Cambria Freeman.

A. APPLE, Editor and Publisher.

HE IS A FREEMAN WHOM THE TRUTH MAKES FREE, AND ALL ARE SLAVES BESIDE.

Terms, $2 per year in advance.

VOLUME 5. EBENSBURG, PA., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1871. NUMBER 2.

HE CATHOLIC WORLD,
A MONTHLY MAGAZINE OF
ERAL LITERATURE & SCIENCE,
EDITED BY REV. I. T. HECKER.]

...the Apostolate of the Most ...Archbishop of New York.

...RLD contains original ...from the best Catholic writers at ...as well as translations from ...of France, Germany, Belgium, ... readers are thus put in ...the choicest literary productions ...and convenient form. THE CATHO... a large double-column magazine ...making two large volumes, or 1728 ...matter is furnished to subscribers

IVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

...advance. Single Copies, Fifty Cents. ...Seven Volumes already published, ...bound in cloth, per vol... cloth, $4; half-morocco, 45; ...numbers of 96 cents each.

...and communications on busi... addressed to

LAWRENCE KEHOE,
...Catholic Publication Society,
9 Warren Street, New York.

...OF THE NEW CATHOLIC PRESS.—"It ...title and in the true sense suggests ...thoughtful discussion of general top... merely an equal.—*Boston Courier.*

...and able writers in its pages ...the asperities of con... ...the narrowness of sectarian... ...Christian Ages. "There is ...finely in this magazine; that ...which don't with a question just ...saying the thoughts of men."—*Hartford Press.* "It ...in Literary merit."—*Cincinnati Gazette.* "We do not see how any ...could be without it."—*Dubuque ...*

...We find ourselves always a turn... ...CATHOLIC WORLD, because we ...sure to find it fresh and pros... ...articles and festivals adapted ...to produce conviction ...—*Boston Religious Magazine.*

TOWN and COUNTRY PROPERTY
FOR SALE.

...OF GROUND in Mooretown, with ...House and Outbuildings. Cellar ...house. Will be sold cheap and ...

...LOT OF GROUND in Mooretown, 66 ...feet front and 240 feet deep. A ...number of Fruit Trees on this Lot. It ...desirable location for building.

...TWO STORY FRAME HOUSE ...the above; finely finished and ...conveniences. Good outbuildings and ...fruit trees.

...STORY FRAME HOUSE in East ...Cellar Kitchen, well and ...Good outbuildings and office on ...all in good repair. Located on Main ...Wells for $100.

...LARGE TWO STORY FRAME HOUSE ...West Ward, suitable for two families.— ...feet front on Main street and 204 feet ...Stabled. Rents for $150.

...TWO STORY FRAME HOUSE in West ...suitable for two families. Lot 60 feet ...Main street and 160 feet deep. A desi...

...BUILDING LOTS in West Ward, Ebensb'g. ...FUTURE LOTS, of about 6 acres each, one ...Ebensburg.

...LOTS suitable for coal wood, on LOTS ...acres each, one mile from town.

...ACRES Hemlock TIMBER LAND, ...to feet lumber. One and a half ...Ebensburg.

...FARM OF 160 ACRES, convenient to ...Ebensburg; cleared and in good order. ...apparatus or with No. 10.

...All the above described property will be ...sold on easy terms. Those desiring ...will call on or address the under... before the 1st day of January next.

J. AUG. HOOPS,
or P. A. SHOEMAKER.

Ebensburg, Dec. 1, 1870.

SHERIFF'S SALES.—By virtue of ...sundry writs of *Vend. Expon.*, issued out ...Court of Common Pleas of Cambria coun... ...directed, there will be exposed to ...public sale, at the Court House in Ebensburg, ...TUESDAY, the 7th day of FEBRUARY ...at 1 o'clock, P. M., the following Real Es...

...All the right, title and interest of Martin ...of, in and to the undivided half of a piece ...tract of land situate in Carroll township, Cambria ...county, adjoining lands of the Commissioners ...Penn, Jos. T. Kirkpatrick and H. C. Kirk... ...on the east, on the north by C. A. Read... ...containing 50 Acres, more or less, ...cleared and improved—now in ...occupancy of Michael Miller. Taken in ex... ...and to be sold as the property of P. P. Tier...

...Also, all the right, title and interest of Cuth... ...of, in and to a piece or parcel of ...situate in Summerhill township, Cambria ...adjoining lands of P. A. Scott, Stone... ...Wright, and others, contain... ...Acres, more or less, about 40 Acres ...of once cleared. Taken in execu... ...at the suit of M. D. Burk.

W. H. ROSAKER, Sheriff.

Sheriff's Office, Ebensburg, Jan. 18, 1871. 1-19-3.

