The Daily Ohio Statesman.

VOL. IX. NEW SERIES. COLUMBUS, OHIO, SUNDAY MORNING, MARCH 22, 1863. NO. 241.

The Ohio Statesman

DAILY, TRI-WEEKLY AND WEEKLY

MANYPENNY & MILLER,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS.

Office Nos. 36, 38 and 40, North High St

TERMS INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

Daily	$6 00 per year
By the Carrier, per week, 12½ cents.	
Tri-Weekly	3 00 per year.
Weekly, single copy,	1 75 "
Clubs of five copies,	7 50 "
" ten copies,	14 00 "
twenty copies,	27 00 "

Terms of Advertising by the Square.

One square 1 year	$20 00	One square 3 weeks	$4 00
One " 9 months	18 00	One " 2 weeks	3 00
One " 6 months	15 00	One " 1 week	1 75
One " 3 months	10 00	One " 3 days	1 00
One " 2 months	8 00	One " 2 days	75
One " 1 month	5 00	One " 1 insertion	50

Displayed advertisements half more than the above rates.

Advertisements headed and placed in the column of "Special Notices," *double the ordinary rates.*

All notices required to be published by law, legal rates

If ordered on the inside exclusively after the first week per cent, more than the above rates; but all such will appear in the Tri-Weekly without charge.

Business Cards, not exceeding five lines, per year, in side, $2 50 per line; outside $3.

Notices of meetings, charitables ocieties, fire companies &c., half price.

All transient advertisements must be paid for in advance The rule will not be varied from.

Weekly, same price as the Daily, where the advertiser see the Weekly alone. Where the Daily and Weekly re both used, then the charge for the Weekly will be all the rates of the Daily

No advertisement taken except for a definite period.

BROOKS, STEARNS & CO.,

WHOLESALE & RETAIL DEALERS IN

Fine & Staple Groceries,

Foreign and Domestic Fruits,

CHOICE FAMILY FLOUR,

Pure Wines and Liquors

FOR MEDICINAL PURPOSES.

Country Produce taken in exchange for Goods.

NO. 273 SOUTH HIGH STREET,

Columbus, Ohio.

All goods delivered free of charge to any part of the City.

DAVID W BROOKS,
JOHN STEARNS,
N. MERION.
dec7-tf

Cincinnati Law and Collection Office.

ESTABLISHED A. D. 1840.

THOMAS POWELL,

Attorney at Law,

AND

COLLECTION OFFICE,

NO. 9 MASONIC TEMPLE,

CINCINNATI.

Remittances in all cases made immediately on the collection of any claim.

The following references are given by permission of the parties, with whom Mr. Powell has for many years been acquainted

Nicholas Longworth, Esq.
Samuel N. Pike, Esq.
Joseph G. Butler, Esq.
W. S. Smith & Co.
Baker & Von Phul.
Tyler, Davidson & Co.
Hon. W. B. Caldwell, Ex-Chief Justice, State of Ohio.
D. W. Corwin, late King, Corwin & Co.
Clark, West & Co., 121 and 123 Duane St., N. Y.
Samuel S. Bowman & Co., 17 John St., N. Y.
Wm. H. Powell, Esq., No. 45 East 22d St., N. Y
dec21'62-tf

IT IS A FIXED FACT!

CONSUMPTION

Can be Cured.

SIR JAMES CLARK, Physician to Queen Victoria, and one of the most learned and skillful men of the age, in his Treatise on Consumption, says: "That Pulmonary Consumption admits of a cure, is no longer a matter of doubt; it has been clearly demonstrated by the researches of Laennec and other modern pathologists." Dr Carswell, who investigated such matters as thoroughly as any other man, says:

"Pathological Anatomy has, perhaps never afforded more conclusive evidence in proof of the curability of a disease than it has in that of tubercular phthisis (pulmonary consumption).

IT IS NOT A FICTION.

These statements are made by men who have demonstrated what they say time after time, in the crowded hospital and the truth-telling dissecting room. They are from men who could have no possible motive for publishing what is untrue, or emblazoning falsehoods.

THE REMEDY WHICH WE OFFER,

Dr. Wistar's Balsam of Wild Cherry,

Has cured hundreds of cases of

Consumption of the Lungs, Liver Complaints, Coughs, Bronchitis, Colds, Asthma, Croup, Whooping Cough, Influenza, etc. Many of them after Every Known Remedy had Failed to Reach the Disease.

Do not procrastinate, but make use of Wistar's Balsam, and live healthy and happy.

