THE JUNE MAGAZINES.

"THE GALAXY." The Jane number of The Galaxy has the following table of contents:-

"Put Yourself in His Place," by Charles Reade, chapters xlii and xliii (with an illus-"Fra Angelico," by Margaret J. Preston: "Tobaccophagei and Tobaccophagism," by John C. Draper; "Enola," by Howard Glyndon; "American Men and Englishmen," by Justin McCarthy; "Keeping the Cash," by J. T. McKay; "Ten Years in Rome-Internal Economy of the Papal States, Ecclesiastical and Civil;" "Two Women," by Rebecca Harding Davis; "Ad Astra." by H. D. Ganse; "Senator Wilson and Edwin M. Stanton," by J. S. Black; "Hostages," by H. H.; "Early Incidents of the Rebellion," a chapter from Mr. Thurlow Weed's autobiography, by Thurlow Weed; "The Galaxy Miseellany;" "Drift-wood," by Philip Quilibet; "Literature and Art;" "Memoranda," by Mark Twain; "Nebulæ," by

the Editor. As entertaining reading for the hot weather as can be found in the magazine is the Hon. Jeremiah S. Black's letter to Senator Wilson in reply to his article entitled "Edwin M. Stanton," which appeared in the February number of The Atlantic. Judge Black opens with a general defense of President Buchanan and the members of his Cabinet, in which, however, he advances nothing very new or startling. The most interesting portion of his paper is that which refers to Mr. Stanton and the eulogy pronounced upon him by Senator Wilson. This we quote for the edification and delectation of our readers:

Your attacks upon Buchanan, Toucey, and Thompson might be safely passed in silence, but the character of Stanton must utterly perish if it be not defended against your

You give us the first information we ever had that Mr. Stanten, though acting with the Democratic party, was an abolitionist at heart almost from his earliest youth. For this fact you vouch his declaration to Judge Chase more than thirty years ago, at Columbus, Ohio; and you attempt to corroborate it by citing his association at Washington with Dr. Bailey and other abolitionists. If you tell the truth, he was the most marvellous impostor that ever lived or died. Among us, his political principles were thought to be as well known as his name and occupation. He never allowed his fidelity to be doubted for one moment. It was perfectly understood that he had no affinities whatever with men of your school in morals or politics. His condemnation of the abolitionists was unsparing for their hypoerisy, their corruption, their enmity to the Constitution, and their lawless disregard for the rights of States and individuals. Thus he won the confidence of Democrats. On the faith of such professions we promoted him in his business, and gave him office, honor, and fortune. But, according to your account, he was all the while waiting and hoping for the time to come when he could betray the Constitution and its friends into the cruel clutches of their enemies. For this cold-blooded and deliberate

treachery you bespeak the admiration of the

American people. You might as well propose to canonize Judas Iscariot. I maintain, on the other hand, that he was what he seemed to be, a sound and sincere friend, political and personal, of the men who showered their favors on his head. He had at least the average amount of attachment for "the Constitution of the United States, and for the peace, good order, and happiness of the same." As a necessary consequence, he dreaded the dishonest and destructive rule which he foresaw that you would be sure to establish as soon as you could. His Democracy did not cease when the war opened. In the summer of 1861, when your anti-constitutional principles began to be practically carried out by the kidnapping of innocent citizens, by the suppression of free speech, and by the enslavement of the press, he imprecated the vengeance of God and the law upon the guilty authors of those crimes with as much energy as any Democrat in the nation. Only a short time before his appointment as Secretary of War his love of liberty and legal justice impelled him to curse Mr. Lincoln himself with bitter curses. He called him by contemptuous names, and with simian, if not with "swinish phrase soiled his addition." I admit that he changed these sentiments afterwards, but I deny that he had adopted your way of thinking while he pretended to concur in ours. His conversion was a real one, produced by what he regarded "as good and sufficient reasons him thereunto moving," and it was accompanied, or immediately followed, by a corresponding change of his party attitude. He was not what you make him out, a mere fawning hypocrite.