JAMES F. MILLIKEN,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
AND REAL ESTATE AGENT,
HOLLIDAYSBURG, PA.

...attention given to the collection of ...claims in Cambria, Huntingdon, Bedford, ...and adjoining counties.

...desiring to purchase, rent, lease, sell ...real estate will find it greatly to ...to call on or address me.

...references in either English or Ger...

...—Wm. Mann, Esq., Messrs. Mor... ...& T. T. Wells, Philadel... ...T. Wall & Bro., W. A. Gordon, ...& Scoope, Esq., Pittsburg; Hon. John ...Hon. S. S. Blair, Hollidays... ...Rose, Altoona; D. W. Woods, ...Cyrus Elder, Esq., Johnstown; ...Esq., Bellefonte. [1-12.-1y.]

$250 PER MONTH — THE BEST ...SELLING BOOK ever published! ...who will sell our new work,

OUR HOME TALK AND MEDICAL ...COMMON SENSE.

...attention. There never was a book ...like it. Any body can sell it. Every ...does. Many agents are now making ...$200 per month selling this wonderful ...96 page Descriptive Catalogue sent ...application. We want good live Agents ...and will appreciate the merits of the ...when they find that it meets a universal ...wants who desire to do good as well as ...Address

J. C. McCURDY & Co., 62 Broome St., New York.

...1, 1871.-3m.

AUCTION!—Having purchased the ...following described articles at a Sheriff's ...the personal property of Samuel F. ...of Clearfield county, and left the same in ...the house of Libbie George during my ...I hereby caution all persons against ...meddling in any way with said property, viz: ...Bedding, 1 Bureau, 1 Bedstead, 1 ...Stands, 2 Stoves, 2 Rocking ...Carpets, 24 yards Carpet, 1 Breakfast ...Dishes.

S. M. DOUGLASS.

...Springs, Jan. 11, 1871. [1-19.-3t.]

EXECUTOR'S NOTICE.—

...Estate of MICH'L CUNNINGHAM, dec'd.

...Testamentary on the Estate of Mich'l ...late of Carroll township, Cambria ...deceased, having been granted to the un... ...residing in Carrolltown borough and ...township, they request all per... ...indebted to said estate to make immediate ...and those having claims will present ...duly authenticated for settlement.

HENRY STANGAN, } Executors.
JOHN MANNION, }

...Dec. 22, 1870.-6t

NOTICE.—The Account of Edward ...Evans, Assignee of Edward Miller, hav... ...filed in the Prothonotary's Office of ...county, notice is hereby given that ...will be confirmed by the Court of ...Pleas at March Term, 1871, if no suffi... ...reason be shown to the contrary.

J. K. HITE, Prothonotary.

Prothonotary's Office, Ebensburg, Jan. 12, 1871.-7-18.-4.

JUDGE BLACK ON STANTON.

WILSON AGAIN SQUELCHED.

To the Hon. Henry Wilson, Senator from Massachusetts:

Contrary to my first intentions, and not without reluctance, I lay aside other business of far greater importance while I take a brief review of your supplemental eulogy on Stanton. The occurrences which caused this change of mind might require explanation, but they are too entirely personal to occupy any space in these pages. Without more preface I give you my thoughts on your last essay.

You take violent exceptions to my former letter as being vituperative and ill-tempered. Let us see how the account stands between us on the score of mere manners, and then determine whether you have a right to set yourself up as an *arbitar elegantiarum*.

You wrote, or caused to be written, and published in a magazine of large circulation, an article in which you attacked the reputation of certain parties in a style so scandalous that vituperation is no name for it.—Without reserve or qualification you pronounced them guilty of the worst crimes known among men. The specific acts of which you accuse them, and the opprobrious epithets which you applied to them, were as insulting as you could make them. Most of the gentlemen thus assailed were dead; but that made no difference to you; your invective was not checked by any regard for the feelings of friends or relatives. The indecency of this was greatly aggravated by the fact that you put it in the form of a funeral panegyric upon whose recent and sudden death should have softened your party rage and solemnized your heart, or at least operated as a temporary sedative upon your appetite for defamation. What was I to do? My first impulse was—no matter what; I did not obey it. But I compelled that all the purposes of a fair vindication might be accomplished by a simple contradiction of your statements, coupled with the plain reasons which would show them to be unworthy of belief. I did this, and I did no more. I did it in terms so free from unnecessary harshness that I am amazed this moment at my own moderation. But you declare and affirm my denial to be an act of "reckless audacity;" to your eyes my *defence* is an *of*fence. I really cannot understand this, unless you suppose that your political opponents have no rights, even of reputation, which you are bound to respect, and that slander, like other injuries, is consecrated by loyalty when a democrat is the sufferer.

