The Bedford Gazette.

Friday Morning, February 21, 1868.

WE print, this week, to the exclusion of our usual variety, the powerful speech of SENATOR DOOLITTLE, delivered in the U. S. Senate a short time ago, and the Johnson-Grant correspondence, in which Gen. Grant is so completely used up. The editor is also absent, which will account for lack of original matter.

GRANT'S DISGRACE.

How are the Mighty Fallen!

Falsehood and Duplicity explicitly proved upon U. S. Grant!

The President's Last Letter to the Defunct Ulysses!

Five Members of the Cabinet, Messrs. Welles, McCulloch, Randall, Browning and Seward, testify to the Lying and Double-dealing of the Great Military Pretender!

A Complete Showing Up of that Consumate Impostor, "Grave-yard" Grant!

Read! Read! Read!

The charge having been made that Gen. U. S. Grant had made a distinct promise to the President that he would either hold on to the War Department and let Mr. Stanton test his right to that office in the courts, or would resign in time to permit the President to appoint some one who would hold on, and that Gen. Grant had promised the President that he would call on him on a certain day fixed by them to let him (the President) know whether he would hold on, or resign, he (Grant) wrote the President a letter denying that he had made any such promises. The President replied that he (Grant) *did* make the promises and that he (Grant) *knew* he made them.

Grant rejoined in a reiteration of his denial and wound up by charging the President, in an insolent manner, with trying to commit him (Grant) to a violation of the Tenure of Office "Law." The President now comes in with his *rebutter* and produces in support of his statement, the evidence of five members of his Cabinet, who were present when Gen. Grant *acknowledged* that he had promised to hold on to the War Department, or resign, and also that he had agreed to meet the President and apprise him of the course he intended to pursue, on the day specified. We give below the letters of the President and members of the Cabinet. Here are six of the most eminent and honorable men in the whole Union whose testimony proves that Grant has not only acted treacherously, but in denying that he had made the promises above described, *he uttered a wilful and deliberate falsehood.* Read this correspondence carefully and then hand to your neighbor:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Feb. 10, '68.

General: The extraordinary character of your letter of the 3d instant would seem to preclude any reply on my part; but the manner in which publicity has been given to the correspondence of which that letter forms a part, and the grave questions which are involved, induce me to take this mode of giving, as a proper sequel to the communications which have passed between us, the statement of the five members of the cabinet who were present on the occasion of our conversation on the 14th ultimo. Copies of the letters which they have addressed to me, are accordingly herewith enclosed.

You speak of my letter of the 31st ultimo as a reiteration of the many gross misrepresentations contained in certain newspaper articles, and reassert the correctness of the statements contained in your communication of the 28th ultimo, adding, (and here I give your own words,) "anything in yours in reply to the contrary, notwithstanding." When a controversy upon matter of fact reaches the point to which this has been brought, further assertion or denial between the immediate parties should cease, especially where upon either side, it loses the character of a respectful discussion, which is required by the relations in which the parties stand to each other, and degenerates in tone and temper. In such a case, if there is nothing to rely upon but the opposing statements, conclusions must be drawn from the statements alone, and from whatever intrinsic probabilities they afford in favor of or against either party.

I should not shrink from this test in the controversy, but fortunately it is not left to this test alone. There were five Cabinet officers present at the conversation, the detail of which, in my letter of the 28th ultimo, you allow yourself to say contains "many gross misrepresentations." These gentlemen heard that conversation, and have read my statement. They speak for themselves; and I have the proof, without a word of comment. I deem it proper, before concluding this communication, to notice some of the statements contained in your letter. You say that a performance of the promise alleged to have been made by you to the President "would have involved a resistance to law and an inconsistency with the whole history of my connection with the suspension of Mr. Stanton."

You then state that you had fears the President would, on the removal of Mr. Stanton, appoint some one in his place who would embarrass the army in carrying out the reconstruction acts, and add: "It was to prevent such an appointment, that I accepted the office of Secretary of War, *ad interim*, and not for the purpose of enabling you to get rid of Mr. Stanton by my withholding it from him in opposition to law, or, not doing so myself, surrendering it to one who would, as the statement and assumptions in your communication plainly indicate was sought."

First of all, you here admit that from the very beginning of what you term "the whole history" of your connection with Mr. Stanton's suspension, you intended to circumvent the President. It was to carry out that intent that you accepted the appointment. This was in your mind at the time of your acceptance. It was not, then, in obedience to the order of your superior, as has been heretofore supposed, that you assumed the duties of the office. You knew it was the President's purpose to prevent Mr. Stanton from resuming the office of Secretary of War, and you intended to defeat that purpose.

