THE LANCASTER INTELLIGENCER.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY BY

H. G. SMITH & CO.

H. G. SMITH. A. J. STEINMAN.

TERMS—Two Dollars per annum payable in all cases in advance.

THE LANCASTER DAILY INTELLIGENCER is published every evening, Sunday excepted, at $5 per annum in advance.

OFFICE—SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CENTRE SQUARE.

The Lancaster Intelligencer.

VOLUME 72 LANCASTER, PA., WEDNESDAY MORNING FEBRUARY 1 1871. NUMBER 5

RATE OF ADVERTISING.

BUSINESS ADVERTISEMENTS, $12 a year per square of ten lines; $8 per year for each additional square.

REAL ESTATE ADVERTISING, 10 cents a line for the first, and 5 cents for each subsequent insertion.

GENERAL ADVERTISING, 7 cents a line for the first, and 4 cents for each subsequent insertion.

SPECIAL NOTICES inserted in Local Columns 15 cents per line.

SPECIAL NOTICES preceding marriages and deaths, 10 cents per line for first insertion and 5 cents for every subsequent insertion.

LEGAL AND OTHER NOTICES—
Executors' notices..... $2 50
Administrators' notice..... 2 50
Assignees' notices..... 2 50
Auditors' notices..... 2 00
Other "Notices," ten lines, or less, three times..... 1 50

Poetry.

For the Intelligencer.

A DREAM WHICH WAS ALL A DREAM

BY E.

I *know* I am not jealous,
It were foolish to be so;
But I do *not* like the way in which
Those girls do hang around Joe.

He laughs, and chats, and dances,
With one and all the girls,
But *most*, I think, with that one,
That wears the jet-black curls.

They say he used to love her;
Perhaps he loves her yet;
I'm sure that she may have him
If he can so soon forget.

But I am very foolish,
The foolishness, I know;
(When I'm not the *least bit jealous*)
To be thinking thus of Joe.

But *twice before* they've schottished;
See his arm around her waist!
How she leans upon his shoulder
With such a careless grace.

I'll go home, and he may have her,
For it really looks as though
His arm was gently pressing
Round her waist; yes, I will go.

Why, I surely have been dreaming!
What's all this? Oh, *now* I know!
It seems so strange, but 'tis no party,
For I'm sitting here with Joe.

Here I'm sitting in the parlor
And his arm was round *my* waist;
I was leaning on his shoulder
With a rather heavy pace.

FOREVER.

Forever and ever the reddening leaves
Float to the sudden grasses,
Forever and ever the shivering trees
Cower and shriek to the chilling breeze
That sweeps from the far-off sullen seas,
To wither them as it passes.

Forever and ever the low groaning
Swings over the earth and earth
Forever and ever the steady rain
Falls on bare, dark hill and barren plain,
And flashes on roof and window-pane,
And hisses upon the earth.

Forever and ever the weary thoughts
Are tracing the sad same track,
Forever and ever, to and fro,
On the old unchanging road they go,
Through dreaming and waking, through joy and woe,
Calling the dead hours back.

Forever and ever the tired heart
Ponders over evil done,
Forever and ever through cloud and gleam,
Tracing the course of the strong life stream,
And dreary and dull as the broken dream,
Forever the same refrain.

Miscellaneous.

Another Scathing Letter from Black to Senator Wilson.

To the Honorable Henry Wilson, Senator from Massachusetts:

Contrary to my first intention, 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 occurrence 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 will say that the letter of 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 *arbiter 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 persons 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 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 aggravated by the fact that you put it in the form of a funeral panegyric upon a man whose recent and sudden death should have sobered your party rage and solemnized your heart, or at least operated as a temporary check upon your appetite for defamation. What was I to do? My first impulse was no matter what; I did not obey it. But I concluded 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 credit. I did so, and I did more. I did it in terms so free from unnecessary harshness that I am amazed this moment at my own moderation. But you declare, affirm, my denial to be an act of "reckless audacity;" in your eyes my defence is an *offence*. 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 accentuated by loyalty when a Democrat is the sufferer.

You make no attempt to impugn the truthfulness of my letter. It was dated to the President on the 20th of November, 1866. That opinion was very simple as it stood upon the record; and in my former letter I gave you the elementary principles of truthfulness in simple, familiar language, 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 safely infer from your silence 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."

RADICAL PATRIOTS AND STATESMEN.