You made no attempt to impugn the soundness or truth of the law as I gave it to the President on the 20th November, 1860. That opinion was very simple as it stood upon the record; and in my former letter I gave you elementary principles, clarified by the most familiar illustrations, and brought the whole subject down to the level of the lowest understanding. Besides you had the aid of about a dozen Senators and members of Congress in getting up your reply. With all these helps you certainly might have specified some error in the opinion if it be erroneous. But you content yourself with merely railing at it. I think I may say, with more confidence than ever, that "you cannot be so ignorant of the fundamental law as not to know that our exposition of it was perfectly sound and correct."

While you do not deny its truth, you annihilate it by the assertion that is extensively disapproved. Do you really believe that an officer, dealing with questions of law, is bound to be popular rather than right? Will you never learn that "statesmen" and "patriots" of your school have notions about all the political virtues which a sound morality holds in utter detestation? To flatter the passions and cajole the understanding of the people is not the highest object of any honest man's ambition. Mr. Jefferson thought he ought to "do them as much good as possible, in spite of their teeth." But on your theory, to be "ever strong upon the stronger side," is not only good for us, but high desert; while it is mere imbecility to offend the powerful by letting the countenance of the law shine upon the weak or oppressed, who cannot reward you with office or money. If your theological opinions conform to your ideas of political duty, you esteem the luck of Barrabas as more meritorious than the fidelity of John or the devotion of all the Marys.

No doubt there was then, as there is now, a set of "small, but ferocious politicians," who became completely infuriated against me because I did not falsify the law, advise the President to violate the Constitution, and thus bring on an immediate dissolution of the Union. But you can hardly expect me to regret that I did not escape their censure. They were men that had been taught that enmity to the Constitution was the sum of all public and private virtue. There certainly is not an uncorrupted man in the country who will say that I was to blame for giving the law faithfully and truly.

You declare that "contemporaneous history has already pronounced" against me, and you quote a few words of twaddle, apparently from the writings of some one whose name you are ashamed to mention. You call this a judgment upon me which posterity will not be likely to reverse. Political power dishonestly wielded always has hacks to defend its excesses by maligning its opponents. A dozen books of that character have been printed within the last seven years. These productions come within the awkward descriptions you have given of your own; they are "not history or biography, nor intended to be;" they are places of deposit for worn-out calumnies—mere sewers into which the filth of the party is drained off. I hope I am tolerably secure from the praise of this venal tribe; and their abuse is *prima facie* evidence of a character at least negatively good. It is not worth while for you or me to trouble ourselves about *posterity*, for posterity will not probably take much account or us. No doubt you did all in your power to subvert the free institutions of our forefathers, and to debauch the political morals of the country; but the utmost exertions of your abilities has not sufficed to raise you above the common level of partizans who have engaged in the same evil work. On the other hand, the cause of liberty regulated by law has had a crowd of advocates so infinitely superior to me that my feeble efforts cannot be expected to attract the notice of future generations.

You make no attempt to justify your abuse of Mr. Buchanan; you do not repeat your charge against Mr. Toucey of scattering the ships of the navy to render that arm powerless; nor do you now pretend to assert that Mr. Thompson was guilty of robbing the Indian trust funds. But you offer no reparation, nor even an excuse, for the wanton and unprovoked injury which you tried to commit on the character of the living and the memory of the dead. You sullenly permit judgment to be rendered against you by *nil dicit*. I mention this only to say that it very seriously affects your credibility upon the other points. *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.*

You pervert my words and my meaning when you say that I represented Mr. Thompson as being above the range of *ordinary mortals*. I merely declared that his mental ability, good sense, and common honesty placed him very far beyond *you*, who had assailed him with a false charge of felonious robbery. You do not see the justice of this comparison, and you think that if I had not been a mere lawyer, having "little acquaintance or association with statesmen," I might have entertained a different notion. Although I consider my calling to be as reputable as any that you ever followed either before or after you took up the trade of a politician, you may make what deduction you please on that account from the value of my judgment; but you must not interfere with my undoubted right to believe (as I do most devotedly) that it would take a great many Wilsons to make one Thompson.

It was not expected that Governor Floyd would escape your maledictions. No public man ever provoked such a storm of popular wrath as he did. The President, who had trusted him, withdrew his confidence, drove him from his councils, and ordered him to be indicted for malversation in office. His colleagues left him to his fate, and there was nobody in all this land to take his part. He had some qualities which commanded the respect of folks like you as long as he lived and moved among you. But absent, unfriended, defenseless, dead—fallen in a lost cause and buried in an obscure grave—he was the very man of all others, in or out of the world, whom your magnanimity would prompt you to attack. But why did you not charge him with misconduct in the financial management of his department?—That might have provoked a comparison between him and Cameron, much to the disadvantage of the latter, whom you wished to court, flatter, and whitewash. Therefore you preferred to take up the exploded charge of sending guns and munitions to the south for the use of the secessionists in the war. Your first paper had nothing in it on this subject except the bold assertion, and I was content with a naked denial. But in your last you come back with a more extended averment, and produce what you seem to suppose will be taken as evidence by at least some of your readers. Let us look at it.

