And it is plain that Henry J. Myres was elected by a majority of 4 votes, there being 2653 legal votes polled for him, and but 2649 for his competitor, Mr. Busbey.

The undersigned has been particular in setting forth the facts which have moved him to his conclusion. In this he has given his reasons for the faith that is in him, and has not followed the course adopted by the majority, in not presenting in detail the votes rejected or allowed.

C. R. EARLY.

The King is Dead. Long Live the King!

We had hoped that the idea of Mr. Sumner, and the abandoned plan of the Cooper Institute meeting would not again be revived or become the necessary subject of discussion. No one has forgotten the emphatic stamp of "aiders and abettors of treason" which Mr. Blair gave to its organization, and it seems too plain to require argument that no one can hold to the doctrine that the States are dead by secession, except by holding to the legal validity of the acts of secession. But the Tribune revives the discussion, printing long extracts from a speech of Hon. Mr. Bingham of Ohio, and concludes by asking a statement of the doctrine of those who oppose Mr. Bingham's views.

Mr. Bingham's whole argument is in a nutshell. He says that, by the Constitution of the United States,

"The Legislature of every State in the Union, and all the judicial and executive officers thereof, must be bound by oath or affirmation to support this constitution. Without this obligation taken and accepted, they cannot in law exist as the officers of the departments of a State Government in the Union. There can be no State *in the Union* without these several departments;"

And he argues that, inasmuch as no Southern governors or legislators have taken the oath, therefore the States have ceased to exist.

This is no law, nor is it good sense. A State does not exist by virtue of its departments or officers. It only manifests existence by these.

If Mr. Bingham held Tennesse bonds he would probably appreciate how it is that a State is not dead though every man in her boundaries be a traitor. For the doctrine which he teaches justifies not only secession, but repudiation by future governments in Tennessee, on the principle that the old State is dead and gone forever! How would Mr. Bingham charge on a new government the debts of a dead and buried State? The Tribune after quoting Bingham at some length says:—

"—If those who denounce this view so fiercely would only favor us with as clear a statement of their own doctrine carried out to its legitimate result, we would receive it gratefully; but either their position is not thus clearly defined or we are unable fully to comprehend it. To our view, if Tennessee is to day a State of the Union, then Isham G. Harris is her rightful, constitutional Governor, and ought to be respected as such, while Andrew Johnson, should surrender all pretensions to the character and go about his business, if business he have. We recognize Mr Johnson as her Governor substantially on Mr Bingham's platform; take away that, and we should not know how to justify his claim to the station. But our object is not to dogmatize, but to set forth fairly and fully what is stigmatized as the 'radical' view of this grave subject. Let it be canvassed from every point of view until the whole truth shall be made plain."

The challenge is offered apparently with sincerity, and though others can better defend the great principles which underlie our national structure, we propose to do it in our own way. We believe that argument may remove from some minds doubts on this subject, and may give to others a clear and definite idea of the rights and powers of the States and the United States. It is a pure legal question, not a political, or a moral question. The inquiry is, what is the law, not what do we wish to make law.

Let us take a Nothern loyal State as the example, where our minds will be free from all prejudicial influences. New York is one of the thirteen original States. She may serve our purpose. Her sovereignty is indisputable.—She is the original owner of every inch of soil within her limits. The right of eminent domain makes the State the absolute original owner of the soil, and she takes that which escheats to her by reason of an alien purchase, or the death of a citizen owner leaving no American heirs.

Now this State is an existing body, a power, we may perhaps say a person. It matters not whether there is a Governor or a Legislature or any other official. The State does not exist by its officer. Sweep every one of them by a pestilence, and the State remains. That is the end of Mr. Bingham's argument. He would make the United States heir to the property of a deceased State, and declare it dead because its executive officers were dead. He might as well have done the same thing when they all went from New York once on an excursion to Sandy Hook in New Jersey, Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Legislature and all. If Mr. Bingham's theory were correct the State was then defunct, and United States might have stepped in to administer on its effects! This is no joking. The argument is clear, and the conclusion is irresistible.

But what is the "clear statement of our doctrine carried out to its legitimate results," which the Tribune asks. It is this expressed in the old and well known phrase "*Le Roi est mort! Vive Le Roi!*" "The King is dead, long live the King!" For the King never dies. The Royalty is never for one instant dead.—Treason cannot slay it, it cannot abdicate, it cannot lay down or be deprived of its crown, until by conquest, or by merging into another nation, the people of one nation cease to have a separate existence. This simple and sound proposition of law, well known to every student of the subject, underlies this whole question which is now before us. The State of New York is the successor to the Royalty of England. The same principle, that the King never dies, is true of the State. The State never dies. At a given hour, all her officials, all her representative or executive officers cease to be in power, and become as other citizens. Then a herald might cry on the Capitol "The State is dead," but he would add with the same breath "Long live the State;" for the suspension of the visible life is no suspension of the existence which in law is immortal.

