

Shreveport Daily News.

VOL. 1.

SHREVEPORT, LA., THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1861.

NO. 80.

The Shreveport Daily News,

Published every Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday morning.

Office, on Texas Street, above Spring, near the Mayor's office.

TERMS:

Daily, per year in advance, \$8.00
Delivered by carrier, 20 cents per week.
Weekly (Monday) in advance, 2.50

ADVERTISING RATES: FOR THE WEEKLY:

For each square of twelve lines or less for the first insertion, \$1.00
For each additional insertion, per square, 50

FOR THE DAILY:

No. Squares	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
1 square	5	7	9	10	12	13	17	24				
2 squares	9	12	14	16	17	18	25	30				
3 squares	12	15	18	21	23	25	35	40				
4 squares	15	19	22	25	27	30	40	50				
5 squares	18	22	26	30	33	37	48	60				
6 squares	20	24	28	32	35	40	52	65				
7 squares	22	26	30	34	38	43	56	70				
8 squares	24	28	32	36	40	45	60	75				
9 squares	26	30	34	38	42	47	63	80				
10 squares	28	32	36	40	44	49	66	85				
15 squares	40	45	50	55	60	65	85	100				

For professional and business cards, (including the Daily paper,) not exceeding five lines, for 12 months, \$15—without paper, \$10.

The privilege of yearly advertisers is strictly limited to their own immediate and regular business; and the business of an advertising firm is not considered as including that of its individual members.

Advertisements published at irregular intervals, \$1 per square, for each insertion. Announcing candidates for a District or State office, \$10; for a Parish office, \$10; City office, \$5—to be paid in advance.

All advertisements for strangers or transient persons, to be paid in advance.

Advertisements not marked on the copy for a specified time, will be inserted till forbid, and payment exacted.

Marriages and deaths will be published as news; obituaries, tributes of respect, and funeral invitations as other advertisements.

DENTAL SURGEONS.

S. HINSON,
DENTIST,
Office nearly opposite the Post Office,
SHREVEPORT, LA.

GEO. W. KENDALL,
DENTIST,
Office, corner Market and Milam sts.,
Opposite the Bank,
SHREVEPORT, LA.

MEDICAL.

DR. A. F. CLARK,
Office at T. H. Morris' Drug Store.
Residence,
Corner of Spring and Farrin Sts.,
SHREVEPORT, LA.
No 9—dly.

SMITH & LEWIS,
DEALERS IN
Drugs, Prints, Oils, Varnishes &c
SIGN OF THE GOLDEN MORTAR,
Shreveport, Texas St.
No 3—dly

Vicksburg Whig.
Published in Vicksburg, Miss. by M. Shannon. Terms, in advance, Daily per annum, \$8; Weekly, \$3.

ICE! ICE! ICE!
A CARGO of Rockland Lake, Crystal ICE, just received and for sale by
A. ENGLE & CO.
Shreveport, April 25—n11—tf

ATTORNEYS AT LAW.

B. L. HODGE,
Attorney at Law,
Office over Childers & Beard's Store,
Cor. Texas and Spring sts.,
n1-lyd
SHREVEPORT, LA.

L. M. NUTT,
Attorney at Law,
Office, corner Milam & Market Streets,
SHREVEPORT, LA.
Practices in Caddo, Bossier and DeSoto.
n10-lyd

LEON D. MARKS, THOS. G. POLLOCK,
MARKS & POLLOCK,
Attorneys & Counsellors at Law,
Shreveport, La.

PRACTICE in copartnership in all the courts held in the city of Shreveport, and in the parishes of De Soto and Bossier.
Office on Market street near Milam.
n3-d-y.

ROBT. J. LOONEY, SAM'L WELLS,
LOONEY & WELLS,
Attorneys & Counsellors at Law.

WILL practice in the Courts of Caddo and surrounding parishes, and in the Supreme Court at Monroe and Alexandria. Office on Market street, near the Postoffice, Shreveport, La.
n14-lyd

EMMET D. CRAIG,
Attorney and Counselor at Law,
Office, opposite Post Office,
SHREVEPORT, LA.
Will practice in the Courts of Caddo, DeSoto, and Bossier. 1dly

J. C. MONCURE,
Attorney at Law,
SHREVEPORT, LA.
Office with L. M. Nutt, corner of Milam and Market streets, n34d-ly

ASSOCIATIONS.

MASONIC.
SHREVEPORT LODGE OF F. and A. M. No. 115, meets every Friday at 7 1/2 P. M.
JOHN W. JONES, W. M.
J. H. Brownlee, Sec'y.

Shreveport Chapter of F. A. M. No. 10, meets on the 2nd and 4th Monday of each month, at 7 1/2 P. M. J. G. McWILLIAMS, T. C. Waller, Recorder. H. P.