A committee was appointed by the House of Representatives in January, 1861, to ascertain how the public arms distributed during the year 1860 had been disposed of. Mr. Floyd was not present at the investigation; he had not a friend on the committee; it was "organized to convict" him if it could. It reported the evidence, but gave no judgment criminating him with the offense you accuse him of. On the contrary, the opinion was expressed by the chairman that the charges were founded in "rumor, speculation and misapprehension." But you take up the reported evidence and try to make out a case which the committee did *not* make out by carefully suppressing all the principal facts and misstating the others.

Your charge of fraudulently sending arms to the south cannot be true of the heavy cannon made at Pittsburgh for the forts in Louisiana and Texas, because they were not sent at all. Floyd gave an order to ship them on the 20th of December, 1860, but it was revoked by the President before a gun was started. It is, of course, possible that Floyd, in making the order, acted in bad faith; but there is no proof of that. On the contrary, Colonel Maynadier, an honest as well as a sharp man, and a most vigilant officer, who knew all the facts of the case, and understood Floyd's attitude with regard to secession and union as well as anybody in the whole country, cheerfully set about the business of carrying out the order, though it was not in writing, and testified that he had no suspicion of any improper object or motive in it. In fact and in truth, Floyd was not, in sentiment or in action, a secessionist until after he saw that the breach between himself and the President, which originated in other matters was irreparable. Up to the time when he got notice that he must resign, he was steadily opposed to the southern movement, and the bitterest enemies he had were the leading men in that section. Colonel Maynadier says that "he was regarded throughout the country as a strong advocate of the Union and opponent of secession;" and he adds as a confirmation of this, that "he has recently published over his own signature in a Richmond paper a letter on this subject, which gained for him high credit in the north for his boldness in rebuking the pernicious views of many in his own State." After he found the whole administration against him, he was driven by stress of necessity into the ranks of the party which he had previously opposed.

The great and important fact to which the resolution of the House directed and confined the attention of the committee, and which is made perfectly clear by the evidence, you do not refer to at all, but keep it carefully out of sight from beginning to end of your statement. The question was and is, whether the secretary of war under the Buchanan administration did at any time subsequent to the first of January, 1860, treacherously dispose of guns and munitions for the purpose of giving to the south an advantage in the war which the leaders in that section intended to make against the Federal government. This was the "rumor, speculation, and misapprehension," to which the chairman of the committee alluded; this is substantially what the partizan newspapers and stump orators have asserted and re-asserted over and over again, until thousands of persons in every part of the country have been made to believe it; this is what you meant by your first article, and what you persist in and re-affirm by your last. Now examine the facts. There was a law almost coeval with the government for the distribution of arms among the different states according to their representation in Congress, for the use of their militia. Under this law the ordnance bureau, without any special order from the head of the department, gave to each state that applied for it her proper quota of muskets and rifles of the best pattern and make for the regular army. During the year 1860 the number of muskets so distributed was exactly 8,423, of which the southern states received 2,091, while the northern states got nearly three times that number, to wit, 6,332. Some long-range rifles of the army calibre were distributed. The aggregate number amounting to 1,728, and they all went to northern states except 758, about half enough for one regiment, which were divided among Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana, the other states of the south receiving none. Why did you conceal these facts? You knew them, and you could not help but see their strict relevancy and great importance. Perhaps you did *not* know that the *suppressio veri* is as bad as the *suggestio falsi*, and thought it fair to make out a criminal charge against the dead rebel by keeping back as much of the truth as did not suit your purpose.

The fact that the south no states neglected to take their proper and just quotas, which they might have got for the asking, satisfied the committee, and no doubt fully convinced you, that there could have been no fraudulent combination in 1860 between them and the war department to rob the government of its arms for their benefit. That concluded the whole case, since it was impossible for a sane man to believe that such a plot could have been formed and acted upon at a previous time, and yet had no existance in the year immediately preceding the war. Nevertheless, the committee went back, and it was proved that in 1859, before any war was apprehended—before the election of Lincoln was dreamed of—before the division of the democracy, which made his election possible with a million majority against him—Floyd ordered a transfer of 115,000 muskets from northern to southern arsenals.—This you parade with great flourish as evidence of a most wicked robbery. But here we find you again at the disingenuous business (is not that a safe phrase?) of keeping back the truth which would have spoiled the force of your story. *These arms were all worthless and unserviceable.* We had 500,000 of them; they cumbered the northern arsenals, and could not be used; a law had been passed to authorize the sale of them; they were offered for years at two dollars and fifty cents apiece, about one-tenth the price of a good gun, and they could not be got off. Twice a considerable number were sold, but the purchasers upon further information refused to take them.—Of these 500,000 condemned muskets, the secretary of war in 1859 ordered 115,000 to be sent south, doubtless for the mere convenience of storage. To "weapon the rebellion" with arms like these would have insured its destruction the instant its force came into the presence of troops having improved modern guns in their hands. Floyd could not have done a greater injury to the southern cause than this would have been. Nor is it possible to believe that southern leaders would have conspired with him to purloin these useless arms in 1859, and then, in 1860, declined to take the share that legally belonged to them of the best muskets and rifles ever invented. All these facts appear in the evidence reported by the committee, from which you pretend to be making fair and candid citations, and you say not a word about them.