Sold by JOHN D. PARK, Northeast corner of Fourth and Walnut streets, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dec. 21-dim&wlt.

POWERS'S HOTEL,

(FORMERLY EARLE'S,)

Nos. 17 and 19 Park Row,

Opposite the Astor House and Park, New York.

Price of Board $1.50 per Day.

THIS LONG ESTABLISHED AND popular House has recently been rebuilt and greatly enlarged by the addition of over 100 rooms, and now has accommodations for over 300 persons. It has also been thoroughly ventilated, and is

HEATED BY STEAM

AND

LIGHTED WITH GAS THROUGHOUT.

This Hotel has one of the best locations in the City, is of easy access from all the steamboats and Railroads leading to the City, and is convenient to all the City conveyances. It has now all the conveniences of a

FIRST CLASS HOTEL,

insuring the comfort of its inmates.

The patronage of the traveling public is respectfully solicited.

TERMS.....$1.50 PER DAY.

H. L. POWERS, Proprietor.

nov30'62-dawfromfeb28

JOHN L. GREEN,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

—OFFICE—

No. 1 Odeon Building.

nov29-tf

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM E. FINCK,

OF PERRY COUNTY.

Delivered in the Ohio Senate, February 27th and 28th, upon the War Policy of the Administration.

[Continued.]

We are now in the midst of civil war, armies have been organized against the Government of the United States, so powerful as to call out on our part immense land and navy forces, and in the language of Vattel, "these two parties must, at least for a time, be considered as forming two separate bodies—two distinct people," "and the common laws of war, those maxims of humanity, moderation and probity, which we have before enumerated and recommended are in civil wars to be observed on both sides."

In our arrangements with the Confederates, in regulating the treatment and surrender of prisoners of war, we have, and it was a matter of necessity as well as humanity, recognized them as belligerents. This principle is therefore sustained by writers on the law of nations and is vindicated on considerations of humanity.

I know that in cases of resistance to law by a small portion of the people of any district of country, not so strong and powerful as to create a case of civil war, as known and defined by the writers on the law of nations, the rule to which I have referred does not obtain. But the condition of war in this country, does make just such a case as that stated by Vattel. And I say that on the rules of public law, that there is no legitimate power in this Government, either on the theory of the law of nations, or by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, to punish the people residing in the States in rebellion by inflicting the forfeiture pronounced by the proclamation of emancipation. And why is not this principle of law which we pressed upon European nations until it was recognized, just as binding upon us now, as it was upon them then? But it may be said that Mr. Adams afterward changed his opinion. I admit that many years afterward, in a heated and personal discussion with Tom Marshall and Henry A. Wise, he did drop utterances in conflict with his previous argument. But can the heated discussion on the floor of Congress, weigh against the calm argument of a deliberate State paper prepared by him whilst Secretary of State, when treating upon the great law of nations, upon which his government founded its claim of indemnity? Then I take it for granted that the doctrine laid down and advocated with so much force and ability by Mr. Adams, in the controversy with Great Britain, is the doctrine recognized by the United States, and I think I may say with entire safety, that there is no respectable American statesman who would at this day call it in question.

But can this proclamation be based upon the Constitution as a punishment for the crime of treason against the Government? I claim that it cannot. First, because the Constitution provides for the mode of trial for the crime of treason, and no forfeiture can be pronounced until after the conviction, and that forfeiture can only be for the lifetime of the party convicted. But I put it upon another and perhaps more startling ground. It is this—that after the period when the jurisdiction of the United States was completely ousted in any of the States in rebellion, and the Government of the confederates organized and enforced, the citizens within such of the States could not, during such period, by the laws of nations as applied to societies of men, be guilty of the crime of treason against the United States by adhering to the Government *de facto* thus organized. It is true that this rule would not exempt the men who, as leaders, or as aiders and abetters, assisted in organizing this most terrible and wicked rebellion against the Government of the United States. These men are guilty of the crime of treason. But I say here, as a matter of public law—as the law of nations, and as the dictate of reason and common sense, that the moment the jurisdiction and authority of the United States was completely ousted in these States in rebellion, that moment the allegiance of the citizens residing in such State or States was suspended as to the Government of the United States.—And why? Because no man can be compelled to owe allegiance to separate and adverse Governments at the same time.