You accepted the office, not in the interest of the President, but of Mr. Stanton. If this purpose, so entertained by you, had been confined to yourself; if, when accepting this office, you had have done so with a mental reservation to frustrate the President, it would have been a tacit deception. In the ethics of some persons such a course is allowable. But you cannot stand upon that questionable ground. The "history" of your connection with the transaction, as written by yourself, place you in a different predicament, and shows that you not only concealed your design from the President, but induced him to suppose that you would carry out his purpose to keep Mr. Stanton out of office by retaining it yourself, after an attempted restoration by the Senate, so as to require Mr. Stanton to establish his right by judicial decision.

I now give that part of this "history," as written by yourself in your letter of the 28th ultimo: "Some time after I assumed the duties of Secretary of War *ad interim*, the President asked me my views as to the course Mr. Stanton would have to pursue, in case the Senate should not concur in his suspension, to obtain possession of his office. My reply was, is substance, that Mr. Stanton would have to appeal to the courts to reinstate him, illustrating my position by citing the ground I had taken in the case of the Baltimore police commissioners."

Now, at that time, as you admit in your letter of the 3d instant, you held the office for the very object of defeating an appeal to the courts. In that letter you say that in occupying the office one motive was to prevent the President from appointing some other person who would retain possession, and thus make judicial proceedings necessary.

You know the president was unwilling to trust the office with any one who would not, by holding it, compel Mr. Stanton to resort to the courts. You perfectly understood that in this interview, "some time" after you accepted the office, the President, not contented with your silence, desired an expression of your views, and you answered him that Mr. Stanton "would have to appeal to the courts." If the President had reposed confidence *before* he knew your views, and that confidence had been violated, it might have been said he made a mistake; but a violation of confidence reposed *after* that conversation was no mistake of his, nor of yours. It is the fact only that needs be stated, that at the date of this conversation you did not intend to hold the office with the purpose of forcing Mr. Stanton into court, but did hold it then and had accepted it to prevent that course from being carried out. In other words, you said to the President, "that is the proper course," and you said to yourself, "I have accepted the office, and now hold it to defeat that course."

The excuse you make—a subsequent paragraph of that letter of the 28th ultimo—that afterwards you changed your views as to what would be a proper course, had nothing to do with the point now under consideration. The point is that *before* you changed your views you had secretly determined to do the very thing which at last you did—surrender the office to Mr. Stanton. You may have changed your views as to the law, but you certainly did not change your views as to the course you had marked out for yourself from the beginning. I will only notice one more statement in your letter of the 3d inst., that the performance of the promises which, it is alleged, were made by you, would have involved you in the resistance of law. I know of no statute that would have been violated had you, carrying out your promises in good faith, tendered your resignation when you concluded not to be made a party in any legal proceedings. You add; "I am in a measure confirmed in this conclusion by your recent orders directing me to disobey orders from the Secretary of War, my *superior* and your subordinate, without having countermanded his authority to issue the orders I am to disobey."

On the 24th ultimo you addressed a note to the President requesting, in writing, an order given to you verbally five days before, to disregard orders from Mr. Stanton as Secretary of War until you "knew from the President himself that they were his orders."

On the 29th, in compliance with your request, I did give you instructions in writing "not to obey any orders from the War Department assumed to be issued by the direction of the President, unless such order is known by the general commanding the armies of the United States to have been authorized by the Executive."

There are some orders which a Secretary of War may issue without the authority of the President; there are others which he issued simply as the agent of the President, and which purports to be "by direction" of the President. For such orders the President is responsible, and he should therefore know and understand what they are before giving such "directions." Mr. Stanton states, in his letter of the 4th inst., which accompanies the published correspondence, that he "has had no correspondence with the President since the 12th August last;" and he further says that since he resumed the duties of the office he has continued to discharge them "without any personal or written communication with the President;" and he adds, "no orders have been issued from this department in the name of the President with my knowledge, and I have received no orders from him."

It thus seems that Mr. Stanton now discharges the duties of the War Department without any reference to the President and without using his name.

My order to you had only reference to orders "assumed to be issued by direction of the President." It would appear from Mr. Stanton's letter that you have received no such orders from him. However, in your note to the President of the 30th ultimo, in which you acknowledge the receipt of the written order of the 29th, you say that you have been informed by Mr. Stanton that he has not received any order limiting his authority to issue orders to the army according to the practice of the Department, and state that "while this authority to the War Department is not countermanded, it will be stisfactory evidence to me that any orders issued from the War Department by direction of the President are authorized by the Executive."