The issue is plainly made. The friends of Mr. Stanton will not permit you to gibbet him in the face of the world after death has disarmed him of the power of self-defense. You must prove the injurious allegations you make or else accept the just consequences. If the Chief Justice will say that he knows Mr. Stanton to have been "in entire agreement" with the abolition party thirty years ago, his testimony may silence denial. But you must not trifle with us; we will hold you to strict proof; hearsay evidence will not be received; least of all will the fact be admitted upon the second-hand statement of a person who thinks, as you manifestly do think, that deception, fraud, and false pretenses are an honor to the man who practises them.

Next in chronological order is your assertion that Mr. Stanton, while yet a private citizen, advised Mr. Buchanan that it was the duty and the right of the Federal Government to coerce seceding States; that is to say, make war against all the inhabitants of every State in which an ordinance of secession had been or should be passed. Now, mark how plain a tale will put you down. Mr. Stanton never was consulted on that subject by the President until after he was Attorney-General; and he never at any time gave such advice as you put into his mouth. He never entertained any opinion of that kind, for he was a lawyer of large capacity and could not believe an absurdity. He had too much regard for his professional character to maintain a legal proposition which he knew to be false. He certainly would not have so debased himself in the eyes of the administration with whom he was particularly desirous,

at that time, to stand well. On this point I wish to be very distinct. I aver that Mr. Stanton thoroughly, cordially, and constantly approved of and concurred in the constitutional dectrines which you de nounce as timid and treasonable. He endorsed the opinion of his predecessor with extravagant and undeserved laudation; he

January, 1861, which expressed the same principles with added emphasis, was carefully read over to him before it was sent to Congress, and it received his un-qualified assent. The existing evidence of this can be easily adduced: it is direct as well as circumstantial, oral as well as documentary, and some of it is in the handwriting of Mr. Stanton himself. If you are willing to put the question into a proper form for judi-cial investigation, I will aid you in doing so, and give you an opportunity to make out

your case before an impartial tribunal. If your statement be true that Mr. Stanton disbelieved in the principles to which the administration was unchangeably pledged, how did he come to take office under it? Was he so anxious for public employment that he consented to give up his own convictions and assist in carrying out measures which his judgment condemned as the offspring of timidity and treason? Or, did he accept the confidence of the President and the Cabinet with a predetermined intent to betray it? Either way you make him guilty of unspeak-

But conceding that he would accept, why did the President, with the consent of his advisers, give the appointment to a man whom they knew to be hostile to them upon points so vital not only to the public interests but their own characters? That at such a time they would invite an undisguised enemy into their counsels, is a tale as wildly improbable as any that ever was swallowed by the credulity of the Salem witch-finders. Your own consciousness of this compels you to explain by attributing it to a special intervention of Divine Providence. Your impious theory is that Almighty God procured this appointment miraculously, in order that you, the enemies of the American Constitution, might have a spy in the camp of its friends. This will not serve your turn. Reason never refers a human event to supernatural agency, unless it be impossible to account for it in any other way. The mystery of this case is easily cleared up by the hypothesis that you have misrepresented it from beginning to end; which is no miracle at all, but quite in the

natural order of things.

The truth is, Mr. Stanton was in perfect accord with the administration, before and after he became a part of it, on every question of fundamental principle. He had unlimited confidence in the men with whom he was acting, and they confided in him. For his chief and some of his colleagues he professed an attachment literally boundless; for all of them who stayed during the term, and for Thompson, who did not stay, he was warm in his friendship. You would now have us believe that these were merely the arts of an accomplished impostor; that while he was, in appearance, zealously co-operating with us, he was reporting to you that "he saw treason in every part of the Government;" and that he was secretly using all the means in his power to stir up the vilest passions against us. Some evert acts of the treachery you ascribe to him are curious; for instance, the

Sumner story, which you tell with singular brevity and coolness. Mr. Sumner called on him at his office, for what purpose you do not disclose. Mr. Stanton did not receive his visitor either with the politeness of a gentleman or the courtesy due to a Senator, much less with the cordiality of a friend; but hus-tled him out of the building as if ashamed to be seen with him in daylight. He told him expressly that he did not dare to converse with him there, but would see him at one o'clock that night. The hour came, and then, when the city was wrapped in sleep, he skulked away to the meeting place, where, under the cover of darkness, he whispered the tales which he did not dare to utter in the hearing of the parties they were intended to ruin. And those parties were his friends and benefactors! Into what unfathomed gulf of moral degradation must the man have fallen who could be guilty of this! But remember, this is another second-hand story, and you are not a competent witness. We will trouble you to call Mr. Sumner, if you please. Let him testify what treason Stanton disclosed, and explain, if he can, how this midnight and secret information against men whom he was afraid to confront is consistent with Mr. Stanton's character as a courageous,

outspoken, and honest man.