Let me ask you, what is the ground on which allegiance to any Government is founded?—Protection. The duties and obligations of the Government and the citizen are reciprocal.—The law writers of all nations say that protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties. Go back to the decisions and history of Great Britain during the period when there were conflicting and contending claimants for the crown, and you will find this principle running through all their relations. The law arises from this fact, that society must have repose. The Government *de facto* has the power for the time being—whether it be rightful or not, is not the question—to impose its obligations and duties on the people within its limits and jurisdiction.

Suppose you, sir, should be residing within the limits of the Confederacy—the rebels have the complete possession of the Government organized by them. Here is a Government *de facto*. They have their armies organized and the power to enforce their laws within certain limited jurisdiction; the tax collector comes and demands of you your taxes, with which to carry on the Government and maintain their armies Can you resist? The conscript agent calls to enroll you in the army. Can you evade his authority? No, sir. By the very force and condition of affairs you would be compelled to pay the tax and perform military duty; and if by the fortunes of war you should be taken a prisoner by the forces of the United States, would any sane man insist that you had been guilty of treason? Most certainly not.

I read the other day a reported speech of that eminent and distinguished lawyer, Mr. Stanberry, delivered at the Opera House in Cincinnati, in which he spoke of "Constitutional Democrats" as if it were a crime to be a constitutional Democrat. He said that such Democrats did not complain, because the Administration did not hang the Confederate prisoners, although the Constitution would require their execution.

Now all I have to say in reference to this, is that it is evident that Mr. Stanberry had not studied the law of nations and the Constitution with the same attention which he has devoted to other branches of the law. I say that these men taken with arms in their hands from the rebel service as prisoners, unless they aided to originate and carry on the rebellion with their own free wills, are not liable to be punished for treason either under our Constitution or by the laws of nations, and I say this from the fact already stated, that it is one of the necessities of society, that there should be a Government, and when the lawful Government is ousted of its jurisdiction, the *de facto* Government is, for the time being, sovereign, and controls those within its jurisdiction. Therefore, the argument and inferences of the learned gentleman were not well founded.

Now, sir, we have cases not only in the Government of Great Britain, but also arising under our own Government, which bring up these points, and settle them.

As early as the time of Henry the VIIth of England, it was declared by Parliament that, "The subjects of England are bound by the duty of their allegiance to serve their Prince and Sovereign, *for the time being*, in defense of him and his realm against every rebellion, power and might raised against him, and that whatsoever may happen against the mind and will of the Prince, as in this land some time past it hath been seen it is not reasonable, but against all laws, reason and good conscience, that such subjects attending upon such service should suffer for doing their duty and service of allegiance." And it was further enacted, that no person attending upon the King, for the time being, in his wars, should for such service be convict or attaint of treason or other offense by act of Parliament or otherwise by any process of law. This statute, which was passed at the conclusion of the wars of the "Roses," relates to those who bore arms in behalf of the King in *possession*, even against him who claimed by right of inheritance.

Sir Michael Foster, speaking of this statute, says: "This putteth the duty of the subject upon a rational and safe bottom. He knoweth that protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties." And the same doctrine is fully laid down by Lord Coke. This principle was, I know, disregarded in the celebrated case of Sir Henry Vane; but that decision was and is still regarded by every lawyer as a palpable perversion of the law, and as most scandalously conducted by the judges who sat in the trial of the case.

But we have an authority on this point in our own country, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of the U. S. vs. Rice.

During the war of 1812 with England, we had in existence an embargo law, which prohibited our people from trading with Great Britain and her colonies.

There was a small port in Maine called Castine. The British forces succeeded in taking possession of this port, and while thus in the military occupation of Great Britain, the American merchants there opened up a trade with Canada and Great Britain, in violation of the embargo laws. After the treaty of peace, some of these merchants were indicted and tried in the Circuit Court of the United States for the violation of these embargo laws; and the case against Rice was taken to the Supreme Court of the U. S. on error. And what was the decision of that high tribunal? Just what I have already stated here to be the law of nations.

Judge Story, delivering the opinion of the Court, held that protection on the part of the Government and allegiance on the part of the citizens were reciprocal duties; that when the jurisdiction and protection of the United States had been ousted by superior force, these merchants came under the jurisdiction of Great Britain; that for the time being they owed no allegiance to the Government of the United States; that they were controlled by such laws as Great Britain chose to impose; that they had a right to trade with that country and Canada, and were not liable to be prosecuted for a breach of the embargo laws. Allow me to read an extract from the opinion of Judge Story. The case is to be found in 4 Wheaton, page 254. The learned Judge, in delivering the opinion of the Court, says:

By the conquest and military occupation of Castine, the enemy acquired that firm possession which enabled him to exercise the fullest rights of sovereignty over that place. The sovereignty of the United States over the territory was of course suspended, and the laws of the United States could no longer be rightfully enforced there or be obligatory upon the inhabitants who remained and submitted to the conquerors. By the surrender the inhabitants passed under a temporary allegiance to the British Government, and were governed by such laws and such only as it chose to recognize and impose. From the nature of the case no other laws could be obligatory upon them, for where there is no protection or allegiance or sovereignty, there can be no claim to obedience.