The President issues an order to you to obey no order from the War Department, purporting to be made "by the direction of the President," until you have referred it to him for his approval. You reply that you have received the President's order and will not obey it, but will obey an order purporting to be given by his direction *if it comes from the War Department.* You will not obey the direct order of the President, but will obey his indirect order. If, as you say there has been a practice in the war Department to issue orders in the name of the President, without his direction, does not the precise order you have requested and have received change the practice as to the general of the army? Could not the President countermand any such commands issued to you from the War Department? If you should receive an order from the War Department, issued in the name of the President, to do a special act, and an order from the President directly, not to do the act, is there a doubt which you ought to obey?

You answer the question when you say to the President, in your letter of the 3d instant, the Secretary of War is "my superior and your subordinate," and yet you refuse obedience to the superior out of deference to the subordinate. Without further comment upon the subordinate attitude you have assumed, I am at a loss to know how you can release yourself from obedience to the orders of the President, who is made by the constitution commander-in-chief of the army and navy, and is, therefore, the official superior as well of the General of the Army as of the Secretary of War.

ANDREW JOHNSON.

General U. S. Grant, commanding armies of the United States, Washington, D. C.

Copy of letter addressed to each of the members of the Cabinet present at the conversation between the President and General Grant on the 14 of January, 1868:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, D. C., Feb. 5, 1868.

Sir: The Chronicle of this morning contains a correspondence between the President and Gen. Grant, reported from the War Department, in answer to a resolution of the House of Representatives. I beg to call your attention to that correspondence, and especially to that part of it which refers to the conversation between the President and Gen. Grant at the Cabinet meeting on the 14th of January, and to request you to state what was said in that conversation.

Very respectfully yours,
ANDREW JOHNSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 5, 1868.

Sir: Your note of this date was handed to me this evening. My recollection of the conversation at the Cabinet meeting, on Tuesday, the 14th of January, corresponds with your statement of it in the letter of the 31st ult., in the published correspondence. The three points specified in the letter, giving your recollection of the conversation, are correctly stated.

Very respect'y, GIDEON WELLES.
To the President.

TREASURY DEPT., Feb. 9, 1868.

Sir: I have received your note of the 5th inst., calling my attention to the correspondence between yourself and General Grant, published in the Chronicle of yesterday, especially to that part of it which relates to what occurred at "Cabinet meeting" on Tuesday, the 14th ultimo, and requesting me to state what was said in the conversation referred to.

I cannot undertake to state the precise language used, but I have no hesitation in saying that your account of the conversation, given in your letter to General Grant of the 31st ultimo, substantially, and in all important particulars, accords with my recollection of it.

With great respect, your obedient servant. HUGH MCCULLOCH.
To the President.

POSTOFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, Feb. 6, 1868.

Sir: I am in receipt of your letter of February, calling my attention to the correspondence published in the Chronicle between the President and General Grant, and especially to that part of it which refers to the conversation between the President and General Grant at the Cabinet meeting on Tuesday, the 14th of January, with a request that I state what was said in that conversation.

In reply, I have the honor to state that I have read carefully the correspondence in question, and particularly the letter of the President to General Grant, dated January 31, 1868.

The following extract from your letter of the 31st of January to General Grant is, according to my recollection, a correct statement of the conversation that took place between the President and General Grant in the Cabinet meeting on the 14th of January last. In the presence of the Cabinet the President asked General Grant whether "in conversation which took place after his appointment as secretary of War *ad interim* he did not agree either to remain at the head of the War Department and abide any judical proceedings that might follow the non-concurrence by the Senate in Mr. Stanton's suspension, and should he wish not to become involved in such a controversy, to put the President in the same position with repect to the office as he occupied previous to General Grant's appointment, by returning it to the President in time to anticipate such action by the Senate."

This General Grant admitted. The President then asked General Grant if at the conference on the preceding Saturday he had not, to avoid misunderstanding, requested General Grant to state what he intended to do; and further, if in reply to that inquiry he (General Grant) had not referred to their former conversations, saying that from them the President understood his position, and that his (General Grant's) action would be consistent with the understanding which had been reached. To these General Grant replied in the affirmative. The President asked General Grant if at the conclusion of their interview on Saturday it was not understood that they were to have another conference on Monday, before final action by the Senate in the case of Mr. Stanton. General Grant replied that such was the understanding, but that he did not suppose the Senate would act so soon; that on Monday he had been engaged in a conference with General Sherman, and was occupied with "many little matters," and asked "if General Sherman had not called on that day."

I take this mode of complying with the request contained in the President's letter to me, because my attention has been called to the subject before, when the correspondence between the President and General Grant was under consideration.

