The American Volunteer.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING BY JOHN B. BRATTON.

OFFICE—SOUTH MARKET SQUARE.

TERMS:—Two Dollars per year if paid strictly in advance; Two Dollars and Fifty Cents if paid within three months; after which Three Dollars will be charged. These terms will be rigidly adhered to in every instance. No subscription discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Editor.

The American Volunteer.

BY JOHN B. BRATTON. CARLISLE, PA., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1872. VOL. 58.—NO. 38.

Rates for Advertising.

ADVERTISEMENTS will be inserted at Ten Cents per line for the first insertion, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Quarterly, half-yearly, and yearly advertisements inserted at a liberal reduction on the above rates. Advertisements should be accompanied by the CASH. When sent without any length of time specified for publication, they will be continued until ordered out and charged accordingly.

JOB PRINTING.

CARDS, HANDBILLS, CIRCULARS, and every other description of JOB and CARD Printing.

Poetical.

MANIFEST DESTINY.

(From the Aldine for February.)

Nothing is as it was of old.
Where cities stood the cattle browse;
Weeds strike their roots through royal mould;
The lizards bask in Cæsar's house.
What Cheops built the Pyramid?
Whose dust, if any, there is hid?

If these, the master-races, fell,
Much more the tribes whom they o'erthrow.
From whence they came, no man can tell,
Nor whither vanished like the dew.
The same destruction now, as then,
Makes obsolete these outworn men.

The red man, whom our hardy sires
Found in possession of the land;
Who built in woods his wigwam fires,
And smoked his pipe; or, bow in hand,
Crept on the wild deer, or the bear—
Or tracked the panther to his lair;

Who, grim, and hard of heart at best
Daubed in his war-paint, stole away,
With twenty devils in his breast,
To where his hated foemen lay;
Whom, if asleep he could not find,
And his strong arms in pinions bind.

To burn him at the dreadful stake—
He would devote to sudden death;—
As suddenly his scalp would take,
And mock the rattle in his breath;
Then, if pappoose and squaw he saw,
Would massacre pappoose and squaw!

These bronze barbarians of the Past,
Cast in the moulds of hell, are gone;
Their world was wanted; far and fast
We drove them towards the setting sun,
Ay, and if future need should be,
We'll drown them in the Western sea!

With iron nets we hold their trail;
They find us wheresoe'er they go;
Though fierce they cannot make us quail,
Nor match the rifle with the bow.
We'll give them graves, and let them try
The happy hunting grounds on high!

GOLD!—BITTERLY COLD!

Cold! bitterly cold!
The moon is bright,
And the snow is white,
Beautiful to behold,
But the wind is howling,
Like the hungry prowling
Wolves on the wintry world,
Cold! bitterly cold!

My shawl is ragged and old;
The hearth deserted and dark,
Gladdened by never a spark,
And my only light
Is the pitiless white
Of the moonbeam's chill,
Silvery chill,
Cruelly—splendidly bright,
This frosty Winter's night—
Cold!—bitterly cold!

Babe, more precious than gold,
Rest, little one, rest!
Sleep, my own one,
Clasped to thy mother's breast;
Though thin and wasted her form,
Her arms shall enfold,
And shield thee from the cold;
For the love in her breast is warm,
Though the chill night's breeze
May the life-blood freeze—
Cold!—bitterly cold!

Cold!—bitterly cold!
My eyes are dim,
And my senses swim,
I am prematurely old!
Foodless and fireless,
Almost sitteless,
Wrapt in rags so scanty and thin,
With bones that stare through the colorless skin,
Weary and worn,
Tattered and torn,
If I should wish I had ne'er been born,
Tell me, is it a sin?
Cold world!—bitterly cold!

Political.

FOUND WANTING.

THE ADMINISTRATION WEIGHED IN THE BALANCE.

A MIGHTY SPEECH BY CARL SCHURZ.

THE FRENCH ARMS JOB LAID BARE TO THE BONE.

NO MERCY SHOWN MORTON OR CONKLING.

&c., &c., &c.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 20.—The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution to investigate the alleged sale of arms to French agents during the Franco-Prussian war. Mr. Schurz was entitled to the floor. Before he began to speak Mr. Fenton remarked that the galleries were completely filled, and asked and obtained unanimous consent that ladies who could not find seats in the galleries should be allowed to occupy the cloak-rooms.