It would be a monstrous wrong to require a man to be amenable to two separate and adverse jurisdictions at the same time.

But it is replied, you are very tender about these rebels, while they are endeavoring to destroy the Union of these States. I repeat that I do not stand here, for the purpose of defending them against any punishment or penalty which may be lawfully inflicted under the Constitution of my country. No, sir; but I stand here to vindicate the supremacy of the Constitution, because in that only can I see the preservation of this people and the restoration of the Union.

I am opposed to all who are opposed to this Constitution, and hence I am opposed to those who are in rebellion against it. You frequently ask us why do you not denounce these rebels? I answer, we do denounce them. I would stand here, or any where, and denounce this rebellion day after day, and month after month, if I thought such a course would save the Union, and bring peace to this bleeding country.

I do denounce secession. It is unwarranted by the Constitution. I denounce those who have organized and set on foot this terrible rebellion. But I insist on it as a public man, as one interested in the maintainance of the Union, and the preservation of constitutional liberty, that in putting down this rebellion, the Constitution itself shall not be destroyed. I am for standing by the Constitution of my country, and its legal authorities, in every constitutional effort to preserve the Union, and maintain its just and rightful authority. But at the same time, I am opposed to any and all usurpations which may be practiced upon the constitutional rights of the people.

If Mr. Lincoln may, upon the authority which he announced to the Chicago preachers, do anything which he regards "necessary to subdue the enemy," where are the limits upon his exercise of power? Who may set boundaries beyond which he may not go, if the Constitution which he has sworn to maintain is to be disregarded?

Who ever dreamed, until the year 1862, that there was contained somewhere in the Constitution, a dormant power, which would authorize the President to issue a proclamation to emancipate three or four millions of slaves? Do you, does any statesman believe, that the Constitution would have been adopted if there had been the least doubt or suspicion in the minds of those who framed and ratified the Constitution, that such a power could be claimed under it in any contingency? Does any sane man believe there is any such power within the provisions of the Constitution? But I may be answered, the exercise of this power is a military necessity; that the power may be exercised when the nation is pressed by rebellion. I deny it. I deny that there is any such power in any department, or in all the departments of the Government combined. The Constitution contains all the powers necessary to meet every emergency, and powers not delegated by the Constitution, can not rightfully be exercised, but are expressly reserved to the States and the people.

I believe that the proclamation was urged upon the President by those who were opposed to a reunion of the States on the old basis.—I believe it firmly, because if the proclamation were carried out successfully there would be no hope in the future for a united people under the Constitution.

Take the case of Georgia. On the first of January, 1863, you have declared all the slaves within that State to be free. Suppose on the first of April, 1863, Georgia proposes again to return into the Union, on the condition that her local laws and domestic institutions as they were when she attempted to secede, shall be guaranteed. If the proclamation has any legal force, her slaves are all free, and can you, after they are thus freed, reduce them again to servitude? What have you done? You have claimed, and attempted by a mere pronunciamento, to set at defiance the Constitution and local laws of a State. Now, a State can not commit treason. The people can; but by this proclamation you propose to set aside State Constitutions, and uproot the condition of social relations which has existed for more than two centuries. Do you suppose that by a mere paper proclamation this can be done, and that too without any power vested in the President by the Constitution? It is madness and folly.

Now, I say that those who urge this proclamation, and who insist that it is all right, are not in favor of restoring the union of these States on the same footing on which they existed prior to the rebellion.

I give Stevens, of Pennsylvania, credit for his boldness. He says distinctly that he is opposed to a restoration of the States under the old Union. He is for a union of the States on the condition that slavery shall be abolished.

What is the purpose of loyal men? It is to bring all the States back again as co-equal into the Union, with their rights as States unimpaired; and that policy, which will unite the people in the loyal States and divide those in the States in rebellion, is the only policy by which this can be accomplished.