Very respectfully, your obediant servant, ALEXANDER W. RANDALL,
Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C. Feb. 6, 1868.

Sir: I am in receipt of yours of yesterday calling my attention to a correspondence between yourself and General Grant published in the Chronicle newspaper, and especially to that part of said correspondence "which referred to the conversation between the President and General Grant at the Cabinet meeting on Tuesday, the 14th of January," and requesting me "to state what was said in that connection."

In reply, I submit the following statement: At the Cabinet meeting on Tuesday, the 14th January, 1868, General Grant appeared and took his accustomed seat at the board. When he had been reached in the order of business, the President asked him, as usual, if he had anything to present. In reply the general, after referring to a note which he had that morning addressed to the President, enclosing a copy of the resolution of the Senate refusing to concur in the reasons for the suspension of Mr. Stanton, proceeded to say that he regarded his duties as Secretary of War *ad interim* terminated by that resolution, and that he could not lawfully exercise such duties for a moment after the adoption of the resolution reached him last night, and that this morning he had gone to the War department, entered the secretary's room, bolted one door on the inside, locked the other on the outside, delivered the key to the adjutant general, and proceeded to the headquarters of the army and addressed the note above mentioned to the President, informing him that he (General Grant) was no longer Secretary of War *ad interim*.

The President expressed great surprise at the course which Gen. Grant had thought proper to pursue, and, addressing himself to the General, proceeded to, say in substance, that he had anticipated such action on the part of the Senate, and being very desirous to have the constitutionality of the tenure-of-office bill tested, and his right to suspend or remove a member of the Cabinet decided by the judicial tribunals of the country, he had, some time ago, and shortly after Gen. Grant's appointment as Secretary of War *ad interim*, asked the General what his action would be in the event that the Senate should refuse to concur in the suspension of Mr. Stanton, and that the General had then agreed either to remain at the head of the War Department till a decision could be obtained from the court, or resign the office in o the hands of the President before the case was acted upon by the Senate, so as to place the President in the same situa- he occupied at the time of his (Grant's) appointment.

The President further said that the conversation was renewed on the preceding Saturday, at which time he asked the General what he intended to do if the Senate should undertake to reinstate Mr. Stanton, in reply to which the General referred to their former conversation upon the same subject, and said "you understand my position, and my conduct will be conformable to that understanding;" that he (the General) then expressed a repugnance to being made a party to judicial proceeding, saying that he would expose himself to fine and imprisonment by doing so, as his continuing to discharge the duties of Secretary of War *ad interim* after the Senate should have refused to concur in the suspension of Mr. Stanton would be a violaiton of the tenure-of-office bill.

That in reply to this he, the President, informed Gen. Grant he had not suspended Mr. Stanton under the tenure-of-office bill, but by virtue of the powers conferred on him by the constitution, and that as to the fine and imprisonment he, the President, would pay whatever fine was imposed, and submit to whatever imprisonment might be adjudged against him, the General. That they continued the conversation for some time, discussing the law at length, and that they finally separated without having reached a definite conclusion, and with the understanding that the General would see the President again on Monday.

In reply, Gen. Grant admitted that the conversation had occurred, and said that at first conversation he had given it as his opinion to the President that in the event of non-concurrence by the Senate in the action of the President in respect to the Secretary of War, the question would have to be decided by the court; that Mr. Stanton would have to appeal to the court to reinstate him in office; that the *ins* would remain in until they could be displaced and the *outs* put in by legal proceedings; and that he *then* thought so, and had agreed that if he should change his mind he would notify the President in time to make another appointment; but that, at the time of the first conversation, he had not looked very closely into the law; that it had recently been discussed by the newspapers, and that this had induced him to examine it more carefully, and that he had come to the conclusion that if the Senate should refuse to concur in the suspension Mr. Stanton would thereby be reinstated, and that he (Grant) could not continue to act as Secretary of War *ad interim* without subjecting himself to fine and imprisonment; and that he came over on Saturday to inform the President of the change in his views, and did so inform him; that the President replied that he had not suspended Mr. Stanton under the tenure-of-office bill, but under the constitution, and had appointed him—Grant—by virtue of the authority derived from the constitution, &c.; that they continued to discuss the matter some time, and finally he left without any conclusion having been reached, expecting to see the President again on Monday. He then proceeded to explain why he had not called on the President on Monday, saying that he had had a long interview with General Sherman; that various little matters had occupied his time till it was late, and that he did not think the Senate would act so soon, and asked "Did not General Sherman call on you on Monday?" I do not know what passed between the President and General Grant on Saturday except as I learned it from the conversation between them at the Cabinet meeting on Tuesday, and the foregoing is substantially what then occurred. The precise words used on the occasion are not, of course, given exactly in the order which they were spoken, but the ideas expressed and the facts stated are faithfully preserved and presented.