He said nothing whatever to us about the treason which he saw in every part of the Government. He made no report of his discoveries to the President. He maintained unbroken his fraternal relations with his colleagues. By your own account, he admitted to Mr. Sumner that he did not dare to speak of such a thing even in his own office, lest it might reach the ears of his associates in the administration. Among the members of Congress whom you name as the recipients of his secret communications, not one man of moderate views is included; much less did he speak to any friend of the parties accused. He cautiously selected their bitterest enemies, and poured his venom into hearts already festering with spite. The House raised a committee "to investigate treasonable machinations and conspiracies," upon which there were members of both parties. Stanton did not go before it and tell his story; nor did he mention the subject to Cochrane, Reynolds, or Branch; but he "made an arrangement by which Messrs. Howard and Dawes were informed" of whatever they wanted to know. It appears, too, that a committee of vigilance was organized by the more active Republican members of Congress; in other words, the extreme partisans of both houses got up a secret body of their own, not to perform any legal duty pertaining to their offices, not to devise public measures for averting the ruin which threatened the country, but to prowl about in the dark for something to gratify personal malice or make a little capital for their party. You were a member of that committee, as it was fit you should be, and Mr. Stanton gave you "warnings and suggestions" how to proceed. This is what you call "rising in that crisis above the claims of partisanship. At night he assisted you to rake the sewers in search of materials to bespatter his colleagues, and every morning he appeared before them to "renew the assurances of his distinguished consideration." It was thus that, in your estimation, "he consecrated himself to the lofty duties of an exalted

patriotism. What cargoes of defamatory falsehood he must have consigned to your keeping! You do not break the foul bulk, but you have given us some samples which deserve examination. He denounced Mr. Toucey as false to his country, inspired Dawes' resolution against him, and expressed the belief that he ought to be arrested. Let us look at this

To Mr. Toucey's face Mr. Stanton breathed no syllable of censure upon his official conduct as head of the Navy Department. To the President or Cabinet he expressed no doubt of his wisdom, much less of his honesty. He met him every day with a face of smiling friendship. Toucey certainly had not the re-motest idea that Stanton was defaming him gave his adhesion to the annual message in behind his back, or conspiring with abolition-

as soon have suspected him of an intent to poison his food or stab him in his sleep. Can it be possible that Stanton was the author of the Dawes resolution?

That resolution is found in the Congressional Globe, Second Session, Thirty-sixth Congress, 1860-61, part second, pp. 1423-24. The proceeding was begun, no doubt, in the hope of finding something on which the charge could be founded of scattering the navy to prevent it from being used against the South. But that failed miserably; and the committee reported nothing worse than "a grave error" of the Secretary in accepting without delay or inquiry the resignation of certain naval officers. Even this had no foundation in law or fact. Its truth was denied and the evidence called for; none was produced. The right to explain and defend was demanded, but the gag of the previous question was applied before a word could be said. The accusers knew very well that it would not bear the slightest investigation. Mr. Sickles said truly (amid cries of "Order") that "censure without evidence disgraces only those who pronounce it." Mr. Toucey's reputation was never injuriously affected by it in the estimation of any fair-minded man. But you fish it up from the oblivion to which it has been consigned, and try to give it decency and dignity by saying that Stanton inspired it. You do not appear to perceive the hideous depth to which your assertion, if true, would drag him down. It is not true; the whole business bears the impress of a different mind. M. Stanton also suggested that his col-

league and friend Toucey ought to be arrested. This could not have been a proposition to take him into legal custody on a criminal charge regularly made. That would have been utterly impossible and absurd. The Dawes committee itself could find nothing against him but an error of judgment. The suggestion must have been to kidnap him, without an accusation or proof of probable cause, and consign him to some dungeon without trial or hope of other relief. If Stanton attempted to get this done, he was guilty of such perfidy as would have shocked the basest pander in the court of Louis XV. But to confute your libel upon Toucey and Stanton both, it is only necessary to recollect the fact that kidnapping of American citizens was at that time wholly unknown and absolutely impossible. We were living under a Democratic administration, the country was free, and law was supreme. Tyranny had not yet sunk its bloody fangs into the vitals of the national liberty. The systematic perjury which afterwards made the Constitution a dead letter was not then established as a rule of political