Allow me here to read a few words from that tried and veteran Union man and statesman, John J. Crittenden, on this subject. In a speech which he made in the House of Representatives, Jan. 29th, 1863, he says:

But now new light has sprung up. You can see nothing sacred in the rights which have been guaranteed in the most solemn form since the foundation of the Government. Under some new theory of yours, you hesitate not to break up social relations which have formed an essential part of our society for two or three hundred years. There are connected with this institution social relations and ties of affection which you can not undo, but which you repudiate. Your President has sent forth a proclamation in which he stops not with making free the slaves of rebels, but which makes free the slaves of every body within the territorial limits marked out.—And this is a means by which it is sought to carry on a war for the restoration of the Union!

From whence does the President derive his power to enforce such a decree? I suppose he assumes it by virtue of his military power, for he issues the proclamation in the name of the Commander-in-Chief of the armies of the United States. He can not seek it from any other source. The Constitution has certainly nowhere, by the remotest inference, given to the President the power of interfering with this institution to the slightest extent in any State where it exists. I beg you to consider the magnitude of the power which the President in his proclamation assumes to exercise. He assumes the prerogative of not only uprooting one of the very foundations of our social system, but to designate by his own fiat the exact region of country in which this emancipation policy shall be executed. Sir, this edict is arbitrary and unconstitutional. It can have no legal effect. It is null and void.

Having thus referred to the proclamation of Sept. 22d, 1862, I desire to say a very few words in relation to the proclamation of Sept. 24th, 1862.

I must be allowed to say that when I read this proclamation of the 24th of September, I was startled at the assumption of power which it claimed to exercise.

I had been taught to believe that in these States, and under this Federal Government, there were certain well-defined safeguards provided by both the State and national Constitutions, by which the rights of free men were to be protected. That every citizen was to be exempt from arrest except by the due process of law, and that when arrested he was entitled to fair and speedy public trial, not by a court-martial, but by a jury of his country, and in the State and district wherein the alleged crime was charged to have been committed, and was not to be tried for any offense except such as was defined to be so by the law of the land.

Let me call your attention to this second proclamation.

Whereas it has become necessary to call into service not only volunteers, but also portions of the militia of the States by draft, in order to suppress the insurrection existing in the United States, and disloyal persons are not adequately restrained by the ordinary processes of law from hindering this measure, and from giving aid and comfort, in various ways, to the insurrection:

Now, therefore, be it ordered—

First. That during the existing insurrection, and as a necessary measure for suppressing the same, all rebels and insurgents, their aiders and abetters, within the United States, and all persons discouraging volunteer enlistments, resisting militia drafts, or guilty of *any disloyal practice*, affording aid and comfort to the rebels against the authority of the United States, *shall be subject to martial law*, and liable to trial and punishment by courts martial or *military commission*.

Second. That the writ of *habeas corpus* is suspended in respect to all persons arrested, or who are now, or hereafter during the rebellion shall be, imprisoned in any fort, camp, arsenal, military prison, or other place of confinement by any military authority, or by the sentence of any court-martial or military commission.

Here is an attempt to oust the civil jurisdiction in these loyal States. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus is suspended, "courts-martial" are organized, with power to try, convict and punish, not persons "in the military and naval service," but any one whom the Provost Marshal may arrest, and the "court-martial" should *think ought* to be punished under the authority of this proclamation.

Now, I ask you as calm and dispassionate men, can you find any authority under the Constitution of the United States, for the exercise of such high and startling powers, on the part of the executive? Why, who is he? He holds an exalted position, one of the highest in the world—but our fathers did not leave his powers undefined and at loose ends. They made for us a Government, delegated to it certain fixed and definite powers. These are all clearly pointed out and named in the Constitution. By that Constitution the President is made the Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy, but that position is inferior to and subordinate to his position as Chief Magistrate. He holds it only because he is President and it is in subordination to the chief office which he exercises. It is a maxim in our Government that the military shall always be subordinate to the civil authority. As Commander-in-Chief the President cannot even make a single article of war; and why? Because the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to make all articles of war.