Mr. SCHURZ, (Rad., Mo.) then addressed the Senate. He said: The weakness of a cause is apt to disclose itself by the nature of the arguments used in its support. When we hear a case advocated by insinuations and innuendoes with regard to the motives of those who have taken the other side, we are very apt to suppose that there must be something wrong. Nobody who has listened to the speeches of the Senators from Indiana and New York (Morton and Conkling) would deny that the general rule applies to the present matter. The Senator from Indiana (Morton) tried to convince the Senate that there could be no suspicion connected with the sale of arms by this government to certain persons, because every road out of the Republican party led into the Democratic—(laughter)—and because the platform of the Missouri liberals does not accord with his views, and must therefore be unrepublican and radically wrong, and because he is in favor of the

RE-ELECTION OF GEN. GRANT,

and is sure to have it. (Laughter.)—The Senator from New York (Mr Conkling), whom I very sincerely regret not to see in his seat after his gallant exploit of yesterday, followed in the footsteps of the Senator from Indiana. He tried to convince us that the sales of arms must necessarily be free from blame, because there is no impression abroad that there is a military ring in this country; because there is an impression of the existence of a Senatorial cabal bent upon destroying this administration; and because the Democrats are circulating in New Hampshire the speeches of certain Republican Senators in order to defeat the administration party there.—Now, sir, I will not deny that these were very eloquently expressed, and might have been proper elsewhere, but certainly they did not throw much light on the question now under discussion, and I should be glad to pass them over, did I not desire to devote a very few remarks to one thing said by that Senator.

WITH AN AIR OF TRIUMPH

he held up a pamphlet purporting to contain one of my speeches, saying that it was circulated by the Democratic party in New Hampshire, and was producing a greater effect than any other document. I have since inquired into that matter, and what do you think that pamphlet contains? It contains the speeches of the Senators from Illinois, Massachusetts, and Nebraska and myself, and they are speeches denouncing the corruption prevailing in the Custom-house in New York. If such things work against the success of the administration party, then the fault does not lie with those who denounce corruption. It is those sycophants, who by covering up every abuse, ever so glaring, and defending every violation of law ever so scandalous, who have brought the commonwealth to the pass where we now find it. Yes, there is a Senatorial cabal upon this floor. It is that cabal which defeated the San Domingo scheme. It is that cabal which forced the investigation of the

CORRUPTION IN THE NEW YORK CUSTOM-HOUSE.

It is that cabal which exposed those abuses and rendered necessary their reformation; "and let me tell the Senate that those speeches of ours would not have produced the least effect upon the Republican voters of New Hampshire if it could have been said at the same time that those abuses, which were laid open in all their deformity a whole year ago, had been abolished, and if it could have been denied that Leet & Stocking were at that moment still plundering the merchants of New York." Mr. Schurz then said that the subject before the Senate stripped of all personal matters, raised three questions. The first was, what was done in accordance with the rule of conduct laid by the government for its own action—the rule that no arms should be sold to any known agent of any belligerent? Second, was what done in accordance with the laws of the country? Third, is there in the facts as they stand before us any

GROUND FOR SUSPICION OF CORRUPT PRACTICES

connected with the transaction? In discussing the first he said it was absurd to assert that these sales were made under the ordinary circumstances surrounding previous sales. It was true that the government had been selling arms all along since the end of the rebellion, and nobody found any fault. But when the great war between France and Germany had broken out, and the President had issued his proclamation of neutrality, would anybody say that no extraordinary precautions were then necessary in the sale of arms? Individuals might be pardoned for taking refuge behind a technical ignorance of the destination of the arms, but a nation could not afford to do that, because its honor and its character among nations were at stake. Mr. Schurz read a letter written by the Chief of Ordnance, describing, he said, the operations of the War Department in making sales of arms at that period. The letter stated that bids had been invited by sending out letters to the principal dealers in arms. It was remarkable, however, that Baker & Co., the only very great arms merchants in New York were not notified, and only

LEARNED BY ACCIDENT

that the sales were to take place. Upon making the discovery Baker came to Washington and notified the Prussian Minister. The minister went to the War Department and asked that the sales should be put off for a few days, and it was done. The Senator from New York (Mr. Conkling) had said that Baker & Co., bought arms which afterwards got into the hands of Germany. That was a mistake. He (Schurz) had been in communication with that house and had ascertained the fact, which was, that they had bid upon a quantity of arms for the purpose of keeping them from the French, expecting to be recompensed by the German government; but the government declined to have anything to do with the arms, and they passed into the hands of Schuyler, Hartley & Graham, and afterwards into the hands of the French. There were new calls for bids, to be opened on the 20th of October. On October 21, at 4 P. M., the

SALES OF A LARGE AMOUNT OF ARMS

to several firms were completed, and according to a despatch of the French Consul *all those arms had been already partly paid for by the French government on the 22nd of October*, just ONE DAY *after the sales from the Department were completed*. Certainly the business was done promptly—(laughter)—and the question naturally suggested whether when Squires was discovered as a French agent the sales were not postponed in order to give him an opportunity to make arrangements with other parties. He did not charge that this was the fact, but he would ask every fair-minded man whether the suspicion did not lie dreadfully near. Then came the sales to Richardson. When the War Department was not offering to the large arms dealers, did it address one of its letters to Mr. Thomas Richardson, counsellor at law at Ilion, New York? (Laughter.) The Senator from New York had laid great stress upon what he assumed to be a fact, that Richardson need not have appeared personally at the department in negotiating his purchase, and that it could have been done by merely sending in his bid accompanied by

TWENTY PER CENT. OF THE PURCHASE MONEY.