I have honor to be, sir, with great respect, your ebedient servant,
O. H. BROWNING.
The President.

Mr. Seward writes a long letter which substantially corroborates the statements of the President and Messrs. Welles, McCulloch, Randall and Browning.

To all of this, Gen. Grant has nothing to answer except, that he does not, to quote his own language, "admit anything in these where *they differ from anything heretofore stated by me.*" In other words, in Gen. Grant's ethics, "a lie well stuck to is as good as the truth." He winds up in the following craw-fishing style:

"Disclaiming any intention now, or heretofore, of disobeying any legal order of the President distinctly communicated, I remain very respectfully your obediant servant,
U. S. GRANT, General.

Ah! ha!

CONGRESSIONAL.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 13.

SENATE—Mr Trumbull, from the Committe on the Judiciary, reported the bill to supply vacancies in the executive department, in certain cases. He gave notice that he would call it up at an early day. A memorial was presented by the Chair, and appropriately referred, from the New England Manufacturing company of Massachusetts, asking an entire revision of the revenue department. Also, one from certain citizens setting forth reasons why the Constitution should be so changed as to acknowledge God and religion.

HOUSE—The House proceeded to the consideration of the bill concerning the rights of American citizens in the foreign States. Mr. Jencks addressed the House in advocacy of the substitute proposed by him. Mr. Wilson (Iowa) moved that the bill and pending amendments be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union as a special order. Mr. Banks stated that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had had a regular meeting this morning, and desired to have the bill re-committed, with all the above amendments, and he asked the gentlemen from Iowa to substitute that motion for his. Mr. Wilson said he would allow the motion to be offered as an amendment, so that the sense of the House might be taken upon it.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14.

SENATE—Messrs. Trumbull, Conklin and Williams presented memorials of officers of the volunteer army protesting against the passage of the bill introduced by Mr. Wilson, relative to communication for pay &c., setting forth that their claims are equitable and grow out of a law of Congress, the decision of which is now pending in the supreme court. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE.—Mr. Wood offered a resolution directing General Grant to furnish all correspondence, by telegraph, or otherwise, between himself and General Hancock, relating to the removal of councilmen in New Orleans. Adopted. Mr. Logan introduced a joint resolution providing that from and after the first of June next all United States bonds shall pay an interest tax of two per cent, to be collected by deducting one per cent. semi-annually from the coupons at the Treasury. Referred to the committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Covode presented a communication giving the history of whisky frauds in New Orleans. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Clark, of Kentucky, introduced a bill to abolish and forever prohibit the system of peonage and Indian slaveay in New Mexico. Referred to the Judiciary Committee.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 15.

SENATE.—The Senate is not in session to-day.

HOUSE.—Mr. Miller presented the petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, asking for an adjustment of the revenue laws so as to keep the balance of the trade in favor of the United States. The House resumed the consideration of the election case from Kentucky, the contestant, Mr. Samuel E. Smith, being entitled to the floor. Mr Smith addressed the House, insisting upon the public importance of the question involved, and disclaiming being interested by personal motives.

Gen. M'Clellan and the Mission to England.

WASHINGTON, February 16.—There seems to be no doubt that the appointment of minister to England has been tendered to General George B. McClellan, but nothing definite has yet been heard from him as to its acceptance. The resignation of Mr. Adams, it has been ascertained from an official source, takes place in April.

Great Democratic Victory at Reading: The City Swept: A Gain of Four Hundred and One.

READING, Feb. 15.—The election for Auditor, Councilmen, and others, took place yesterday. The Democrats swept the city and routed the Radicals, horse, foot, and dragoon.

The Auditor, Hiester M. Nagle, was elected by a majority of 382. Last year the Radical majority was 19, which makes a clear Democratic gain of 401 over the vote of last fall.

There were no local issues to influence the election. The battle was fought out squarely, on the grounds of principle. Both sets of candidates were trustworthy.

There is great rejoicing here over the result. The majority will be increased when the great and final contest comes.

A WAR ON HUMANITY.—The New York World publishes a letter from a Georgia correspondent which presents a very dark side of the reconstruction policy. It appears that in Mississippi a trifling gift of sugar and tea by Gen. Gillem to the State Insane Asylum reveals the fact that such articles are almost unknown to the patients in that institution, and that it is only by the most rigid economy that the bare necessaries of life can be furnished them. After detailing a similar case in Georgia, the editor adds:

"As no power is given these commandants to fully relieve such necessities, and as State appropriations are exhausted, it is not impossible that the most painful distresses may be felt by just those very classes that in any decent community are the most fully provided for and watched over. That these disgraceful probabilities are the legitimate result of congressional reconstruction cannot be denied, and we beg any man who has the honor and fair fame of his country at heart to reflect if the existence of these wrongs in two States does not argue for their perpetration in all the other States where the same general cause is at work."