While you do not deny its truth, you think you annihilate it by the assertion that it is extensively disapproved. Do you really think that a mere majority, 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 are totally repugnant to the utter destruction? To flatter the passions and confound the understanding of the people is not the highest object of any honest man's ambition. Mr. Adams thought he might do "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 fortune, but high desert; while it is mere imbecility to attempt to be powerful by betting the countenance of the law shine upon the weak or the oppressed, who cannot reward you with office or money. Your theological opinions conform to your ideas of political duty, you esteem the luck of Barabbas 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 class of "small but genteel 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 who had been taught that enmity to the Constitution was the road to 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.

THE TRUTH OF THE WHOLE.

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 is not likely to reverse. Political power dishonestly wielded always has looks 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 description 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 diverted. I hope I am too tolerant to secure from the praises 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 probably not take much account of us. No doubt you did all in your power to subvert the free institutions of our revolutionary fathers, and to debauch the political morals of the country; but the utmost exertion of your abilities has not sufficed to raise you above the common life of partisans 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 pretend to assert that Mr. Thompson was guilty of robbing the Indian trust funds. But you offer no reparation nor even make an excuse for the wanton and unprovoked injury which you tried to commit upon the character of the living and the memory of the dead. You sullenly permit judgment to be rendered against you *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 places 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 almost devoutly) that it would take a great many Wilsons to make one Thompson. It was not to be 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 counsels, 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, defenceless, 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 bald assertion, and I was content with a naked denial. But in your last you come back with an 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.

FLOYD BURIAL AND SECESSION.

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 inquiries; he had not a friend nor a witness to matter; it was "organized to convict him, if it could. It reported the evidence, but gave no judgment criminating him with the offence you accuse him of. On the contrary, the opinion expressed by the chairman that the charges were unfounded in "rumor, speculation, and misapprehension." But you take up the report and endeavor to make out a case which the committee did not make out by carefully suppressing all the principal facts misstating the others. Your charge of fraudulently sending arms from the North to the South, and of heavy cannon made at Pittsburg for the forts in Louisiana and Texas, because they were not sent at all. Floyd gave an order to ship them on the 29th of December 1858, but it was countermanded 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 Craig, who knew him 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 else, testified that he was perfectly satisfied at 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 last and truth it was ordered by Floyd, in view of the 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 of that section. Old, Alexander H. Stephens, was then regarded throughout the country as a strong advocate of the Union and opponent of secession; and he adds as a confirmation of this, "he had recently published over his own signature in a Richmond paper a letter on this subject which gained him high credit in the North for his boldness in rebuking the pernicious views of many in his own State." Floyd was involved 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 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 had plotted to make against the Union the Federal Government. This was the rumor, speculation, and misapprehension" to which the Chairman of the Committee alludes. It was substantially what your partisan newspapers and stump orators have asserted and reasserted over and over again, until thousands of persons in every part of the country have been made to believe it. Is this what you mean by your first article, and what you persist in and reaffirm by your last. Now examine the facts. There was a law almost coeval with the government for the distribution of arms among the militia of the 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 War Department, gave to each State that applied for it her proper quota of muskets and rifles of the best pattern and make provided for the regular army. During the year 1860, the number of muskets so distributed was exactly 8,423, of which the Southern States received 2,661, while the Northern States got nearly three times that number, to wit: 6,372. Some long-range rifles of the army calibre were distributed. The aggregate number amounted to 1,728, and they all went to Northern States except 758, about half enough for one regiment, which were divided between 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 but know that they were relevant 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 a dead rebel by keeping back the whole truth as that did not suit your purpose. The fact that the Southern 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 arms for their benefit. That concluded the whole case, since it was impossible for the same man to believe that such a plot could be formed and acted upon by Secretary Floyd and yet had even existence 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 thought of as leading to 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 was followed with a great flourish as evidence of some most wicked robbery. But here we find you again at the disingenuous business that (to use a sailor phrase?) of keeping back a 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 sold; a law had been passed to authorize the sale of them; they were offered for years at $2.50 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 examination refused to take them. Of these 500,000 condemned muskets, the Secretary of War, in 1859, ordered 115,000 to be sent to the South, doubtless for the mere convenience of storage. To "weapon the rebellion" with arms like these would have insured its destruction the instant its forces came into the presence of troops having the improved modern gun 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, decline 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 will not shock your polite ears by mentioning.

HOWELL COBB.

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 even be 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 bold or 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.

EDWIN M. STANTON.