Your whole account of the "Cabinet scene" at which Floyd, "raging and storming, arraigned the President and Cabinet," and "the President trembled and grew pale," and Stanton met the baffled traitor and his fellow-conspirators with a storm of fierce and flery denunciation," is a pure and perfectly baseless fabrication. It is absurd to boot. What was Floyd's arraignment of the President and Cabinet for? You say for violating their pledges to the secessionists; and the charge against the President and Cabinet of violating their pledges was predicated solely on the fact that Colonel Anderson had removed from Fort Moultrie to Fort Sumter; and Floyd was disappointed in Colonel Andersen, whom he "had expected," as a Southern man, to "carry out his purposes in the interest of treason." This is mere drivelling at best, and it is completely exploded by the record, which shows that Colonel Anderson's transfer of his force from Fort Moultrie to Fort Sumter was in literal obedience to orders from the President, which Floyd himself had drawn up, signed, and transmitted. Moreover, Floyd at that time was not in a condition to arraign anybody. He himself had just before that been not only arraigned but condemned, and the President had notified him that he would be removed if he did not Was it this broken-down and powerless man who made the President tremble and grow pale by complaining that a subordinate had unexpectedly obeyed his own orders? You are not silly enough to say so. Was it Stanton's 'storm of fierce and fiery denunciation?" Stanton was no stormer in the presence of such men as he then had to deal with. His language was habitually deferential, his whole bearing decent, and his behavior at the council board was entirely free from the insolence you impute to it. Your tales do not hang together. No one can give credence to your report of bold and stormy denunciation by Stanton in the presence of his chief and his colleagues, and at the same time believe what you say of him at another place, where you describe him as a dastard, skulking about in the dead of night to find a place of concealment remote enough to make him safe, and confessing that he did not dare to breathe his accusation in the face of day. The crawling sycophant—the stealthy spy—who bargained so carefully for darkness and secrecy when he made his reports, must have been wholly unfitted to play the part of Jupiter Tonans in a square and open conflict. It is not possible that the fearless Stanton of your "Cabinet scene" could be the same Stanton who, at one o'clock in the night, was "squat like a toad" at the ear of Sumner,

Essaying by his devilish arts to reach

The organs of his fancy. I take it upon me to deny most emphatically that Mr. Stanton ever "wrote a full and detailed account of that Cabinet scene" by which you can have the least hope of being corroborated. I cannot prove a negative; but I can show that your assertion is incredible. That he should have coolly indited a letter, even though he never sent it, filled with foolish brags of his own prowess, which half a dozen men then living could prove to be false, was not consistent either with his prudence, veracity, or taste. Besides, he often spoke with me about the events of that period, and never in my hearing did manifest the slightest disposition misunderstand or misrepresent them. On the contrary, when a state-ment resembling yours about the Cabinet scene was published in a London paper, I suggested that he ought to contradict it; and he replied, explaining how and by whom it had been fabricated, but said it was not worth a contradiction, for every man of common intelligence would know it to be a mere tissue of lies. You cannot destroy Stanton's character for sense and decency by citing his own authority against himself. Nor can you find any other proof to sustain the story. is the weak invention of some scurvy politician, who sought to win the patronage of one administration by maligning another.

Some busy and insinuating rogue, Some cogging, cozening slave, to get some office, Hath devised this slander.