—A specific against falling on ice may be found in the old penitential recipe, sackcloth and ashes; sackcloth for the soles and ashes for the streets.

NEWS AND OTHER ITEMS.

—A planter, residing near Beaufort, S. C., went to recover his mules, which were stolen by a party of negroes, last week. He was met by a large force of freedmen, who wrested his gun from his hands and shot him dead on the spot.

—The New Orleans colored Alderman Dumas, who refused to accept the nomination for Lieutenant Governor, on the ground that he was "a candidate for Governor only," is among the persons just removed from office by General Hancock for "contempt of orders from headquarters."

—The following prices are paid for labor in Austin, Nevada: Ordinary labor $3.50 a day, or $60 and found per month; skillful miners, $4 to $5 per day; carpenters, $5 to $7 per day; wood in quantities, to mills, &c., $6 per cord; hay, of which there is plenty, $30 per ton; flour, 11 cents per pound; bacon, 30 cents; good board per week, $10; poor board, $6.

—The men's boot, shoe and gaiter makers in New York have been on a strike since last Monday week, and some 600 men are idle. They have struck against a reduction of wages of 20 per cent, proposed by the employers.

—A gluttonous Rhode Islander, named Hodijah Blake, devoured a turkey weighing nearly eight pounds at one sitting, last Monday. It only took half an hour to complete the job, and his price was fifty dollars.

—The daughter of a Maine clergyman eloped the other day while her parents were at a funeral. The bridegroom was arrested immediately after the marriage on a charge of horse stealing.

—The Mahometans are excited over the fact that the Sultan went out to dine with a subject, a mark of condescension which is utterly at variance with all the traditions of the Moslem faith.

—The underground railway of London, during the five years of its existence, has carried eighty millions of passengers, at an average speed of sixteen miles per hour, and without the loss of a single life.

—Snow and strawberries seldom come together. On January 29 the editor of the New Orleans Picayune had on his table snow-balls and strawberries, the latter raised in the open air.

—The annual report of the Idaho territorial treasurer places the territorial debt at somewhat over $13,000.—Utah, on the contrary, owes nothing, but has $16,000 in the treasury.

—The Wisconsin Legislature has passed a law to prohibit the locking of cars while in motion, and prohibiting the use of kerosene in lighting cars.

—The Washington correspondent of the radical Chicago Republican says that Mr. Washburne wrote all General Grant's letters to the President.

—The Raleigh (N. C.) Standard says there are five hundred persons in Wake county who are "suffering the most acute pangs of cold and hunger."

—A Lancashire woman recently starved to death because she was a relation of a member of Parliament and wouldn't go to the poorhouse.

—The Boston ice crop this season is the largest and best ever gathered. Ice twenty-two inches in thickness was cut at Wenham Lake on Saturday.

—In the late large fire at Wilmington, N. C., twelve persons are supposed to have perished. Five bodies have already been recovered from the ruins.

—New Orleans claims to possess more miles of street railway than any city of its size in the world.

ANOTHER REVOLUTION.—The New York Journal of Commerce, which has all along been hopeful that the troubles which now beset the country, as the fruit of radical policy, would blow over, begins now to take the alarm. So we infer from the following note of warning which it places conspicuously at the head of its leading editorial column:

"It looks as if the zeal of those who care more for party supremacy than for the most vital interests of the country, and who would rather ruin the land we love than resign their rule over it, was about to plunge them headlong into a course that must end in revolution. Those who have hitherto been the most hopeful are now gloomy and despondent, for madness seems to rule the hour, and the folly of our legislators appears to be without restraint. If the country must pass through the fire before peace and unity can be restored, perhaps it may as well come now as ever."

CHILDREN'S LIVES SAVED FOR 50 CENTS.—Thousands of Children die annually of Croup. Now, Mothers, if you spend 50 cents, and always have a bottle of Dr. Tobias' Venetian Liniment in the house, you never need fear losing your little one when attacked with this complaint It is now 20 years since I have put up my Liniment, and never heard of a child dying of Croup when my Liniment was used; but hundreds of cases of cures have been reported to me, and many state if it was $10 per bottle they would not be without it. Besides which, it is a certain cure for Cuts, Burns, Headache, Toothache, Sore Throats, Swellings, Mumps, Colic, Diarrhœa, Dysentery, Spasms, Old Sores, and Pains in the Back and Chest. No one once tries it who is ever without it. It is warranted perfectly safe to take internally. Full Directions with every bottle. Sold by the Drugists. Depot, 56 Cortlandt Street New York. feb21ml.