If you were "a mere lawyer," or any lawyer at all, and would go before a judicial tribunal mutilating the truth after this fashion, you would immediately be expelled from the profession, and no judge would ever permit you to open your mouth in a court of justice again. If you would appear as a witness, and in that character testify to the contents of a written document in the way you have set out this report to your readers, it might be followed by very disagreeable consequences, which I would not shock your polite ears by mentioning.

Mr. Cobb, while secretary of the treasury, performed his duties with singular purity, uprightness and ability. No enemy has ever ventured to point out a single public act done in that department by him of which the wisdom, the lawfulness, or the honesty could be even doubted. The disjointed and loose accusation of your first paper implied that by some official delinquency he had purposely disorganized the fiscal machinery of the government, or otherwise perpetrated some malicious mischief on the public credit. Now, however, you are reduced to the old and never failing resort of "treasonable utterances," something that he said in private conversation had the effect of injuring the credit of the United States. What was it? It is well known that the prices of all securities, public and private, began to go down immediately upon the Presidential election of 1860, and continued going down for years afterwards. Is this attributable to the treasonable utterances of Thomas, and Dix, and Chase? But what is the use of pursuing such a subject? Mr. Cobb was dead, and you felt a sort of necessity for doing some despite upon his grave. This feeble absurdity was all you could do.

I considered myself bound to defend Mr. Stanton against the praise which described his character as infamous. Down to the time of his apostacy we were close and intimate friends, and I thought I knew him as well as one man could be known to another. I do not claim that he owed me anything; for I made no sacrifices of myself or anybody else to serve him. I advanced him in his profession and thereby improved his fortune, but he got nothing in that way for which he did not render equivalent services. I strove long, and at last successfully, to remove the prejudices of Mr. Buchanan and others against him, because I thought them unjust, and because it was inconvenient for me that the President should not trust a man in whom I had unlimited confidence. I recommended him pressingly for postmaster general upon the death of Mr. Brown, solely for the reason that the exigencies of the public service in that department required a man of his great ability and industry. I caused him to be appointed attorney general, because I knew (or thought I knew) that he and I were in perfect accord on all questions, whether of law or policy, which he might have to deal with, and because I was sure he would handle them not only with fidelity, but with consummate skill. But though he was not in my debt, the apparent warmth of his nature impelled him to express his gratitude in most exaggerated language. After he took office under the Lincoln administration our paths diverged so widely that I did not often see him.—When I did, he sometimes overwhelmed me, as before, with hyperbolical demonstrations of thankfulness and friendship. If his feelings ever changed, he "died and made no sign" that was visible to me.

Here let me record my solemn declaration, that I never saw anything dishonorable in his conduct while I was associated with him. He never disappointed me while he was employed under me, or while we were colleagues in office; and he never failed me in anything which I had a right to expect at his hands. His enemies spoke evil of him, but that is "the rough brake that virtue must go through," and I allowed no tale-bearer to shake my faith. My own personal knowledge does not enable me to accuse him of any mean or disgraceful act. How far you have succeeded, or may hereafter be able to succeed, in proving him a treacherous hypocrite, is a question to be considered. But I am not one of your witnesses; my testimony, as far as it goes, is directly against you.

Under these circumstances it was impossible for me to be quite silent when I saw your publication in the "Atlantic," or to confine myself to a mere vindication of the other parties assaulted. It was plain to me that you had "wholly misunderstood the character of Mr. Stanton, and grossly injured him by what you supposed to be a panegyric." Your description of him, if accepted as true, would impel the belief that his whole political life was one long imposture; that as a trusted member of the Buchanan administration, he acted alternately the incompatible parts of a spy and a bully; that while he was the chief law officer of the government, he was engaged in the foulest conspiracy that ever was hatched against the life, liberty, and honor of a colleague for whom he was at that very time professing unbounded friendship; that he was the *protege* and crony of Simon Cameron, and appointed secretary of war to carry out his policy; that being so appointed he did loyally and feloniously embezzle public money to the amount of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars at one time. It is true that you were actuated by no malicious intent. You meant to do him honor. According to your moral apprehensions, all the evil you ascribed to him was good. When you wove for him this disgusting "wreath of mere gone to seed," you thought you were decorating his coffin with a chaplet of the choicest flowers. You painted a monster of depravity, and you expected the American people to worship it with all the fervor of savages when they fall down to adore the image of some hideous demon. No doubt the votive offering of your affection took this anomalous form because you believed that duplicity and crime employed against democrats would give him the highest claim he could have on the admiration of the abolitionist, and because it did greatly increase your own esteem and regard for him. But my interest in his reputation required that he should be properly appreciated by that *honest* portion of the people that still adhere to the moral creed of their fathers.