Shreveport Council, E. and S. M. No. 5, meets on the 1st and 3rd Saturday of each month, at 7 1/2 P. M. EMMET D. CRAIG, Henry Levy, Recorder. T. G. M

I. O. O. F.
The regular meetings of **NEITH LODGE, No. 21,** are held on Wednesday evenings, at 7 o'clock, at their Lodge Room on Texas street.
P. H. KEYES, N. G.
S. SELIGMAN, Secretary. n10

COMMISSION MERCHANT

J. E. PHELPS, J. V. ROGERS,
Phelps & Rogers,
(Successors to T. H. Etheridge)

Grocers & Commission Merchants

Car. Commerce and Milam sts.,
SHREVEPORT, LA.
Keep constantly on hand a large assortment of *Staple and Fancy Groceries, Hay, Corn, Oats, etc.*
Advances made on consignments to our friends in New Orleans. n18dly

J. R. Simpson, G. M. Calhoun,
Simpson & Calhoun,

WAREHOUSE & COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

Receiving and Forwarding Agents,
SHREVEPORT, LA.
Having leased the popular and commodious Warehouse of Messrs. Howard, Tally & Co., and having had long experience in business, we hope to receive a share of the public patronage, and pledge ourselves to do all in our power to give entire satisfaction in all business entrusted to our care.
All we ask is a trial. n25

SPEECH OF John C. Breckinridge on the Lincoln War.

[Concluded.]

Thus the President has assumed the legislative and judicial powers, which in every age has been the very evidence of despotism, and he exercises them to any, while we sit in the Senate Chamber, and the other branch of the Legislature at the other end of the Capitol. Mr. President, what is the excuse—what is the justification, necessity? I answer, first, there was no necessity. Was it necessary to preserve the visible emblems of Federal authority here that the Southern coast should have been blockaded. Did not the same necessity exist when Congress, at the last session, refused to pass the Force bill? Was it necessary to the existence of the Union, till Congress should meet, that powers not conferred by the constitution should be assumed? Was there a necessity for overrunning the State of Missouri? Was there a necessity for raising the largest army ever assembled on the American continent, and for collecting the largest fleet ever collected in an American harbor? Congress may deem it was necessary in contemplation of a protracted struggle for the preservation of the constitution and the Union. What I mean to say is, that there was none of that over-ruling necessity for present preservation which may apply to usurpations of the constitution. In the case of the man in Maryland who was confined so long in Fort McHenry, was there any necessity of confining him instead of turning him over to the civil authorities? The chief charge was, that weeks before he had been concerned in treasonable acts. Was not the judicial authority there to take charge of him, and if convicted, to punish him? If there was a necessity in the present state of affairs, and Congress in session here, then what a long necessity we have before us and impending over us. Let Congress approve and ratify these acts, and there may occur a necessity which will justify the President in superseding the law in every State in this Union, and there will not be a vestige of civil authority left to rise against this usurpation of military power. But I deny this doctrine of necessity. I deny that the President of the United States may violate the constitution upon the ground of necessity. The doctrine is utterly subversive of the constitution. It substitutes the will of one man for a written constitution. The Government of the United States, which draws its life from the constitution, does not rest upon an implied consent. It rests upon an express and written consent, and the Government may exercise such powers and such only as are given in this written form of Government. The people of these States conferred on this agent of theirs just such powers as they deemed necessary. All others were retained. The constitution was made for all contingencies—for peace and for war—and they conferred all the power they deemed necessary, and more cannot be assumed. If the powers be not sufficient, still none others can be exercised. Will this be denied? Is the idea to be advanced that all constitutional questions are to be made subordinate entirely to the opinions and ideas that may prevail at the hour with reference to political unity? It has been held heretofore, and I thought it was axiomatic, and received by the world, that the terms of the constitution of the United States were the measure of power on the one side, and of obedience on the other. Let us take care how we establish a principle that, under any presumed stress of circumstances, powers not granted may be assumed. Take care and do not furnish an argument to the world and history that it shall not

respect that authority which no longer respects its own limitations. These are a few of the reasons that will control my vote against this resolution. I hope it will be voted upon, and if it should receive a majority, as I fear, it will be an invitation to the President of the United States, in the absence of all legislation, to do the like acts whether, in his opinion, it is in Kentucky, and Missouri, and everywhere? In his discretion he will feel himself warranted in subordinating the civil to the military power, and to imprison citizens without the warrant of law, and to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, and establish martial law, to make searches and suppress the press, and to do all those acts which rest on the will and authority of a military commander. In my judgment, if we pass this, we are upon the eve of putting, so far as we can, in the hands of the President of the United States the power of a dictator. With such a beginning as this what are we to expect in the future? When we see men imprisoned within hail of the Capitol, without warrant, and Congress in session, and the courts paralyzed and Congress not rising in a protest of indignant terms against it, we may be filled with gloomy forebodings for the future. What may we expect except a line of conduct in keeping with what has been done? Is this a contest to preserve the Union? If so, then it should be waged in a constitutional manner. Is the doctrine to obtain that provinces are to be entirely subordinate to the idea of political unity? Shall the rallying cry be the constitution and the Union, or are we prepared to say that the constitution is gone, but the Union survives? What sort of a Union would it be? Let this principle be announced, and let us carry on this contest with this spirit, winking at or approving the violations of this sacred instrument, and the people will soon begin to inquire what will become of our liberties at the end of the experiment?