SUDDEN DEATH is the fate of every fibre upon which the
Caustic Poison
of an ordinary hair dye falls. There is no
Resurrection
for the filaments thus blighted. But, as it were,
in the Twinkling of an Eye,
hair of any obnoxious color is changed to a
Rich and Glorious Hue,
and at the same time vitalized and improved by the use of
CRISTADORO'S HAIR DYE,
nature's safe ally, and beauty's regenerator Manufactured by J. CRISTADORO, 68 Maiden Lane, New York. Sold by all Druggists. Applied by all Hair Dressers. feb21ml

SPECIAL NOTICES.

FACTS.

That we have unequalled facilities for conducting business to the advantage both of ourselves and patrons, we submit the following TRUTHS—well known as such to the entire business community.

1st. We have *abundant cash capital*, therefore—
2d. We are enabled to *Buy for Cash exclusively*, consequently at the *lowest possible prices*, with the markets of the entire world to select from.
3d. In this particular WE HAVE ADVANTAGES shared by no other house in our business.
4th. We sell for cash exclusively—therefore at the lowest possible prices—having no losses incurred by selling on credit, to provide for.
5th We have a business experience of a quarter of a century, having been longer established than any house in our trade in Philadelphia.
6th. Our business is thoroughly systematized, the result of long experience, which has taught us what the wants of the public are, and how best to meet them.
7th. We employ the best talent in all departments, our garments are therefore unsurpassed in style, fit and workmanship.
8th. Our business is large and constantly, increasing, enabling us to keep at all times the *largest, best assorted, and most complete stock of* MEN'S, YOUTHS', and BOYS' CLOTHING in Philadelphia, to which large daily additions are made of fresh goods, replacing those sold.
9th. For reasons already enumerated we can, and do sell clothing in every respect superior—surpassed by none, equalled by few—at prices guaranteed *in all cases lower than the the lowest elsewhere*, or the sale cancelled and money refunded.
10th. If buyers should for any cause become dissatisfied after a purchase is made, if reported within a reasonable time, we pledge ourselves, by exchange, refunding of money, or otherwise, to give full satisfaction in every case, and request that all such may be reported to us for adjustment.

CARD.—Our stock of Fall and Winter Clothing is full and complete, and selling rapidly, but is as rapidly replenished each day with fresh and desirable styles of new goods, purchased recently, for cash, at great sacrifices, enabling us to sell at prices lower than have been known for years. Congratulating our patrons upon the decline of prices, which enables us to offer superior garments *at such low rates*, we request the favor of a call.

Halfway between Fifth and Sixth streets } BENNETT & CO., TOWER HALL, 518 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA.
jan3m6*] And 600 Broadway, NEW YORK.

ADDRESS TO THE NERVOUS AND DEBILITATED whose sufferings have been protracted from hideous causes, and whose cases require prompt treatment to render existence desirable. If you are suffering or have suffered from involuntary discharges, what effect does it produce upon your general health? Do you feel weak, debilitated, easily tired? Does a little extra exertion produce palpitation of the heart? Does your liver, or urinary organs, or your kidneys, frequently get out of order? Is your urine sometimes thick, milky, or flocky, or is it ropy on settling? Or does a thick scum rise to the top? Or is a sediment at the bottom after it has stood awhile? Do you have spells of short breathing or dyspepsia? Are your bowels constipated? Do you have spells of fainting or rushes of blood to the head? Is your memory impaired? Is your mind constantly dwelling upon this subject? Do you feel dull, listless, moping, tired of company, of life? Do you wish to be left alone, to get away from everybody? Does any little thing make you start or jump? Is your sleep broken or restless? Is the lustre of your eye as brilliant? The bloom on your cheek as bright? Do you enjoy yourself in society as well? Do you pursue your business with the same energy? Do you feel as much confidence in yourself? Are your spirits dull and flagging, given to fits or melancholy? If so, do not lay it to your liver or dyspepsia. Have you restless nights? Your back weak, your knees weak, and have but little appetite, and you attribute this to dyspepsia or liver-complaint?