The record showed, however, that the business could not have been done in that way, because some effort was necessary in order to satisfy the conscience of the War Department about the propriety of making the cartridges, and it showed, also, that that effort was made, not by Richardson in person, but by another gentleman—Mr. Remington—the same Remington who, on the 15th of the preceding October, had been discoveed to be an agent of the French government. As further evidence that there did exist just grounds for suspicion, and therefore for investigation. Mr. Schurz read two extracts from testimony given by Mr. Remington in France on the trial of Place. Mr. Remington, being a witness under oath, said: "I did not regard myself as obliged to make advances, and this still less, inasmuch as I had myself to pay to the government of the United States an advance of ten to twenty per cent." Again, before the investigating committee of the French Assembly, he said: "By the French government I was charged to treat with the government of the United States." This last statement also showed

WHAT BROUGHT REMINGTON BACK

to this country in December of that year. He came to transact the business connected with the purchase which was ostensibly made by Richardson, the lawyer, and it was after his return here on that errand that the interviews and negotiations described in his (Remington's) letter took place. The Senator from Indiana (Mr. Morton) had objected to his (Schurz's) statement the other day that the government was not only bound not to sell to men whom they knew to be agents of either belligerent, but also to satisfy themselves by all the means of information in their possession that persons applying for arms were not the agents of one or the other belligerent; but he (Schurz) was willing to accept Mr. Morton's statement of the rule, which was that if the government had reason to believe that the person buying the arms was an agent of the French government, they had no right to make the sale, and that all the government was called upon to know was that the purchaser was not the agent of one or the other of the belligerents, and he insisted that the government had

FAILED TO DO ITS DUTY.

Judge even by that rule. The Senator from New York (Mr. Conkling) had said that 'cash' was the purchaser. That might be well, provided this Mr. Cash was not the representative of a known agent of the French government. No matter, says the Senator from New York (Mr. Conkling) "cash" is the man who buys, and we look at nothing but cash. But then where is our reasonable diligence? Where is our good faith? No matter, says the Senator, this great American Republic of ours understands her good faith and interprets her neutral duties upon strictly "cash principles."—(Laughter.) Proudly the standard of our national morality and honor was borne aloft by the Senators from New York with a dollar mark in cash as the coat of arms of this great republic of the United States. (Laughter.) Seriously speaking, are we sensible men? Are we honest men? Is this our rule of neutral duty? Is this the rule to be observed not only by us but toward us? Let me warn Senators to pause long before they commit themselves to any position so absurd, so mean, so utterly dishonorable. Let me tell them it is not safe for nations to play

LITTLE TRICKY GAMES

and endeavor to cover themselves up with little quibbling technicalities. Mr. Schurz discussed this at great length, and as additional evidence that there was ground for suspicion and investigation, read a passage from the testimony given by Jules Lecense who was president of the Armament Committee at Tours, in France, while these sales were going on. The question was upon a certain overcharge on a lot of rifles, and this witness said, "*There was no expense beyond the percentage allowed to Remington*, SINCE WE HAD TREATED DIRECTLY WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, *which delivered these arms free of charge on board the vessels.*" After this and the other statements he [Mr. Schurz] thought the Senators should cease to talk about the want of patriotism of those who called the attention of the Senate and the country to this matter. It was quite evident that foreign governments were as well informed as they were, or even better.—(Laughter.) These

STATEMENTS MADE UNDER OATH

in foreign courts left no course open for the United States except to investigate and show the statements to be false if they were so, or if they were true to punish the guilty.

The second question was, were the laws of our own country violated? and he argued that it was at least a proceeding of doubtful legality to sell the breach-loading rifles at all. The statute authorized the sale of old cannon, arms, and other ordinance stores which were *damaged or otherwise unsuitable* for the United States, military service or for the militia of U. S., and under this the Chief of Ordinance had assumed the right to sell a large number of breach-loading rifles of the patern of 1866, and that at a time when the militia throughout the country were armed with old muzzle-loaders.

A LAME EXCUSE.

Mr. Morton said that the breach-loaders were of a discarded pattern, and that it was the intention of the government to arm the militia with an improved rifle. In view of this fact, therefore, the discarded rifles did not properly come within the classes of ordnance stores mentioned in the statute.

Mr. Schurz said that the Secretary of War and the Chief of Ordnance had some doubt about the propriety of their action at the time, and he had a letter from the Chief of Ordnance to General Belknap stating that the arms so sold were fit for the United States service. He felt authorized, therefore, to charge

FLAGRANT AND MANIFEST BREACH OF LAW.