The pregnant question for us to decide is, whether the constitution is to be respected in this struggle, or whether we are called upon to follow the flag over the ruins of the constitution? I believe, without questioning the motives of any, the whole tendency of the present proceeding is to establish a Government without limitations, and radically to change our frame and character of Government. I was told, the other day, by a distinguished American, that many Americans abroad, when asked about the present condition of things here, said, "We thought your Federal Government rested on consent, and how do you propose to maintain it by force?" Often the answer would be, "It was intended to rest on consent, but it has failed. It is not strong enough, and we intend to make it strong enough, and to change the character of the Government, and we will give it all the strength we deem essential, without regard to the provisions of the constitution, which was made some eighty years ago, and has been found not fit for the present condition of affairs." I think it is well that the attention of the country should be called to the tendency of things. I know there are thoughtful, conservative men—thousands of men who love the constitution, scattered through the adhering States—who would never consent to make this contest with any purpose to interfere with the personal rights of political communities. He then referred to a suggestion in a northern paper, that a change in the character of the Government was contemplated, and also a speech made by the present Secretary of War, in which he said the Southern States must be subdued, and at the end of this contest there would be no Virginians, as such, or Carolinians, but all Americans. I call on Senators to defend the constitutionality of these acts, or else admit that they carry on this contest without regard to the consti-

tution. I content myself in saying that it never was contemplated by the framers of the constitution that this government should be maintained by military force or by subjugating different political communities. It was declared by Madison and by Hamilton himself, that there was no competency in the government thus to preserve it. Suppose the military subjugation is successful—suppose the army marches through Virginia and the Gulf States to New Orleans—then the war is prosecuted unconstitutionally. Even if there were warrant of law for it, it would be the overthrow of the constitution. There is no warrant in the constitution to conduct the contest in that form. In further proof of how they intend to conduct this contest, I refer to the speech of the eloquent Senator from Oregon (Mr. Baker,) when he declared he was for direct war, and said that for that purpose nobody was so good as a dictator. Is anything more necessary to show that, so far as that Senator is concerned, he proposed to conduct the contest without regard to the constitution? I heard no rebuke administered to the eminent Senator, but, on the contrary, I saw warm congratulations, and the Senator declared that, unless the people of these States were willing to obey the Federal Government, they must be reduced to the condition of Territories; and, he added, he would govern them by Governors from Massachusetts and Illinois. This was said seriously, and afterwards repeated.

Mr. Baker, (Republican,) of Oregon, explained. He said he was delivering a speech against giving too much power to the President, and was keeping his usual constitutional, guarded position against an increase of the standing army, and gave, as an excuse for voting for the bill, the present state of public affairs. He did say he would take some risk of despotism, and repeated that he would risk a little to save all. He hoped the States would return to their allegiance, but if they would not, he thought it better for civilization and humanity that they should be governed as Territories. He did say so then and believed so now, and thought the events of the next six months would show that it would be better if the Senator believed it too.

Mr. Breckinridge said the answer of the Senator proved what he said, and contended that it was evident that the constitution was to be put aside. It was utterly subversive of the constitution and of public liberty to clothe any one with dictatorial powers. He then referred to the speech of Mr. Dixon, of Connecticut, who said in substance, that if African slavery stood in the way it must be abolished.

Mr. Dixon, (Republican,) of Connecticut, had the Secretary to read what he did say on the subject, as published yesterday.

Mr. Breckinridge said it appeared to him that the most violent Republicans had possession of the Government, and referred to the bill introduced by Mr. Pomeroy to suppress the slaveholder rebellion, and which also contained a provision for the abolition of slavery. He contended that the very title was enough to show that the constitution was to be put aside.

Mr. Bingham, (Republican,) of Michigan, asked if he contended this was not a slaveholders' rebellion. Mr. Breckinridge—I do, sir. I do. He then referred to the refusal of last session to make any compromise, though the Southern leaders said they would be satisfied with the Crittenden compromise. But all efforts were refused, and now any offers of peace are ruled out of order in one House and it is vain and idle to argue for it. He wanted to let the country know Congress deliberately refused the last effort to avert the horrors of an internal struggle. But why utter words? I shall trouble the senate no longer. I know no argument or appeal will have any effect. I have cherished all my life an attachment to the Union of