I do not assert that your last paper proves nothing. I will give you the full benefit of every fact you have established. So far as you have shown Mr. Stanton to be guilty of the baseness you impute to him, I will make no contest about it. But I will not yield one inch to any allegation of yours unsupported by evidence. I will try to save out of your hands as much of his character as you have not already destroyed by credible evidence. My effort was to take him down from the pillory to which you had nailed him by the ears as "a fit figure for scorn to point its finger at." You have done your strongest to oppose my rescue of him, and any partial success which may have rewarded your struggle, must be a great comfort of which I cannot justly deprive you. We will examine your evidence and see upon what points you have made out your case, and wherein you have come short of your aim.

I.—You asserted that Mr. Stanton had been from his earliest youth an abolitionist in his secret heart; that to leading men of that party he declared himself in entire agreement with them, and hoped for the time to come when he could aid them. In other words, he gave in his perfect adhesion to them, concurred in their views of public morality, and was willing to promote their designs against the federal and state governments whenever he could make himself most efficient to that end. At the same time he was in the democratic party by virtue of his declared faith in exactly the opposite sentiments. To us he made himself appear a democrat of the most ultra class. I do not say that he was an active propagandist; but all democrats with whom he spoke were impressed by the seeming strength of his attachment to those great principles by the application of which they hoped to save the Union from dissolution, the country from civil war, and the liberties of the people from the destruction with which your ascendancy threatened them. We took him on his word, believing him thoroughly, and gave him honor, office and high trusts. Now a man may be an honest democrat or a sincere abolitionist, but he cannot honestly and sincerely be both at the same time. Between those two parties the hostility was deadly. Each recognized the other as a mortal foe. They were as far assunder as the poles on every point of principle and policy. They differed not merely about rules for the interpretation of the organic law, but opposed each other on the broad question whether that law was entitled to any obedience at all. One of them respected and reverenced the constitution as the best government the world ever saw, while the other denounced it as an agreement with death and a covenant with hell, which it was meritorious even for its sworn officers to violate. If we loved any portion of it more than an other, it was that part which guarded the individual rights of the people by habeas corpus, jury trial, and other great judicial institutions, which our ancestors on both sides of the Atlantic had shed so much of their blood to establish; and it was precisely those provisions which had your bitterest enmity, and which you made the first use of your power to abolish, trample down, and destroy. Mr. Stanton could not have been truly on more than one side of such a controversy; he could not serve God and Mammon both; he could not be for the constitution and against it too; he could not at once believe and disbelieve in the sanctity of an oath to support it. He professed most fervently to be heart and soul with us. If he also professed to be with you, he was a hypocrite. If he kept up this fraudulent deceit for thirty years, and thereby got the highest places in the gift of both parties, he was "the most marvelous impostor that ever lived or died."

When your first article appeared, I did not believe that you had any ground for this shocking imputation upon his character. I was compelled to disbelieve and contradict it, for reasons which were then given and need not now be repeated. But I said the testimony of the chief justice would silence my denial. The chief justice has spoken out and sustained your assertion. You do prove by him a declaration from the lips of Mr. Stanton, made nearly thirty years ago, from which the inference is a fair one that he was in the democratic party with intent "to betray the constitution and his friends into the cruel clutches of their enemies" whenever he could find an opportunity.

But you are not satisfied with this. To make the brand ineffaceable, you show that several years after his declaration to Mr. Chase, he, being an avowed advocate and champion of democratic principles, was either appointed by his political brethren, or else volunteered to answer an abolition lecture delivered at Steubenville by a man named Weld. He disappointed all parties, including the lecturer himself, by declining to come forward, though very pointedly called for. He made no excuse at the time for deserting the cause he had undertaken, but afterwards he slipped round secretly and alone to the private room of the lecturer and gave himself in as a convert. "I meant," said he, "to fight you, but my guns are spiked, and I came to say that I now see with you," etc., etc. It never struck Mr. Weld that there was anything sneaking or shabby about this transaction. With the obliquity of vision peculiar to his political sect, he saw nothing but "hearty frankness, independence, moral insight and keen mental force" in the conduct of a man who privately denounced the opinions and principles which he publicly supported; and twenty-five years afterwards Mr. Weld piously thanks God on paper for such an artful dodger to serve as a leader of his party.