He charged it on the showing of the Chief of Ordnance himself, and if there was to be any quibbling about this point he would be glad to hear it at once. Possibly an attempt would be made to explain it away too, but he would ask the Senate what would become of popular respect for the laws if the law-makers thus recklessly quibbled away their meaning?—What would become of constitutional government in this country if the executive officers of the government were to be allowed to feel that they might disregard the plainest provisions of law, and that, like Cæsar Augustus, they could always rely upon a submissive and obedient Senate? He begged the Senate to remember that there was

MORE AT STAKE THAN CARTRIDGES

or cash. On the third point Mr. Schurz argued that the facts already shown were enough to justify a suspicion of corrupt transactions. The testimony of Remington and of the French officials, already referred to; the anxiety of the Chief of Ordnance to aid Remington in settling his accounts in France relating to the same transactions, for which he (Remington) had been ostensibly driven out of the War Department; the difference between the amounts paid by the French and those received by our government; the jeopardizing of our national relations; the risking of our internal harmony; the flagrant and *confessed* violation of law by the War Department; and the mysterious disappearance of large sums of money—all these facts and circumstances went to show that there was ground for suspicion and for investigation. And the Senators on the other side knew it and felt it keenly, as was shown by these attempts to divert the Senate and the country from the true question by charging those who urge this resolution with acting as French agents, and with want of patriotism.—These charges were

FLIMSY AND ABSURD.

It was the duty of the government to investigate this matter, and if the wrongs charged upon the Executive Department have been committed it was the duty of the legislative department of the government to frankly and boldly disavow them. That was the only course worthy of the American republic, and therefore he was not afraid to discuss these matters in the Senate and denounce the wrong in them, for he remembered that Cobden and Bright, when they warned the British Parliament of the consequences of its conduct during the rebellion, were far better patriots than those who decried them for it. Mr. Schurz then spoke of the amendment offered by Mr. Conkling, ordering the committee to inquire whether any Senator or American citizen had been in collusion with any foreign agent or spy, &c., and said it was a subject of rather a painful character. He regretted that the Senator had introduced that amendment for his own sake. He reminded him that spies were used only in time of war, and suggested that he should strike out that word from the amendment as likely to be offensive to the French government. Messrs. Morton and Conkling had offered

A GROSS INSULT TO THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT

by assuming that the agitation of this question might affect the decision of the German Emperor as arbitrator between the United States and Great Britain, and now the Senator from New York was going to insult the French government also. If this amendment meant anything it meant collusion of an improper nature and for improper purposes, and everybody knew that it was aimed at three persons—Mr. Sumner, himself (Mr. Schurz), and the Marquis de Chambrun. He (Mr. Schurz) would vote for the amendment, and he would give the Senate some evidence in advance of the investigation—the Marquis de Chambrun was no spy. He was the legal advisor of the French legation; a French gentleman of distinguished family, and of high character and attainments. Further, he was

NOT THE MAN

who had given Mr. Schurz the first information on this subject. (Laughter.)

But, continued Mr. Schurz, what is the spirit of this amendment? I have said that I regretted that the gentleman had introduced the amendment. I do not know that I can make myself intelligible to his mind or to his moral feeling, except in one way, by supposing that I had introduced an amendment directing the committee to inquire. Also, whether those who gave letters of introduction to Remington to France were guilty of corrupt practices in connection with these transactions. Does the Senate want to know why I did not do it? It was because I considered it infinitely beneath me. (Applause in the galleries.)

PREVARICATION WORSE THAN LYING.

Mr. Conkling said he had not given Remington a letter of introduction to France; he had merely addressed a note to Mr. Remington himself, the purport of which he had stated on a former occasion.

Mr. Schurz—If the Senator had given Mr. Remington a note stating that he had investigated all these transactions, and that he would be very glad if the French government would settle them, and that he had a personal interest in them, even then I would not be the man to offer this amendment.

A NEIGHBORLY NOTE.

Mr. Conkling said that Mr. Schurz had been the man to drag in the irrelevant fact that he (Conkling) had written a note to Mr. Remington containing statements which he had felt called upon to make in justice to a neighbor and in the interest of fair play.

Mr. Schurz said that when the subject was first mentioned by him he had repeatedly expressed the opinion that the giving of the note to Mr. Remington was only an act of neighborly friendship on Mr. Conkling's part.

THE BLONDE MEANS BUSINESS.

Mr. Conkling disputed this. He also said that his amendment was aimed not merely at Schurz, Sumner, and the Marquis de Chambrun, but at all who might come within its scope, and he meant to stand by it. He had drawn it, however, without having the statute before him, and if the Senator (Mr. Schurz) found any offensive phrase in it he was willing to withdraw that phrase.

A SPECTACLE FOR AMERICANS.

Mr. Schurz—Oh, I have no doubt the Senator is earnest in this matter. I have never doubted that it looks just like him. (Laughter.) The Senator has referred to a statute which he held up before us yesterday, threatening us with fine and imprisonment. Ah, sir, it is a glorious spectacle! Here stand two American Senators, not entirely unknown to the country, whose record is not entirely devoid of patriotism and service, and whose only aim is to investigate abuses and violation of law and have them punished. Those Senators are met here by one of the spokesmen of the administration, flourishing a statute in his hand threatening them with fine and imprisonment. Let it be known in every nook and corner that he who is in earnest in setting his face against those in power, and who boldly seeks to detect fraud and punish violations of law, is confronted by the powers that be with

THE PROSPECT OF A DUNGEON.