Nor, if a State does or could die, is there any law by which the United States would inherit its powers or property. It is to be borne in mind, that in America the State sovereignty is the original sovereignty, and no State has ever parted with its royalty. The thirteen States granted certain powers to the United States, but reserved all not expressly conveyed; and there is no possible way in which the United States could become possessed of the State Capitol and grounds at Albany, or the Erie canal, so as to be able to make a valid deed of grant and give title to it, except by conquest, or by grant from New York. It thus becomes plain that the United States will not succeed as heir to New York, in the event of cessation of our State existence. It is not necessary to say who would be the heir.—Enough that the United States would not, unless she seized on the inheritance by force.

Now suppose that New York should call a convention and pass a secession ordinance, and the members of the convention should go home in peace, and every thing go on as before. Is it not plain that New York remains New York? The act of the convention is a nullity. It is void of itself. It does not destroy New York. It does not terminate her existence. It is mere waste paper. If Governor Morgan were to preside in such a convention, he would not cease to be governor. To go a little further, if a convention of the State of New York were called to make a new constitution, and should adopt a constitution, one clause of which declared the State no longer one of the United States, the act of the convention would not be a nullity, except just so far as it contravened the constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law. In other words, those portions of the new constitution which could be sustained without infringing on the United States Constitution would be law, and those which did so infringe, would be void. The State might thus cripple its own powers and embarrass its own movements, and the people would then be driven to exercise their functions in a new convention. But the State remains alive, though every word of the new constitution were treason to the United States, and if it were so, then every word would be a nullity, and the old Constitution would remain law.

These principles are well known to lawyers, they should be as well known to all citizens.

We now go a step further, and suppose that the citizens of New York should make war on the United States and attempt to establish secession as a physical fact. Here we come to the distinction between State action and individual action. The State action being judged by law, is declared a nullity. The individual action, judged by law is a crime. The method of punishing royalty, is conquest and subjugation. This the United States will never do to a State for reasons we will not pause to enumerate. The decrees of Courts as to the illegal acts of royalty, are that they are void.—The methods of punishing individuals are different, and are dependent on the statutes of the land. Now let us suppose Governor Morgan in arms with the State against the United States. He would thereby become a criminal against the law and liable as an individual to punishment, but he does not cease to be Governor of New York until he is impeached and removed, or until he is driven from the State, or until by some provision of the State Law, he is deposed or incapaciated for holding office. For example, at any period of the war of rebellion, he might pardon a prisoner in State Prison, and his pardon would be valid and could be pleaded as good in any court. Why? Because he is Governor. All his acts as Governor are valid, except such as are by authority of laws which contravene the United States Constitution.—Even some of those may be valid to a certain extent, but we will not pause to show what and why. In short, any act done by a rebellious State, which is not unconstitutional, is the valid act of the State, and binds the State. It is certainly unnecessary for us to go into the familiar principle of law that an acting Governor *locum tenens* is the lawful Governor, though forms and oaths have been neglected.

Now we come to the knotty point about Tennessee. If what we have said is true, it becomes manifest that Harris was Governor of Tennessee, strange as the Tribune may suppose it, until he left the State, or abandoned the office. We observe that senator Johnson goes on the theory that Harris has abdicated the office of Governor, and that the office is vacant. No one here knows the facts on which he bases his theory; and for the sake of pursuing the line of argument, we will suppose it is a mistake, and that Harris has not formally or actually abandoned his office. Andrew Johnson has been sent to Tennessee by the President to act as "Military Governor." Possibly the President proposes to regard him as a civil Governor, but as he remains Senator, we apprehend that he is only a nominal "Military Governor." In his proclamation he does not profess to assume the office of State Governor. We took the liberty of suggesting a doubt about this title of Military Governor the other day, and we venture the repetition of it. We do not know any such officer in American law or soldiery. It is, we suppose, a special mission, devised by the President to put in operation the principles we are now stating; and although we have no right to interpret the President's views, and may wholly mistake his theory, we will venture a theory of our own to reconcile what seems to the Tribune an apparent inconsistency between the authority of Governor Johnson and that of Harris, and also to explain the President's possible design in the appointment of an officer on such a special mission to Tennesse.

To do this we must go into the subject of the relation of the States to the United States. If part of the citizens of New York should call a convention, and make a new State Constitution in which another part of the citizens had no part, and thus two Constitutions and two State Governors and Legislatures should come into existence, who is to decide between them as to legitimacy? An appeal to the Courts of the State or of the United States would give the legal decision, but pending such a legal reference, it is plain that the United States authorities alone have power to decide. Royalty is established by recognition. International law controls it. A kink is a king, a nation exists as such, because recognized as such by other nations. A State, in this country, is prohibited by the Constitution from making foreign treaties, or having foreign relations. It must look alone to the United States for recognition. It is a State because the United States so regards it. Now, without discussing what would be the decision of the Courts between a loyal State government and a disloyal, between a Constitution which professed allegiance to the United States and authorities acting under it, and a Constitution casting off allegiance, and authorities acting under that, we may safely affirm that it would be proper for the United States to recognize the loyal authorities and