I consider 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 any thing; for I made no sacrifices of myself or any body 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 other's 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 Post-Master 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 that 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 energetic 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 testimony to his honor, that I never saw any thing 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 in any thing 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 was to 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 quiet when I read your last paper, publication in the *Atlantic*, or to confine myself to a mere vindication of the other parties assailed. It was plain to me that you had "wholly misunderstood the character of Mr. Stanton and completely misjudged what you supposed to be a panegyric." Your description of him, if accepted as true would compel the belief that his whole political life was one long imposture; that as a member of the Lincoln 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 pet and idol of the 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 property in the second year of a laborious and rating year 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 was a Democrat; he 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 had heard him curse the perpetrators of such crimes only a month or two before, exercised the charity which believeth all things and concluded that he was possessed with a headlong impulse which had suddenly revolutionized all his thoughts, feelings, principles and motives. But your proofs show that in the kindness of your nature you do not give heed enough to the maxim, *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus.* Such a depth could not be reached by a single plunge. The man of such a moral nature must have previously undergone that gradual process of decomposition which could result only from long sympathetic association with the enemies of the Constitution. This is the inference I draw from that you have made out this part of your case. With Democrats he was a Democrat, enjoying their confidence and taking their counsels; while he caused it to be well understood among "your friends in out-halls and pulpits and politics" that his devotion to the Democracy was entirely simulated. It is now also clear beyond doubt, that to Southern men he avowed the purpose of bringing a secession.

The testimony of Governor Brown to that effect is as good as any that you have produced to prove him an abolitionist, and you have made the fact so probable by your own evidence that it will be sufficient to establish it. Is not my conclusion a fair one from the premises, that this is the most "marvellous" imposture upon record? Does the history of the world hold on all its pages a leader amongst men in which a man has raised himself to the highest public employments under two different parties of diametrically opposite and irreconcilable principles, by making simultaneous professions of fidelity to both of them? Do not mention Sunderland, for his hypocrisy gained him nothing; nor Tallyrand, for he was merely a spy and a traitor to Napoleon, and 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 played for years imposed himself on the London police as an honest man and a most zealous friend of justice, pretended to assist the sufferers by robbery, and became rich by their rewards; but during all that time he was the adviser, the "guide, philosopher and friend" of the principal thieves in the city, and to them he constantly betrayed the intended movements of the officers of justice 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 to office, that a law of Congress might be legally made against the States and the people thereof, in which ordinances of secession had been passed, by way of preventing the execution of the laws. Then, 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' 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 in his mind that all his official 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 you attribute to him could not have found a lodgment in his mind, even for one moment.

4. If he had really 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 indorsed 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 any doubt in his mind as to the relative rights of the parties. Jeremiah S. Black was once 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 you in 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 of Leecompton Constitution. So far as we, his Democratic associates, were permitted to know him, no man detested more than he did the knavish trick of abolitionists in preventing a vote on slavery by which it would have been expelled from Kansas and the whole troubled 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, 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 looking at this side of his character, and supposing it had no other, he was accordingly to your understanding of his history, an "entire agreement" with the deadly enemies of every principle we believed in. The mere fact that he paid visits to Dr. Bailey is no proof of this; it might be much more abolition people. All that might happen, and his fidelity to the Constitution would remain no feather. But you mention it as a remarkable circumstance, and it is remarkable, because it was the only occasion in his life when he departed from the habit of assembling there to talk over their plans, to conceal their slanders against the administration, and to lay their plots for the overthrow of the government and laws. If it was a mere friendly visit, it was so out of 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 extremely useful to them, and gained a 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 he had opposed by every open act of his life. He was probably the person upon whom Lundy relied when he went into court in the Sickles case, and loudly bragged that he was the son of slaveholding parents; his father was a North Carolinian and his mother a Virginian. Lundy was a Democrat, and you find in on page 51 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 same effect is more explicit. 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 given 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 "I know Edwin M. Stanton. I know his judgment; 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 property in the second year of a laborious and rating year 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 was a Democrat; he 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 had heard him curse the perpetrators of such crimes only a month or two before, exercised the charity which believeth all things and concluded that he was moved by some headlong impulse which had suddenly revolutionized all his thoughts, feelings, principles and motives. But your proofs show that in the kindness of your nature you do not give heed enough to the maxim, *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus.* Such a depth could not be reached by a single plunge. The man of such a moral nature must have previously undergone that gradual process of decomposition which could result only from long sympathetic association with the enemies of the Constitution. This is the inference I draw from that you have made out this part of your case. With Democrats he was a Democrat, enjoying their confidence and taking their counsels; while he caused it to be well understood among "your friends in out-halls and pulpits and politics" that his devotion to the Democracy was entirely simulated. It is now also clear beyond doubt, that to Southern men he avowed the purpose of bringing a secession.