The next place you find him after the Steubenville affair is in the van of the Ohio democracy. They, too, believed in the "hearty frankness and independence" of the declarations he made to *them*. They showed their faith by their works; the legislature by a strict party vote elected him law reporter, an office which he sought eagerly, and received with many thanks.

In all the conflicts of the Buchanan administration with the abolitionists and their allies, he was an open-mouthed opponent of the latter. He was always sound on the Kansas question, and faithful among the faithless on the Lecompton constitution. So far as we, his democratic associates, were permitted to know him, no man detested more than he did the knavish trick of the abolitionists in preventing a vote on slavery by which it would have been expelled from Kansas and the whole trouble settled in the way they pretended to wish. He was out and out for Breckenridge in 1860, and regarded the salvation of the country as hanging on the forlorn hope of his election. To Mr. Buchanan himself, and to the members of his cabinet, he paid the most assiduous court, and was always ready for an occasion to serve them, and showed his devotion in ways which sometimes went rather too close to the verge of obsequiousness.

While we were looking at this side of his character, and supposing it had no other, he was, according to your understanding of his history, in "entire agreement" with the deadly enemies of every principle we believed in.

The mere fact that he paid visits to Dr. Bailey is nothing. It is nothing that he there met abolition people. All that might happen, and his fidelity to the constitution would mouth no feather. But you mention it as a remarkable circumstance, and it is remarkable, because abolitionists exclusively were to the habit of assembling there to talk over their plans, to concoct their slanders against the administration, and to lay their plots for the overthrow of the government and laws. It was a place where men congregated for political, not merely for social purposes, and Mr. Stanton knew he would be DE TROP unless he was one of them. He accordingly made himself not only acceptable, but interesting, by telling them that he was of Quaker blood, and got his abolitionism by inheritance; his grandfather liberated his slaves—he did—and purged the family of that sin; and Benjamin Lundy took him on his knee when he was a little boy, and taught him the political doctrine which he had never forgotten, but which he had opposed by every open act of his life. He was probably fresh from one of these SYMPOSIA when he went into court in the Sickles case and loudly bragged that he was the SON OF SLAVE HOLDING PARENTS; his father was a North Carolinian, and his mother a Virginian. You may see that part of his speech on page fifty one of the printed trial. It is hard to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, but Stanton seems to have mastered the difficulty.

Mr. Sumner's testimony to the early and thorough going abolitionism of Mr. Stanton is entitled to great weight, because it is coupled with an act which attests its entire sincerity. It is a part of his certificate that when Mr. Stanton's nomination as secretary of war was sent to the Senate, he (Sumner) immediately rose to urge the confirmation, stated his acquaintance with the nominee, and said emphatically, "Within my knowledge, he is one of us." Mr. Sumner certainly would not have made such a declaration at such a time and for such a purpose unless he had the clearest conviction, based upon personal knowledge, that Mr. Stanton was an abolitionist of the most virulent type, prepared to tread the constitution and the statute book under his feet, and ready to go all lengths for the subversion of liberty and justice.

There is another fact corroborating your view which you have not mentioned, but of which you are fairly entitled to the benefit. When Mr. Stanton went into the war department, he immediately began to act with reckless disregard of his sworn duty. He surrounded himself with the most loathsome miscreants, and used them for the foulest purposes. Law, justice and humanity were utterly outraged.—Those who knew him as I did, and heard him curse the perpetrators of such crimes only a month or two before, exercised the charity which believeth in all things, and concluded he was moved by some headlong impulse which had suddenly revolutionized his thoughts, feelings, and principles of action. But your proofs show that in the kindness of our construction we did not give heed enough to the maxim, NEMO REPENTE FUIT TURPISSIMUS. Such a depth could not be reached by a single plunge. The integrity of his moral nature must have previously undergone that gradual process of decomposition which could result only from long and sympathetic association with the enemies of the constitution.

On the whole, it must be admitted that you have made out this part of your case. With democrats he was a democrat, enjoying their confidence and taking their favors, while he caused to be well understood among "men of your school in morals and politics," that his devotion to the democracy was entirely simulated. It is now almost clear beyond doubt that to southern men he avowed himself a full-blooded secessionist. The testimony of Gov. Brown to that effect is as good as any that can have produced to prove him an abolitionist, and you have made the fact so probable in itself that very slight proof would be sufficient to establish it.