Why, sir, I did not know that the administration was in such a desperate condition as that. (Laughter and applause in the galleries.) They are developing very fast; how long will it be until you cannot even get up testimony against Leet and Stocking, the knights of the "general order," without having some statute dug up that will fine and imprison you for it? (Laughter.) But if the Senator from New York thinks that he can in that way strike fear into my soul, he will soon find that he is greatly mistaken. On the path of duty that I have walked I have seen men far more dangerous than he is, and before a thousand of them my heart will not quail. No, sir, I will vote for his amendment, vote for it with all the scorn which it deserves. (Loud applause in the galleries.) Mr. Schurz then spoke of the charge that this was a move to alienate

THE GERMAN VOTE.

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. Morton) and the Senator from New York (Mr. Conkling) were very sweet on the Germans just now. (Laughter.) They had said that no man owned the Germans of America. That was a fact, and he was proud of it, for he was one of the Germans. No man, no politician, no Senator, not even the President of the United States, owned the Germans; least of all were they owned by that class of politicians who desperately cling to the skirt of power through whatever mire it may drag them. (Laughter and applause in the galleries.) The Germans had fought Tammany in New York, and they would in solid array fight every Tammany, great or small, on whatever side it might appear. An attempt had been made to suppress this investigation by

CRACKING THE PARTY WHIP,

but those who made that attempt grievously mistook the time and the spirit of the people. The people could be no longer deceived by misrepresentations of the motives of those who were fighting against corruption. When motives were called in question they knew that the motives of the henchmen of power were at least as open to suspicion as the motives of those who opposed them. Let me tell those gentlemen, said he, that we knew the road to patronage just as well as others did if we had chosen to walk it. The crack of the party whip has lost its power in these times. Mere party cant lies stale and nauseating upon the stomach of the people. If you think that

THE MOVEMENT NOW SPREADING ALL OVER THIS LAND

is a mere plot of politicians you will soon discover your mistake. It is a reaction against the easy political morals and the sprit of jobbery which have been developed in times of war and great political excitement. It is an earnest uprising for honest and pure government. You cannot repress it by party discipline—you cannot kill it with penal statutes. It may be a mere commotion to-day; undertake to resist it and you will find it a great moral and political revolution to-morrow. Whatever others may do (he said) I have taken my lot. It is to this cause that my heart is devoted, and with this cause I will stand or fall.

THE HENCHMAN'S REPLY.

Mr. Morton said that the only new point in Mr. Schurz's speech was the passage quoted from the testimony of Lecesne, and insisted that the statements of Remington and the admissions of Mr. Schurz in his previous speech showed that Lecesne's statements must be false. The Senator from Missouri had charged that an attempt had been made to stifle the proposed investigation by cracking the party whip, but every Senator, and every person acquainted with the proceedings knew, and the Senate knew, that directly the reverse was true. Nobody had proposed to resist this inquiry. He had intended, from the first, to vote for it, and the resolution would have been passed without a word of debate, had not the movers of the resolution forced debate upon the Senate by insisting upon the preamble. The Senator from Missouri had also asserted that the Senatorial cabal had forced investigation into the New York Custom-house. This also was untrue. He (Morton) and all those upon his side had voted for the investigation in New York, and their only offence was that they were not willing to organize a committee, a majority of which would have been enemies to the administration, and give them power to

THROW MUD AND SMUT

on the President and his administration from that time up to the next election.—He (Morton) was independent enough to support the administration. Here was an administration which could be assailed only on personal grounds of falsehood and calumny, and because the honest friends of the Republican party stood up in the Senate to defend it, they were called party "henchmen." He cared not for the epithets of the Senator from Missouri (Schurz.) The Senator talked about clinging to the skirts of power, but up to the time when he fell out with the administration that Senator had made quite as many recommendations and obtained as many appointments to office as he (Morton) had, and he had heard it stated that the Senator's personal difficulty with the administration had grown out of the removal of his friends from office.

Mr. Schurz said he would authorize the Senator (Morton) to tell everybody who told him so

THAT HE LIED.

Mr. Morton was not convinced by that statement. The object of those who had forced this debate upon the Senate was to draw these crowds to the Senate chamber and to make capital against the Republican party. The whole affair was gotten up by a long previous arrangement. The charge was false from beginning to end, and the evidence brought to support it was trival; but whether false or not the majority were willing to have it investigated. The movers of the resolution, however, were determined to bring it before the country in advance of the investigation because they knew that the investigation would amount to nothing. The object of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Schurz) was to separate the Germans from the Republican party and from native citizens in order to make them a balance of power. The Senator was attempting to revive

KNOW-NOTHINGISM IN ITS WORST FORM.