Now, reader, self-abuse, venereal diseases badly cured, and sexual excesses, are all capable of producing a weakness of the generative organs. The organs of generation, when in perfect health, make the man. Did you ever think that those bold, defiant, energetic, persevering, successful business men are always those whose generative organs are in perfect health? You never hear such men complain of being melancholy, of nervousness, of palpitation of the heart. They are never afraid they cannot succeed in business; they don't become sad and discouraged; they are always polite and pleasant in the company of ladies, and look you and them right in the face—none of your downcast looks or any other meanness about them. I do not mean those who keep the organs inflamed by running to excess. These will not only ruin their constitutions, but also those they do business with or for.

How many men from badly-cured diseases, from the effects of self-abuse and excesses, have brought about that state of weakness in those organs that has reduced the general system so much as to induce almost every other disease—idiocy, lunacy, paralysis, spinal affections, suicide, and almost every other form of disease which humanity is heir to, and the real cause of the trouble scarcely ever suspected, and have doctored for all but the right one.

Diseases of these organs require the use of a diuretic. HELMBOLD'S FLUID EXTRACT BUCHU is the great Diuretic, and is a certain cure for diseases of the Bladder, Kidneys, Gravel, Dropsy, Organic Weakness, Female Complaints, General Debility, and all diseases of the Urinary Organs, whether existing in Male or Female, from whatever cause originating and no matter how long standing.

If no treatment is submitted to, Consumption or Insanity may ensue. Our flesh and blood are supported from these sources, and the health and happiness, and that of Posterity, depends upon prompt use of a reliable remedy.

Helmbold's Extract Buchu, established upward of 18 years, prepared by
H. T. HELMBOLD, Druggist,
594 Broadway, New York, and
104 South 10th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
PRICE—$1.25 per bottle, or 6 bottles for $6 50, delivered to any address. Sold by all Druggists everywhere. mar8,'67yl

TO CONSUMPTIVES.—The Rev. EDWARD A. WILSON will send (free of charge) to all who desire it, the prescription with the directions for making and using the simple remedy by which he was cured of a lung affection and that dread disease Consumption. His only object is to benefit the afflicted and he hopes every sufferer will try this prescription, as it will cost them nothing, and may prove a blessing. Please address Rev. EDWARD A WILSON, No. 165 South Second Street, Williamsburgh, New York. sep13m8

ITCH! ITCH!! ITCH!!!—*Scratch! Scratch!! Scratch!!!*—In from 10 48 hours

WHEATON'S OINTMENT	cures	THE ITCH.
WHEATON'S OINTMENT	cures	SALT RHEUM.
WHEATON'S OINTMENT	cures	TETTER.
WHEATON'S OINTMENT	cures	*Barbers' Itch.*
WHEATON'S OINTMENT	cures	*Old Sores.*
WHEATON'S OINTMENT	cures	*Every kind of Humor like Magic.*

Price, 50 cents a box; by mail, 60 cents. Address WEEKS & POTTER, No. 170 Washington Street, Boston, Mass. For sale by all Druggists. sep20,'67yl

INFORMATION.—Information guaranteed to produce a luxuriant growth of hair upon a bald head or beardless face, also a recipe for the removal of Pimples, Blotches, Eruptions, etc., on the skin, leaving the same soft, clear, and beautiful, can be obtained without charge by addressing THOS. F. CHAPMAN, Chemist, 823 Broadway, New York. sep13m8

CANCER, SCROFULA, &c., CURED.—☞ Persons afflicted with Cancer, Scrofula, Tumors, Eruptions, &c., are CURED by the use of Dr. GREENE'S ELECTRO-MEDICATED BATHS and Indian Vegetable remedies which cleanse the blood of all Humors, Mercury, Lead, &c., and restore health to invalids afflicted with every variety of disease. A book describing Cancer, Scrofula, Humors and other diseases, with their proper means of *cure*, may be obtained free at the Medical Institute, or by mail. Address Dr. R. GREENE, 16 Temple place, Boston, Mass.

ERRORS OF YOUTH.—A Gentleman who suffered for years from Nervous Debility, Premature Decay, and all the effects of youthful indiscretion, will, for the sake of suffering humanity, send free to all who need it, the recipe and directions for making the simple remedy by which he was cured. Sufferers wishing to profit by the advertiser's experience, can do so by addressing, in perfect confidence, JOHN B. OGDEN, mayl7,'67-ly Cedar Street, New York.

THE HEALING POOL, AND HOUSE OF MERCY.—Howard Association Reports, for YOUNG MEN, on the *crime of solitude*, and the *errors, abuses* and *diseases* which destroy the manly powers, and create impediments to *marriage*, with sure means of relief. Sent in sealed letter envelopes, free of charge. Address Dr. J. SKILLON HOUGHTON, Howard Association, Philadelphia, Pa. jan7,'67y1.