The testimony of Governor Brown to that effect is as good as any that you have produced to prove him an abolitionist, and you have made the fact so probable by your own evidence that it will be sufficient to establish it. Is not my conclusion a fair one from the premises, that this is the most "marvellous" imposture upon record? Does the history of the world hold on all its pages a leader amongst men in which a man has raised himself to the highest public employments under two different parties of diametrically opposite and irreconcilable principles, by making simultaneous professions of fidelity to both of them? Do not mention Sunderland, for his hypocrisy gained him nothing; nor Tallyrand, for he was merely a spy and a traitor to Napoleon, and 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 played for years imposed himself on the London police as an honest man and a most zealous friend of justice, pretended to assist the sufferers by robbery, and became rich by their rewards; but during all that time he was the adviser, the "guide, philosopher and friend" of the principal thieves in the city, and to them he constantly betrayed the intended movements of the officers of justice 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 to office, that a law of Congress might be legally made against the States and the people thereof, in which ordinances of secession had been passed, by way of preventing the execution of the laws. Then, 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' 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 in his mind that all his official 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 you attribute to him could not have found a lodgment in his mind, even for one moment.

4. If he had really 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 indorsed 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 any doubt in his mind as to the relative rights of the parties. Jeremiah S. Black was once 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 you 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 wasted by division, its heart broken by defeat. Every Northern State was in the hands of 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 laws 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, who 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 northern friends of secession orators and the leading newspaper organ of the so-called Republican party took the high ground that the Southern States had a right to break up the Union, because they could elect no President they opposed. But, though they "drew much people after them," and gave great encouragement to the insurrectionary movement, no man who was at once honest, intelligent, and true to the Constitution, could have seen the wisdom of the President's views. The President-elect indorsed them fully on his way to the Capital, as he did afterwards by his official action. From all quarters adhesions and applauses were up, which showed the popular appreciation of them. Even the Massachusetts Legislature, without one dissenting voice in its lower branch, and only one in the other, by an overwhelming majority in the other House, passed a solemn resolution approving them in the strongest language and offering to aid in carrying them out. But everything depended upon the action of Congress, and he went into court in the Sickles case, and loudly bragged that he was the son of slaveholding parents; his father was a North Carolinian and his mother a Virginian; and he was a Democrat of the Democratic branch, and in the Democratic branch of Democrats, and yet he was a bitter abolitionist, and his allies 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 other's 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 Post-Master 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 that 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 energetic 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 testimony to his honor, that I never saw any thing 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 in any thing 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 was to 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 quiet when I read your last paper, publication in the *Atlantic*, or to confine myself to a mere vindication of the other parties assailed. It was plain to me that you had "wholly misunderstood the character of Mr. Stanton and completely misjudged what you supposed to be a panegyric." Your description of him, if accepted as true would compel the belief that his whole political life was one long imposture; that as a member of the Lincoln 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 pet and idol of the 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 property in the second year of a laborious and rating year 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 was a Democrat; he 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 had heard him curse the perpetrators of such crimes only a month or two before, exercised the charity which believeth all things and concluded that he was moved by some headlong impulse which had suddenly revolutionized all his thoughts, feelings, principles and motives. But your proofs show that in the kindness of your nature you do not give heed enough to the maxim, *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus.* Such a depth could not be reached by a single plunge. The man of such a moral nature must have previously undergone that gradual process of decomposition which could result only from long sympathetic association with the enemies of the Constitution. This is the inference I draw from that you have made out this part of your case. With Democrats he was a Democrat, enjoying their confidence and taking their counsels; while he caused it to be well understood among "your friends in out-halls and pulpits and politics" that his devotion to the Democracy was entirely simulated. It is now also clear beyond doubt, that to Southern men he avowed the purpose of bringing a secession.

The testimony of Governor Brown to that effect is as good as any that you have produced to prove him an abolitionist, and you have made the fact so probable by your own evidence that it will be sufficient to establish it. Is not my conclusion a fair one from the premises, that this is the most "marvellous" imposture upon record? Does the history of the world hold on all its pages a leader amongst men in which a man has raised himself to the highest public employments under two different parties of diametrically opposite and irreconcilable principles, by making simultaneous professions of fidelity to both of them? Do not mention Sunderland, for his hypocrisy gained him nothing; nor Tallyrand, for he was merely a spy and a traitor to Napoleon, and 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 played for years imposed himself on the London police as an honest man and a most zealous friend of justice, pretended to assist the sufferers by robbery, and became rich by their rewards; but during all that time he was the adviser, the "guide, philosopher and friend" of the principal thieves in the city, and to them he constantly betrayed the intended movements of the officers of justice for the preservation of order and law.

II.