Mr. Schurz said that no man in the country had more earnestly or steadily opposed the formation of any political organization based on separate nationalities.

Mr. Morton said he must judge the Senator by his acts. He was responsible for the election of his Democratic colleague (Mr. Blair) to the Senate. Mr. Blair was Mr. Schurz's political offspring. (Laughter.)

Mr. Blair said he had been elected to the Senate, not by his colleague, but by the people of Missouri. His colleague, however, had endeavored to give the people an opportunity to have a fair election, and of course the Senator (Mr. Morton) did not like that.

Mr. Morton said that was the pretence, but the election of Mr. Blair was the result of a coalition of certain Republicans with the Democrats, and that coalition had not yet been dissolved. Mr. Morton then charged that Mr. Schurz was staying in the Republican party for the purpose of defeating it, and read an extract from a speech made by him in Chicago in which he said that if General Grant were renominated he (Mr. Schurz) would not support him. The Senator had a right to

LEAVE THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

if he pleased, but he had no right to stay in it and attempt to defeat it.

Mr. Schurz asked whether he meant to say that those who were not in favor of the renomination of Gen. Grant had no business in the Republican party.

Mr. Morton said he did not. Those who were opposed to the renomination of the President had a right to express their opposition. But if he should be renominated, and if their love for the party and its principles were stronger than their personal hatred, they would submit. A man, however, who announced in advance that if the candidate most likely to be nominated should receive the nomination he would not support him, placed himself in a very questionable position in the party. Mr. Morton continued at length, and read extracts from Mr. Blair's speeches to show that Mr. Schurz was guilty of what he had charged.

[For the Volunteer.]

REMINISCENCES OF CARLISLE.

SMITHFIELD, Feb. 16, 1872.

Messrs. Editors:—I was neither convinced nor silenced by my friend's retort, so I replied, 'You must admit that Carlisle has produced a great many good men; that her College has sent forth not a few men of distinction; and that many of her bad boys have turned out fine men—all the more useful perhaps for their early wildness.'

'I admit nothing of the kind. On the contrary, I deny each and every one of your propositions; they are true only in a relative sense. Everything goes by comparison. As compared with Cheyenne, or Omaha, or even with some towns of less recent origin, I admit that Carlisle has produced many good men; that as compared with Franklin College, Lafayette or even Jefferson, Dickinson has undoubtedly sent forth a considerable number of men of distinction; and that, as compared with Natchez or Vicksburg, or other towns along the Mississippi, many of the bad boys of Carlisle have become good men: All this I admit, and much comfort may it give you. But to say that Carlisle, as a town more than a hundred years old, has produced a *great many* good men, and that Dickinson, as a College which has been in existence three quarters of a century, has sent forth *not a few* distinguished men, is to say more than you can prove, and I demand the evidence before you repeat it.'

'Well, you are the first Carlisle man I have yet seen who was unwilling to concede this much to the old borough, and to his old *Alma Mater*. I am not prepared at this moment with the proof you demand, but I don't mean to surrender my conviction till I am compelled, which I hope I shall never be.'

'There you are! A Carlisler to the back bone! Clinging to your self-approval with determined tenacity, and dodging all evidence going to show you in error. Well, hug your illusions if they give you pleasure. Far be it from me to attempt to dispel them, so long as they are innocent. But there is one of them that is not innocent; which, in fact, operates as a premium upon vice, and the tendency of which is injurious to the last degree. It is the idea that a bad youth, if converted, becomes all the better and more useful man; an idea which is involved in the popular maxim, 'The greater the sinner the greater the saint;' a maxim which I abhor and utterly repudiate.'

'Don't be so fast, nor so positive. You are in opposition to the opinions of many of our best people, and in conflict with the obvious teachings of the scriptures and of religious experience. Was not Paul 'the very chiefest of the apostles?' And yet had he not been a 'blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious?' Was not that eminent and useful minister, John Newton, the captain of a slave ship, and a prime promoter of what Wesley called the 'sum of all villainies'? Was not Col. Gardiner, whom the pious Dodrige has made famous for his zeal as a Christian reformer, one of the most vicious and dissolute of young men? I cannot but think that, on reflection, you will revise your opinions and admit that the prevalent idea is on the whole well founded.'