Your history of his appointment to the War Department is as erroneous as that which you have given of his conduct while Attorney-General. You say that he cordially indorsed Mr. Cameron's recommendation to arm the negroes against the white people of the South; many ways; and the special message of 8th ists to destroy his reputation. He would that Mr. Lincoln disapproved this and re-

quired it to be suppressed; that afterwards, when Cameron "felt the pressure of the mul-tiplied labor," he proposed to resign, but coupled his offer with a condition that "some one should be appointed not unfriendly to his policy," namely, the policy of arming ne-groes, to which Mr. Lincoln was himself opposed; that Cameron did resign upon these terms, and used the privilege conceded to him by suggesting the name of Stanton. Everybody who knows Simon Cameron will understand the object of dragging this thing by the head and shoulders into your article. In fact and in truth there was no kind of connection between these two men-no sympathy nor mutual respect. Cameron did not resign; he was removed for good cause. He had no lot or part in naming his successor. The removal and the appointment were both made before Mr. Cameron knew of either, and they were made because the President saw the necessity of having a man at the head of that department who was competent and incorruptible. The correspondence afterwards published under the names of Messrs. Lincoln and Cameron was fictitious, and got up at the instance of the latter to give the affair a false appearance. It is morally impossible that Stanton could have given his approval to Cameron's abortive report on the negroes; for he was at that time a white man every inch of him, proud

of the great race he sprang from, and full of faith in its capacity to fight its own battles and govern itself. Nothing would have humiliated him more than to see the American people relinquish their rightful place in the front rank of the world, surrender their inheritance of free government, and sneak back behind the African for protection in war or in peace. Long after he was Secre-tary of War he told Mr. Mallory, of Ken-tucky, that he had not only refused to sanction the enlistment of a negro regiment, but had punished an officer for merely proposing it. I understand that you have promised to contradict yourself on this subject, and I hope you will keep your word. Your account of his raid upon the Trea-

sury, in company with Governor Morton, would look very strange in a panegyric made by anybody else but you. I will restate the facts you have given, but without the drapery by which you conceal from yourself the view of them which must unavoidably be taken by all men who believe in the obligation of any law, human or divine. In the winter of 1863, the Legislature of Indiana was dissolved before the appropriations had been made to carry on the State government or aid in putting troops in the field. Of course, Congress did not, and could not, make appropriations for carrying on the State government or putting troops in the field, which the State was bound to raise at her own expense. But the Governor determined to get what money he wanted without authority of law, and h looked to Washington for assistance. President Lincoln declined to aid him, because no money could be taken from the Treasury without appropriation. Mr. Stanton, being applied to, saw the critical condition of the Governor, and, without scruple, joined him in his financial enterprise. He drew a warrant for a quarter of a million of dollars, and gave it to the Governor to spend as he pleased; not only without being authorized by any appropriation for that purpose, but in defiance of express law appropriating the same money to another and a totally different object. If this be true, the guilt of the parwhich the English language will supply. It was getting money out of the public treasury, not only unlawfully, but by a process as dis-honest as larceny. It involved the making of a fraudulent warrant, of which the moral turpitude was no less than that committed by a private individual when he fabricates and utters a false paper. It was a gross and palpable violation of the oaths which the Governor and Secretary had both taken. It was, by the statute of 1846, a felonious embezzlement of the money thus obtained, punishable by fine and ten years' imprisonment in the penitentiary. The parties, according to your version, were both conscious of the high crime they were perpetrating, for you make one say to the other, "If the cause fails you and I will be covered with prosecutions, and probably imprisoned or driven from the country." You do not diminish or mitigate the offense one whit by saying that the money was afterwards accounted for. A felony cannot be compounded or condoned by a simple restitution of the spoils; and the law I have cited was made expressly to prevent officers charged with the safe keeping, transfer, or disbursement of public money from using it to accommodate friends in a "critical condition." But what will be said of your trustworthiness as a contributor to history when the public comes to learn that this whole story is bogus? I pronounce it untrue in the aggregate and in the detail-in the sum total and in every item. The truth is this:-In 1863 the Democratic majority of the Indiana Legislature were ready and willing to pass their proper and usual appropriation bills, but were prevented by the Republican minority, who "bolted" and left the houses without a quorum until the constitutional limit of their session expired. The Governor refused to reconvene them, and thus, by his own fault and that of his friends, he was without the ways and means to pay the current expenses of the State. He was wrong, but his error was that of a violent partisan, not the crime of a corrupt magistrate. He did not come to Washington with any intention to relieve his necessities by plundering the Federal Treasury. He made no proposition either to Mr. Lincoln or Mr. Stanton that they or either of them should become his accomplices in any such infamous crime. His purpose was to demand payment of a debt due, and acknowledged to be due from the United States to the State of Indiana. The money had been appropriated by Congress to pay it, and it was paid according to law. I know not how Mr. Morton may like to see himself held up as a felon confess ing his guilt, but I can say, with some confidence, that if Mr. Stanton were alive he