What if the Constitution had provided that some other person should be the Commander-in-Chief, to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate? Could such person have declared martial law all over these loyal States, suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*, and organize courts-martial to try persons not in the military service? Why, what is martial law? It is just no law at all. It is the mere whim or caprice of the military commander, where martial law is declared. Every safeguard of the citizen is at the mercy of the military commander. In the language of Hon. Benjamin Curtis, late a Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, martial law "is the will of the military commander, operating without any restraint, save his judgment, upon the lives, upon the property, upon the entire social and individual condition of all over whom the law extends." Mr. Justice Curtis adds:

Will any one be bold enough to say in view of the history of our ancestors and ourselves, that the President of the United States can extend such law as that over the entire country or over any defined geographical part thereof, save in connection with some particular military operation which he is carrying on there? Since Charles I. lost his head, there has been no king in England who could make such law in that realm. And where is there to be found in our history or our Constitutions, either State or National, any warrant for saying that a President of the United States has been empowered by the Constitution to extend martial law over the entire country, and to subject thereby to his military power every right of every citizen? He has no such authority.

Let it be remembered that Mr. Curtis is not, nor never has been, a Democrat.

But in this proclamation of Sept. 24th, the President has attempted to establish martial law and military courts all over these loyal States. Who ever dreamed that there was power vested in the Executive sitting at Washington to issue an order that martial law should be established in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois or Wisconsin, and especially while those States are loyal and their civil courts open daily for the transaction of business? Why, sir, it is a farce on the rights of the American people. I declare it here boldly that you cannot find authority for it either in British or American history.

[To be continued.]

[From the New York Journal of Commerce.]

The New Revenue Bill.

We have received an official copy of the amended Revenue Act, but it is so long that we cannot find room for it in our columns. We have carefully compiled a table giving the new stamp duties on promissory notes and drafts, which we herewith subjoin. All the tables we have seen contain important errors, but we trust that this will be found correct. By an unfortunate phraseology, the law would seem in each new paragraph to reimpose a higher tax on each outside limit of time, than the one given in the preceding clause. Thus we have "not *exceeding* 33 days" in one clause, at one cent, and "not less than 33 days" in the next at two cents; but it is so evident that the first expression in each case was designed to fix the rule that we have adopted that construction throughout. Under twenty dollars all notes are free; *memorandum checks* (erroneously printed in the law with a comma between the two words) are classed with notes, and pay the same amount. The rate on demand notes, and notes or drafts on time up to 33 days, including grace, is the same.

NEW RATES FOR PROMISSORY NOTES.

Amount of Note or Draft.		Amount of Required Stamps.					
Over and	Not Over	On Demand, or not over 33 days.	Over 33 days, and not over 63 days.	Over 63 days, and not over 93 days.	Over 93 days, and not over 4 months.	Over 4 months, and not over 6 months and grace	Over 6 months, and grace.
$ 20	$ 200...	01	02	03	04	06	10
200	400...	02	04	06	08	12	20
400	600...	03	06	09	12	18	30
600	800...	04	08	12	16	24	40
800	1000...	05	10	15	20	30	50
1000	1200...	06	12	18	24	36	60
1200	1400...	07	14	21	28	42	70
1400	1600...	08	16	24	32	43	80
1600	1800...	09	18	27	36	54	90
1800	2000...	10	20	30	40	60	1 00
2000	2200...	11	22	33	44	66	1 10
2200	2400...	12	24	36	48	72	1 20
2400	2600...	13	26	39	52	78	1 30
2600	2800...	14	28	42	56	84	1 40
2800	3000...	15	30	45	60	90	1 50
3000	3200...	16	32	48	64	96	1 60
3200	3400...	17	34	51	60	1 02	1 70
3400	3600...	18	36	54	72	1 08	1 80
3600	3800...	19	38	57	76	1 14	1 90
3800	4000...	20	40	60	80	1 20	2 00
4000	4200...	21	42	63	84	1 26	2 10
4200	4400...	22	44	66	88	1 32	2 20
4400	4600...	23	46	69	92	1 39	2 30
4600	4800...	24	48	72	96	1 44	2 40
4800	5000...	25	50	75	1 00	1 50	2 50
On 10,000.....		50	1 00	1 50	2 00	3 00	5 00
15,000.....		75	1 50	2 25	3 00	4 50	7 50
20,000.....		1 00	2 00	3 00	4 00	6 00	10 00
25,000.....		1 25	2 50	3 75	5 00	7 50	12 50
30,000.....		1 50	3 00	4 50	6 00	9 00	15 00
35,000.....		1 75	3 50	5 25	7 00	10 50	17 50
40,000.....		2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00	12 00	20 00
45,000.....		2 25	4 50	6 75	9 00	13 50	22 50
50,000.....		2 50	5 00	7 50	10 00	15 00	25 00
60,000.....		3 00	6 00	9 00	12 00	18 00	30 00
70,000.....		3 50	7 00	10 50	14 00	21 00	35 00
80,000.....		4 00	8 00	12 00	16 00	24 00	40 00
90,000.....		4 50	9 00	13 50	18 00	27 00	45 00
100,000.....		5 00	10 00	15 00	20 00	30 00	50 00

MERCHANT TAILORING ESTABLISHMENT,

NEIL HOUSE,

(OPPOSITE THE STATE CAPITOL,)

MARCUS CHILDS, Proprietor.