'I have not spoken without reflection. My opinion needs no revision. I repeat what I before said, and, in view of your reply, with added emphasis, your doctrine is unscriptural, irrational and simply damnable. To claim Paul as authority for a fallacy so monstrous, is to misrepresent the great Apostle of the Gentiles and pervert his teachings.—What are the facts? As a Jew, strong in the faith of his fathers, conscientious even to bigotry in his devotedness to his church, he railed against the new doctrine and persecuted its advocates with the severest rigors of the law; but, nevertheless, in his private life and personal character he was, both as a youth and a man, a person of singular uprightness.—No stain rested on his reputation; no consciousness of impurity or dishonor disturbed his peace, or impaired his self respect. All he had to repent of was his violent hostility to the doctrine of 'Christ and him crucified,' and this he did in the strong language which you have quoted, but you have not finished the quotation for he adds: 'I obtained mercy *because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.*

'As to John Newton, he certainly did much good in the latter part of his life, but whether enough to compensate for the evil he did in the first part, and for the evil his example has been made to do since, I do not think can be positively asserted. The fact, as it is stated in his biography, 'that he continued four years in the African trade after his conversion,' has been joy to the heart and marrow to the bones of all slave-traders, slave-breeders, and other systematic wrong-doers for more than a century.—That he himself looked with anything but complacency on his early wickedness is evident from the fact, that when at eighty years of age he was besought by his friends to give up preaching, he said: 'What! shall the old African blasphemer stop while he has power to speak?'

'As for Col. Gardiner, all I have to say is that his biographer did not commend him as an example to the young just beginning to go astray, but as an encouragement to the older and more hardened, in their efforts to break the bands of iniquity.'

'But you have said that my doctrine is irrational, which I do not see. Certainly one who speaks from his own experience; who has himself made trial of the evil of wrong-doing, and can, of his own knowledge, testify of its folly, is a better witness and more powerful advocate than one who cannot thus testify.'

'A better witness he may be, but not a more powerful advocate. A man picked out of the gutter, dirty and ragged, bleareyed and bloated, is certainly a better witness of the evils of drunkenness than one whose life has always been temperate, but hardly a more powerful advocate of the Temperance cause.

'But you are mistaken in ascribing the doctrine I advanced to my Carlisle rearing. The fact is I don't think I ever heard any one there say seriously 'the greater the sinner the greater the saint,' or formally teach that bad men when converted make the best Christians.'

'Perhaps not, but you have heard—if you kept your ears open—many a one informally and by implication teach that doctrine. You cannot have failed to notice that the main hope of pious parents in Carlisle is not in nurture and admonition but in conviction and conversion, not in pure and sweet domestic and social influences to prevent their children from going astray, but in preaching and praying to bring about their reclamation after they have become wanderers.'

'But that is hardly to the point which I raised, which was that a man who speaks from experience speaks with more power than is possible for one without experience.'

'Certainly he does; and, therefore, the man who from his own experience from his youth up can testify to the advantages of a pure and virtuous life, is—other things being equal—the most powerful possible advocate of purity and virtue.—Therefore, he that 'was without sin' was able to speak 'as never man spake,' and to leave behind him words which are fresh with their original power after the lapse of nineteen centuries. But, I will take you on your own ground. You require that a man must speak experimentally, not only of the advantages of virtue but of the evils of vice. Then hear me: I testify to that which I do know and bear witness to that which I have proved, when I say to you that every act of conscious wrong doing inflicts a lasting injury upon the wrong-doer. Every wilful falsehood leaves a scar. Every deed of dishonesty or cruelty—though repented of and forgiven—leaves behind it a mark on the soul. Every deliberate act of selfish meanness will continue through life to serve as a drawback to happiness. God may forgive the liar, the cheat, the wasteful squanderer of time and opportunity, but the man who has been guilty of these offences will never forgive himself, nor cease to suffer in some measure their natural penalty. That is the teaching of my experience, does yours inculcate a different lesson?'

'I will answer that question by asking another: Is this a new doctrine, which you have learned in the Church, under the teaching of your friend, the Bishop?'

'No, it is an old conviction which I reached while yet in Carlisle. I learned it from no man. I evolved it out of my own consciousness, and found it confirmed by reason and the scriptures. As for the Bishop, I never heard him express himself on the subject, tho' I doubt not from the general tenor of his preaching that he holds to the same opinion.'

'By the way, and to change the subject, which side do you take on the great question which is now dividing you, the Ritualistic or Anti-Ritualistic?'

'Neither; I am neither a Ritualist nor, in a partisan sense, an Anti-Ritualist. I am neither High Church nor Low Church. What then am I? Read those two books* which I gave you this morning and you will see exactly where I stand. I take no part in theological controversies or Ecclesiastical quarrels. I had a heart-scald of both when I lived in Carlisle. There, I used to hear the changes ring on the one hand upon the 'Pelagianism' and 'Semi-Pelagianism' of the New Haven School of theology, and on the other upon the 'Hyper-Orthodoxy' and 'Supra-Calvanism' of Princeton.—One side denounced Dr. Taylor, and the other derided Dr. Green. I remember I once innocently asked a round faced rosy divine of the New School who used to visit Carlisle, from a neighboring town, and who was talking very lightly about 'Original Sin,' what that much used phrase meant. Putting on an air of much gravity, he said: 'I will tell you.—It means:

"In Adam's fall we sinned all;
In Cain's murder we sinned murder;
By Dr. Green our sin is seen."

I laughed of course at the party hit, but it did not leave a pleasant impression on my mind. The fact is, I saw so much that was ugly and puerile on both sides of the controversy that I never think of it now without disgust. The best thing you Presbyterians have done in the last thirty years was the burying of your hatchet and reuniting as one church.