What must amaze the readers of your article more than anything else is the perfect sincerity of the belief which you express, directly or indirectly, in every line of it, that the base misconduct you attribute to Mr. Stanton is eminently praiseworthy. You seem to be wholly unconscious of defaming the man you meant to eulogize. But, if your facts be accepted, the honor and honesty of them will not be measured by your standards. It may be true that public opinion has of late been sadly debauched; but the American people have not, permanently changed their code of morality. Good faith between man and man, personal integrity, social fidelity, observance of oaths, and obedience to the laws which hold society together, have heretofore been numbered among the virtues, and they will be again. The government of God has not been reconstructed. Fraud or force may abolish the Constitution, but the Ten Commandments and the golden rule are beyoud your reach; some persons have faith

would call you to a very severe reckoning.

enough to believe that even "the gates of hell shall not prevail against them."

The odious character you have given Mr.

Stanton is not merely unjust in itself, but, if uncontradicted, it must lead to other misconceptions of him. Besides the offenses against law, justice, humanity, and truth which you have enumerated and assigned to him for his glorification, he has been charged with others which, if established, must expose him to universal execration. For instance, it is asserted that in the winter of 1861, when he was a member of the Cabinet, he gave to Governor Brown, of Mississippi the most emphatic assurance of his conviction that secession was right, and urged him to "go on" with it; that in 1862, while he was writing the most affectionate letters to General McClellan, he not only maligned him at Washington, but maliciously plotted his defeat and the destruction of his army before Richmond; that he refused in 1864 to receive the Andersonville prisoners when offered freely without ransom, exchange, or other equivalent, though he knew that if left there they must perish miserably for want of the medicine and food which their captors had not the means to give them. These accusations, you are aware, have often been made, with horrible aggravations which I need not repeat. His friends have denied and discredited them, mainly on the ground that his character was wholly above such imputations. But you have done your full best to make this defense worthless. If he wore the cloak of constitutional democracy with us, and put on the livery of abolitionism with you, why should he not assume the garb of a secessionist with men of the South? If he tried to get his friend Toucey kidnapped, what moral principle could hinder him from contriving the ruin of his friend McClellan? If he craftily exerted himself at your end of the avenue to bring on a bloody civil war, which according to his own declarations at our end was unlawful and causeless, what crime against human life was he not capable of committing? If he willfully left our prisoners to certain starvation, and then managed falsely to throw the odium of their death upon the political enemies of the party in power, and thus contributed very largely to the enslavement of the Southern States, was not that an act of "intense and abounding patriotism," as well worthy of your praise as some others for which you have bestowed it? Those who give credit to you will find it perfectly logical to believe the worst that has ever been said

Sejanus has passed for about the worst specimen of ministerial depravity whom we have any account of; but nothing is re-corded of him which might not be believed of Stanton, if you are regarded as credible authority; for you have made it a labor of love to paint him as a master in the loathsome arts of treachery, dissimulation, and falsehood—unfaithful alike to private friendship and to public duty. With the talents he possessed, and the principles you ascribe to him, he might have made an invaluable Grand Vizier to a Turkish Sultan, provided the Sultan were in the prime of life and had no powerful brother near the throne; but in a ree country such a character cannot be