THIS LARGE AND MAGNIFICENT Establishment is one of the most complete in the West, and has just been filled with a large and well selected stock of

WINTER GOODS,

which will be found to excel anything ever before offered in this market. In the Custom Department I employ none but the best Cutters and Workmen, and all orders will be speedily filled, and

Warranted to Fit and be Well Made.

MILITARY GENTLEMEN

Will find at this Establishment all the necessaries required for a complete outfit, and my facilities and prices are such that I can defy competition in this line.

READY MADE CLOTHING

AND

GENTS' FURNISHING GOODS,

Will be found in great variety, having the largest stock of this kind ever brought to this city, all of which I invite the public to call and examine before purchasing elsewhere.

REMEMBER!

My Store is opposite the Capitol, in the New Neil House Building, and is one of the finest Store Rooms in the country. A visit to it will repay any one for the trouble.

dec19-d6m MARCUS CHILDS.

NEW GOODS!

AT

P. Rose's.

HAVING JUST RECEIVED FROM NEW YORK AN elegant assortment of Goods for Gentlemen's wear, I am now prepared to offer to my old patrons and others, great inducements in the selection of garments for the coming season.

I have a large stock of

Cloths, Cassimeres and Vestings,

And a general assortment of FURNISHING GOODS of the richest and neatest styles in the market, all of which I am selling at the CHEAPEST POSSIBLE RATES FOR CASH.

SPECIAL ATTENTION PAID TO MILITARY OFFICERS' CLOTHING.

Having had long experience in the cut and manufacture of OFFICERS' CLOTHING, I feel confident I can give entire satisfaction to all my patrons.

P. ROSE,
Merchant Tailor,
Cor. High & Town sts.,
aug8-d1y Columbus, O.

BENNO SPEYER'S

BANKING HOUSE,

Commission, Forwarding and Notarial Office;

GENERAL PASSENGER AGENCY

FOR THE

Bremen, Hamburg and Havre Steamers;

AND ALSO

RAILROAD TICKET AGENCY, EAST AND WEST.

Nos. 7 & 9 West Third St.,

(Corner Main),

Cincinnati, Ohio.

dec19-tf

V. R. GLAZIER, Agent,

AUCTIONEER.

AUCTION, SALE

AND

COMMISSION ROOMS,

No. 134 South Fourth Street,

Opposite the Market House.

I am now prepared to receive on Commission all kinds of property.

Old and new Furniture BOUGHT AND SOLD.

Particular attention given to the sale of Horses and Wagons and Carriages, and Household and Kitchen Furniture.

Sales in the country promptly attended to.

dec9-dtf

COAL OIL! COAL OIL!

FOR SALE AT REFINERS' PRICES, by the barrel.

W. H. RESTIEAUX,
jan29-tf 106 South High Street.

TELEGRAPHIC.

Morning and Noon Dispatches.

Interesting from Rebeldom.

NEW YORK, March 21.—A special to the Times from Washington says: Three hundred and seventy released prisoners arrived from Richmond to day. One of them, Mr. Seeds, of Cincinnati, a New Orleans pilot, mentions steady and significant removal of machinery for manufacturing ordnance and small arms, from Richmond to northern Georgia. The removal of ordnance stores in large quantities has also been going on for some time. There is a possibility of the transfer of the seat of war below Virginia, recognized by authorities at Richmond. Upon the interesting point of the duration of the war, Mr. Seeds said it might last six months after the next crop, but he thought it would be ended with that crop. If Vicksburg should be taken it would end almost immediately, for their armies would be cut off from their supply of meat, which is in Texas. He said every pound of meat eaten in the Richmond prisons came from there. He mentioned a conversation between Governor Winder and another officer, well authenticated, in which Windor said it would be ended by August.

Mr. Seeds declares there is a general feeling among the soldiers from all the Southern States favorable to ending the war and returning to the Union. The prisons in the South are full of deserters, awaiting trial by court-martial. Military executions are so common as to cease being commented upon.