'As for Ecclesiastical strife we had had a taste of that, or something like it, in College a few years before. Its effect was to divide the friends of the institution and ultimately to blow the College skyhigh. You remember how it was. The Episcopalians were jealous of the Presbyterians and accused them of using their predominance in the institution for the promotion of sectarian ends. The Presbyterians denied the charge and retorted by intimating that the Episcopalians were worldly and unspiritual, and took no interest in the advancement of vital religion. The quarrel ran high and at last found its way into the State Legislature. A Committee of Investigation was ordered, the report of which led to the withdrawal of the annual subsidy on which the College had depended for existence; and in a few years the institution found itself unable to go on for want of funds. Our people, (though I was not a churchman), triumphed but they did so at the loss of the College. They had killed the goose which laid the golden egg. In a few years the institution was handed over to the Methodists. Whether our friends prefered acknowledged Methodist sectarianism to suspected Presbyterian sectarianism, I have never heard. I must say, however, that the jealousy of the Episcopalians was not wholly without grounds; and I must say too that the withdrawal of the state appropriation, though we all deplored it at the time, was a very proper act of legislation. If a town wants a College let it provide means to support one. If it tries to do this and fails, let it hand over its enterprise to some powerful sect. If the sect finds it has more Colleges on its hands than it can support, let it drop the weakest and concentrate its force upon one of the best and most promising. In this one let them raise high the standard of scholarship, and the others let them convert into Grammar Schools or High Schools for young ladies. What do you think?'

'I think it is time to go to bed. It is after twelve o'clock and we have got to be up betimes in the morning.'

'Don't be in a hurry; it is not often that we meet. Do you remember Andrew Carothers?'

'Indeed I do, and a better man or more truly Christian gentleman never lived.—He was one of the Carlisle men for whose memory I have a sincere reverence.'

'It is the same with me. But I have one thing against him; he allowed John Peck to cover the most beautiful head of silver hair that ever graced human temples with the ugliest black whig that ever obscured 'a crown of glory.'

'Yes, but you know the old gentleman suffered from rheumatism in his head, and wore his wig on that account.

'I don't care; it was not a sufficient reason for thus grieving his friends and shocking the esthetic sense of the public, Better to have worn his hat all day and gone to bed with it at night than to put on and wear that frightful mop. I hate wigs any how. They come next to the dyeing of the hair. By the way, do you remember old Rodebaugh?'

'Yes, very well. You mean *Rodenbaugh*, the man who used to live out at the toll-gate, whose son had a leg amputated by Drs. Foster and Mahon. I remember that circumstance very well. It was a hot Sunday in midsummer and the doctors were afraid of mortification.—Poor fellow! How he suffered! Chloroform—'Heaven's best gift to surgery—had not then been discovered. But what of 'old Rodebaugh' as you call him?'

'Nothing, only I was thinking that if he were living in these days he would be suspected of dyeing his beard. Do you remember Parker Simmison?'

'Yes, very well, and a very nice man he was. What of him?'

'Nothing, only I often wondered if—when he was dyeing hats—he never felt tempted to put his head in the kettle.—Yes, he was a very nice man; his smiling salutations to the students as they used to pass his open window are among my most vivid recollections. He was sprung of good stock and belonged to a good family—the Dennys and Murrays including our excellent friend Mrs. Boyd.—Parker used to insist that the right name of the Gerard boys was *Gearhart*, he said knew their father was called by that name when in earlier days he followed the trade of a hatter. Do you remember the suit brought by Hopkins the book agent, before Squire Squiers, against 'old Mac' for the recovery of the subscription price of the 'Biographies of the signers of the Declaration of Independence? You don't? Well, old Mac claimed that he had subscribed with the understanding that he should not be called upon to take and pay for the book; that all that Mr. Hopkins wanted was the use of his name. But Mr. Hopkins refused to see it in that light, and insisted upon what was "nominated in the bond." Do you remember "Dumb Sam," and the "Twins," and John Sponsler's man "Twist," and Noble's "Jake," who was minus a foot, and Jake Krider and "his mare Nance," and Daddy Sykes, and old Bombarger? and——

"No, I don't remember anybody or anything more. My head is all in a jumble with your talk, and I must go to bed and get a sleep before I can see things straight again. Good-night!"

Messrs. Editors, I don't mean to say that the dialogue which I have been relating is an actual report of a literal conversation, but I do mean to say that there is nothing in these letters from beginning to end of essential importance which is not strictly true, and that nothing in them which is fictitious is of any essential importance.

Very respectfully yours,
AN OLD DICKINSONIAN.

*He had given me Dr. Mawrice' "Theological Essays," and the "Life and Letters" of the Rev. Frederick W. Robinson.

THE poor need help.

BURGLARY is a science.

CANVAS are reported scarce.

THE runaway market is dull.

BUY coal while the