thought of without disgust and abhorrence. In your eyes the "intense and abounding patriotism" of Stanton is sufficient to atone not only for all the faults he had, but for all the offenses against law and morals which the utmost fertility of your imagination can lay to his charge; and patriotism in your vocabulary means devotion to the interests of that political sect which has you for one of its priests. This will not suffice. You cannot safely blacken a man with one hand and neutralize the effect by daubing on the whitewash of patriotism with the other. Patriotism, in its true sense, does indeed dignify and adorn human nature. It is an exalted and comprehensive species of charity, which hides a multitude of sins. The patriotism of Washington, which laid broad and deep the foundation of free institutions and set the noble example of implicit obedience to the laws; the patriotism of John Hampden, who voluntarily devoted his fortune and his life to the maintenance of legal justice; the patriotism of Cato, who resisted the de-structive madness of his countrymen, and greatly fell with a falling State; the patriotism of Daniel O'Connell, who spent his time and talents in constant efforts to relieve his people from the galling yoke of clerical oppression; the patriotism of the elder Pitt. who, speaking in the cause of universal liberty, loudly rejoiced that America had resisted the exactions of a tyrannical Parliament-to such patriotism some errors may be pardoned. When men like these are found to have committed a fault, it is well that history should deal with it tenderly,

"And, sad as angels for the good man's sin, Weep to record and blush to give it in." But the loyalty that tramples on law-the fidelity which stabs the liberties it ought to protect—the public zeal which expends itself in gratifying the vindictive or mercenary passions of one party by the unjust oppres-sion of another—this kind of patriotism has less claim to the admiration of the world. It is a cheap thing, readily supplied to any fac-tion unprincipled enough to pay for it. It is entirely too "intense and abounding;" and its intensity and abundance are always greatest in the worst times. It does not sanctify evil deeds. If it be not a sin in itself, it certainly deserves to be ranked among what Dr. Johnson calls "the rascally virtues."

Mr. Stanton's reputation is just now in a critical condition. He took no care of it while he lived, and he died, like Bacon, leaving a vulnerable name "to men's charitable speeches." He needs a more discriminating eulogist than you, and a far better defence than I am able to make. I have not attempted to portray his good qualites; I intended only to protest against your shameless parade of vices to which he was not addicted, and crimes which he never committed; and this I have done, not only because it is just to him but necessary for the vindication of others.

BOOTS AND SHOES.

BARTLETT,

No. 33 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

Ever thankful for the patronage extended heretofore, and desirous of further favors, begs announce his SPRING STYLES OF BOOTS and SHOES for Gents' and Boys' wear.

A large assortment of CUS FOM-MADE GOODS, made on his improved Lasts, which are unrivalled for comfort and beauty, enables him to furnish a ready fis at all times. 1 13 thatn Day

> STEAMBOAT LINES. FOR CHESTER, HOOK,

WILMINGTON.—The steamer S. M. FELWILMINGTON.—The steamer S. M. FELTON leaves CHESNUT STREET WHARF
at 10 A. M. and 250 P. M.; leaves WILMINGTON at 650
A. M. and 1250 P. M. Fare to Wilmington 15 cents
Excursion Tickets, 25 cents. Chester or Hook 10 cents;
Excursion Tickets, 15 cents,

55 lm

NATURE'S GIFTS,

SCIENTIFICALLY DEVELOPED.

As mankind, from indiscretion or other causes, has been doomed to suffer from disease, so also has remedy fer disease been provided. Our hills and valleys abound with roots and herbs, which if scientifically prepared and compounded, will restore health and vigor to the invalid. To find such a remedy we should seek one that has stood the

HOOFLAND'S

GERMAN BITTERS

Sure Cure for Liver Complaint fure Cure for Dyspepsia, Sure Cure for Debility, Sure Cure for Jaundice, Sure Cure for Marasmus,

in the Liver or Digestive Organs. The great remedy for

IMPURE BLOOD. And all diseases arising from it, The great preventive e

And all affections arising from weakness or want of action

FEVER AND AGUE

It is an impossibility for any one to have Fever and Ague if they will use a few bottles of this remedy each spring

> \$100 \$100 \$100

Will be given for any case of this disease that occurs to any one that uses the Bitters or Tonic as a proventive.

Those who have the Fever and Ague will find, after the chills have stopped, that by using a few bottles of the Bitters or Tonic, that the disease will not return.

These remedies will rebuild their Constitution faster than any other known remedy.

The remedies were placed before the public thirty years ago, with all the prejudices of so-called "patent medicine" operating against them, but gradually their virtues became known, and now, to day, they stand at the head of all preparations of their class, with the indorsement of eminent judges, lawyers, clergymen, and physicians.