Generals Willich, Stoughton and seventy-five officers of various grades were in Libby prison. Seventeen of our officers held as hostages for Col. Zearvana, the French lady, are at hard labor in the penitentiary at Richmond

Railroad Train Attacked by Guerrillas--Adams Express Robbed.

LOUISVILLE, KY., March 20.—The Nashville train yesterday was thrown off the track by obstructions four miles above Richland station, and not at Woodburn station, as previously reported. The locomotive, tender and two express cars were smashed The guerrillas fired into the hind car, containing women and children. They called themselves Morgan's men. The passengers returned the fire, killing and wounding three guerrillas. But one passenger was slightly wounded.

The guerrillas took away the officers' side arms, rifled their carpet sacks, etc.

The Adams Express safe was robbed of its contents. A part was subsequently recovered. The mail on the train was seized, but recovered.

The conductor ran back a mile to a stockade, and soldiers came up at double quick, recaptured the train and drove off the guerrillas, wounding several and taking four prisoners.

Gen. Brannan and Lieut. McKee, who were on the rear car, were neither captured or paroled, but are safe at Nashville.

Death of Maj. Gen. Sumner.

SYRACUSE, March 21.—Major General Edwin V. Sumner, U. S. A., died in this city at a quarter past one this morning, of congestion of the lungs. He had been sick but a few days.

The Army to be Paid.

WASHINGTON, March 21.—The Secretary of the Treasury has placed in the hands of the Paymaster-General here a sufficient supply of money to pay the entire army up to the 1st of March. Sufficient has also been sent and reached its destination, to pay the entire Army of the West.

The Herald's dispatch says: Gen. Burnside to-day received his final orders from the War Department, and left this afternoon for Fortress Monroe.

NEW YORK, March 21.—The Tribune's special from headquarters Army of the Potomac, March 20th, says: After the review of the 12th corps by Gen. Hooker yesterday, he met the officers at Gen. Slocum's headquarters. Gen. Hooker expressed satisfaction with their soldierly appearance, and said he relied on them for assistance and hearty co-operation in the ensuing campaign. So far as he was concerned, he meant there should be no more mistakes or doubtful results, if the enemy did not run.

BALTIMORE, March 20.—A great unconditional Union meeting was held here to-night, addressed by Gov. Johnson of Tenn. Gen. Burnside entered the hall and was received enthusiastically. He made a short speech. Secretary Chase, Postmaster Gen. Blair and Representative Maynard of Tenn., were present.

NEW LONDON, CT., March 20.—The Union meeting here to night was one of the greatest demonstrations known in this section. Speeches were made by Gov. Wright of Indiana and Col. Beard of Illinois.

BALTIMORE, March 21.—There was a great storm at Fortress Monroe yesterday. Snow over a foot deep.

NEW YORK, March 21.—The City of Baltimore took out $429,000 in specie.

PHILADELPHIA, March 20.—Mr. J. Cook, U. S. loan agent, announces the conversion of two millions legal tenders into the 5:20 Government loan within the last six days. Among the subscriptions to-day was $100,000 in Cincinnati, and $20,000 in Cleveland; total to-day, $700 000.

HARRISBURG, March 20.—Romufort, Dem, was elected Mayor to-day by 38 majority. Democratic loss 250.

W. R. KENT,

AUCTIONEER.

Auction, Sales

AND

COMMISSION ROOMS

No: 102 South High Street.

I AM NOW PREPARED TO Receive on Commission every description of property, such as Dry Goods, Groceries, Liquors, Furniture, Carriages, Horses, etc.

I also intend to devote my attention to sales of Real Estate and Personal Property, at any point, within twenty miles of the City.

☞ Auction Sales every evening.

Consignments respectfully solicited.

I have a large room over my sales-room, for storage purposes.

REFERENCES:

Kelton, Bancroft & Co.,	J. & T. R. Miller,
D. T. Woodbury & Co.,	Stone & Lewis,
Butler, Brother & Co.,	John Geary & Son
W. H. Restieaux,	Glenn & Thrall.

may10-1y

DENNISON HOUSE

Fifth St., between Main and Sycamore,

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

CORBIN GALLEHER, JOS. F. PERRIN, ... Proprietors.

THIS HOTEL HAS BEEN REPAIRED and refitted throughout, and is now open to the public. The proprietors, recently of the Goddard House, Maysville, Ky., solicit the patronage of the traveling community. No pains will be spared to give satisfaction to the guests of the House.

Dec. 21, '62-3m. CORBIN GALLEHER, JOS. F. PERRIN.