Is not my conclusion a fair one from the premises, that this is the most "marvelous" imposture upon record? Does the history of the world hold on all its pages of wonders another case in which a man has raised himself to the highest public employments under two different parties of diametrically opposite and hostile principles, by making simultaneous professions of fidelity to both of them? Do not mention Sunderland, for his hypocrisy gained him nothing; nor Talleyrand, for he was merely a trimmer; nor Benedict Arnold, for he acted his double part only during a few months, and closed it with ignominious failure. To find a parallel, you must go to another scene of action, and a far lower line of life.—Jonathan Wild for twenty years imposed himself on the London police as an honest man and a most zealous friend of justice, pretended to assist the officers in their business, and shared richly in their rewards; but during all that time he was the adviser, the "guide, philosopher and friend" of the principal thieves of the city, and to them he constantly betrayed the measures taken by the public authorities for the preservation of order and law.

II.—We are directly at issue upon the question whether or not Mr. Stanton advised President Buchanan, before his appointment as attorney general, that war might be legally made against the states, and the people thereof, in which ordinances of secession had been passed, by way of coercing them to remain in the Union. You say he was sent for by the President, and gave him that advice, accompanied by an argument in writing, which was so convincing that it was inserted in the first draft of the message, but afterwards stricken out. No such paper being in existence, and Mr. Buchanan as well as Mr. Stanton being dead, your allegation is easily made; if it be true, it is hard to prove, and though false, it is harder still to disprove. The evidence you produce is Mr. Dawes's statement that Mr. Stanton told him so. I say nothing about the danger of relying on the accuracy of a conversation reproduced from mere recollection, after so long a time; but I answer that it is not true, for the following reasons:

1. Mr. Buchanan made it a rule never to seek advice from outsiders on legal questions. When he was in doubt, he took the opinions of those who were officially responsible for their correctness. He had no kitchen cabinet.

2. If he had made this an exceptional case, and taken Mr. Stanton into his counsels by the back stairs, and if Mr. Stanton had furnished him with a paper which produced conviction on his mind that all his constitutional advisers were wrong, he would most certainly have shown it to them, or told them of it.

3. Mr. Stanton was a lawyer of undoubted ability, and the absurd opinion which you attribute to him could not have found a lodgment in his mind, even for one moment.

4. If he really had entertained such a notion, and desired in good faith to impress it upon the administration, he would not (I think he could not) have concealed it from me. It would have been contrary to the whole tenor of his behavior in those days, and what is more, very much against his own interests.

5. He did express views exactly the opposite of those which you say he urged upon the President. He endorsed the opinion which I gave on the 20th of November, 1860, in extravagant terms of approbation, adhered steadily to the doctrines of the annual message, and when required officially to pronounce upon the special message of January, 1861, he gave his concurrence heartily, strongly and unequivocally. In all the discussions upon the subject, he did not once intimate that there was, or ever had been, the slightest difference between him and the other members of the administration. Do you mean to say that this was mere sham? Was he so utterly devoid of all sincerity, honor, and truth, that he gave the whole weight of his influence and power to the support of a doctrine which he believed to be not only false but pernicious? If he was such a knave as that, then tell me what reliance can be placed on any statement he may have made to Mr. Dawes.

III.—Did he betray the Buchanan administration while he was a member of it? Was he false to the principles that he pretended to believe in? Was he treacherously engaged with you in trying to defeat the measures he was trusted to support? Did he aid and strengthen and assist in your efforts to blacken the reputation of his associates and friends? Before these questions are answered, let us look for a moment at the situation we were in.

Mr. Buchanan was compassed round on all sides with more difficulties and dangers than any other public man in this country ever encountered. The party which elected him was utterly routed; its force was wasted by division, its heart broken by defeat. Every northern State was in the hands of political enemies, flushed with the insolence of newly acquired power; and after his official condemnation of secession, the south fell away from his side in a body. With bitter, remorseless, unrelenting foes in front, and flank, and rear, he was literally unsupported by any political organization capable of making itself felt. But he was "shielded, and helmed, and weaponed with the truth," and he went right onward in the path made sacred by the footsteps of his great predecessors. He declared the secession ordinances mere nullities; the Union was not for a day, but for all time; a State could not interpose itself between the federal government and individual citizens who violated federal laws; the coercive power did not apply to a State, and could not be used for purposes of indiscriminate carnage in which the innocent and the guilty would be mingled together; but the law must be executed, and the just rights of the federal government maintained in every part of the country against all opposers. The whole theory of the constitution, as expounded by the men who made it, and all their successors down to that time, justice, humanity, patriotism, honor, and conscience, required him to announce and maintain these principles. They were not only true, but were either expressly or impliedly admitted to be true by all except the open and avowed enemies of the Union.—The secessionists, of course, had trained themselves to a different way of thinking, and they immediately assumed an attitude of pronounced hostility to the administration. The foremost of the abolition orators and the leading news-