Read the following symptoms, and if you find that your system is affected by any of them, you may rest assured that disease has commenced its attack on the most important organs of your body, and unless soon checked by the use of powerful remedies, a miserable life, soon terminating in death, will be the result.

Constitution,

Flatelence, Inward Piles, Fulness of

Blood to the Head, Acidity of
the Stomach, Nausca, Heartburn, Disgost for Food, Fulness or Weight in the Stomach, Swimming of fluttering at the
fit of the Stomach, Swimming of the Head, Hurried
ficult Breathing, Fluttering at the Heart, Choking
uffocating sensations when in a lying posture, Dinane
of Vision, Dots or Webs before the Sight, Dull Pain
in the Head, Deficiency of Perpisration, Yellewness of the Skin and Ryes, Pain in the Side,
Back, Chest, Limbs, etc. Sudden flushes
of Heat, Bursing in the Flesh,
Constant imagining of Myil,
and Great Depression
of Spirits.

All indicate disasse of the Liver or Digestive Organs combined with impure blood.

O

HOOFLAND'S GERMAN BITTERS

Is entirely vegetable and contains no liquor. It is a compound of Fluid Extracts. The Roots, Herbs, and Barks from which these extracts are made, are gathered in Germany; all the medicinal virtues are extracted from them by a scientific chemist. These extracts are then forwarded to this country to be used expressly for the manufacture of this Bitters. There is no alcoholic substance of any kind used in compounding the Bitters; hence it is free from all the objections incident to the use of a liquor preparation.

0 HOOFLAND'S GERMAN TONIO

Is a combination of all the ingredients of the Bitters with the purest quality of Santa Cruz Rum, Oranges, etc. It is used for the same discuses as the Bitters, in cases where some pure alcoholic stimulus is required.

TESTIMONY

Like the following was never before offered in behalf of any medicinal preparation:— HON. G. W. WOODWARD. Chief, Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. PHILADELPHIA, March 16, 1867.

I find "Hoefland's German Bitters" is a good Tonic, useful in diseases of the digestive organs, and of great benefit in cases

of debility and want of nervous actic in the system.
Yours, truly, GEO. W. WOODWARD

HON. JAMES THOMPSON,

Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. PHILADELPHIA, April 22, 1866.
I consider "Hoofland's German Bitters" a valuable medicine in case of attacks of Indigestion or Dyspepsia. I can certify this from my experience of it.

Yours, with respect,

JAMES THOMPSON.

HON. GEO. SHARSWOOD, Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

I have found by experience that "Hoefland's German Bitters is a very good tonic, relieving dyspeptic symptems almost immediately. GEORGE SHARSWOOD.

HON. WM. F. ROGERS. Mayor of the city of Buffalo, N. Y.

MAYOR'S OFFICE, BUFFALO, June 22, 1869.
I have used "Hoofland's German Bitters and Tonio" in

my family during the past year, and can recommend them as an excellent tonic, imparting tone and vigor to the system. Their use has been productive of decidedly beneficial effects.

WM. F. BOGERS. HON, JAMES M. WOOD, Ex-Mayor of Williamsport, Pennsylvania. I take great pleasure in recommending "Hoefland's German Tonic" to any one who may be afflicted with dyn-

pepsia. I had the dyspepsia so badly that it was impossible to keep any food on my stomach, and I became so weak as not to be able to walk half a mile. Two bottles of Tonic effected a perfect cure.

JAS. M. WOOD. JOHN EUTERMARKS, ESQ., Law Partner of Judge Maynard, Williamsport, Pa.

This is to certify that I have used "Hoofland's German Bitters" for dyspepsia, and found it an invaluable remedy.

CAUTION.

Hoofland's German Remedies are counterfeited. See that the signature of C. M. JACKSON is on the wrap-D

per of each bottle. All others are counterfeit. Principal Office and Manufactory at the German Medi-

NO. 631 ARCH STRRET, Philadelphia, Pa.

CHARLES M. EVANS, Proprietor,

FORMERLY C. M. JACKSON & CO.

PRICES.

er bottle, or half a dozen for

Do not forget to examine well the article you buy

FOR SALE BY ALL DRUGGISTS and Dealers in