

BY STOUGHTON GEORGE.

Pass along the watchword, Hancock's banner fling!

Oh, then, to the White House, there four years to dwell,

Oh, then, to the White House, there four years to dwell,

Oh, then, to the White House, there four years to dwell,

GARFIELD'S FRIEND ON HANCOCK.

PARIS, July 18, 1880.

To the Editor of the World: Sir—A cable dispatch reached me at London,

I inferred from your interrogatory that some evil-disposed persons had been attributing to me the authorship of the orders and letters issued by Gen. Hancock while he commanded in Louisiana and Texas.

Why should my opinion be asked or volunteered on General Hancock as a civilian? Anybody else who has watched his life is as good a judge as I, and there are thousands who know him much better.

Mr. GARFIELD. I hope the bill will be allowed to come in, and then we can act on it in the morning.

Objection was made, and Mr. Garfield said he would bring it up the first thing on Monday next.

Major-General Winfield S. Hancock was commissioned Major-General on July 26, 1866, and he was the last person commissioned in that grade before January, 1868.

This bill was not heard of again, but House Bill No. 439 came from the Committee on Reconstruction on that day (January 13, 1868), through Mr. Bingham.

The bill contained the following sections: The following are sections 2, 3 and 5 of House Bill No. 439:

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That for the speedy enforcement of the act entitled "An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States," passed March second, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven, and the several acts supplementary thereto, the General of the Army of the United States is hereby authorized and required to enjoin by special orders upon all officers in command within the several military departments within said several States, the performance of all acts authorized by said several laws above recited, at his discretion, by his order from command any or all of said commanders, and detail other officers of the United States Army, not below the rank of colonel, to perform all the duties and exercise all the powers authorized by said several acts, to the end that the people of said several States may speedily reorganize civil governments, Republican in form, in said several States, and be restored to political power in the Union.

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That the General of the Army may remove any or all civil officers now acting under the several provisional governments within said several disorganized States, and appoint others to discharge the duties pertaining to their respective offices, and may do any and all acts which by said several laws above mentioned are authorized to be done by the several commanders of the military departments within said States; and so much of said acts, or of any act, as authorizes the President to detail the military commanders to said military departments, or to remove any officers who may be detailed as herein provided, is hereby repealed.

The 5th section made any interference by force with the orders of the General of the Army (Grant), or any refusal or neglect to carry out the statute, a high misdemeanor, punishable by \$5,000 fine and two years' imprisonment.

This statute aimed at compelling Hancock to obey the orders of Grant, the General, and not of Johnson, the President; and it empowered General Grant to remove Hancock if he obeyed Johnson and not Grant. It also gave the General of the Army full power to do everything he saw fit in each of the Military Departments without any control of the President.

Its real animus was the effort of Garfield, and those who acted with him, to subordinate the civil to the military power in all the South, and to remove Hancock because he recognized the law as superior to the sword.

The bill was put upon its passage, and the Congressional Globe, of January 21, 1868, contains the following speech from James A. Garfield in its favor.

"I call attention to the oath that every officer and enlisted man takes before entering the army. It is in these words: 'I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States.'"

"I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States." "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States."

"I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States." "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States."

"I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States." "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States."

ed to others who are wholly incapable of them. The opinion was industriously propagated and accepted by a great many as true that Hamilton wrote the farewell address of Washington, but the evidence is conclusive which shows that every word of that immortal production came from Washington himself; and Hamilton could not have written it any more than he could have made the world.

Some of Jackson's most characteristic papers, bearing the full impress of his own mind, were habitually credited to persons of far inferior ability. When it was charged against Jefferson that he wrote Logan's speech, he solemnly declared that he was unequal to such a composition. I am not affecting modesty when I claim credence of my present denial for a similar reason.

I could not have written Hancock's No. 40—not because I pretend to be dumb or altogether unskilled in the use of the English words, but because if I had undertaken to write it the chances are ninety-nine in a hundred that my argumentation would have marred its majestic simplicity and greatly diminished its power.

When a public man, meets a grave responsibility, saying no more nor less than just the thing he ought, but saying that with unequivocal clearness, you may be sure he is the interpreter of his own thoughts. At any rate, the attempt is unjust to bastardize No. 40 by assigning to it an origin totally different from the true one.

Why should my opinion be asked or volunteered on General Hancock as a civilian? Anybody else who has watched his life is as good a judge as I, and there are thousands who know him much better.

But since the question is propounded I will answer, subject to fair correction, that he is in my opinion the highest and best qualities of a Republican ruler. I think his fidelity to sound principles, coupled with his sound judgment, will entitle him to rank with the great Presidents of former times.

I do not compare him with Washington, for the grandeur of that character is and will remain forever unapproachable, but I do say that Washington, if placed in his situation, would have acted precisely as he did.

His patriotism has not the impulsive ardor of Jackson's; but his fidelity to the truth, his love of justice and his scorn of wrong, are quite as unmistakable. He is not a doctrinaire, like Jefferson, for his busy life has left him no time to study the abstract philosophy of politics, but his practical good sense knows the right intuitively and always catches the nearest way to do it.

If he be elected, the ability of his administration will inspire universal respect, and his moderation and magnanimity will conciliate even his enemies. I have the fullest faith that he will not only keep his oath to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution, but will so carry out its provisions that the great objects of its framers as expressed in the preamble will be fully accomplished.

To form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

J. S. BLACK.

Contrast the Two Records.

From the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Hancock is a man of destiny. Why, just look at the record. In 1868 Garfield brought a bill into Congress to drop the junior Major General. That was Hancock. It passed both Houses of Congress and was signed by the President.

But before it could be carried into effect George H. Thomas, the senior Major General, died, and Hancock, going up one grade, was no longer the junior Major General, and so the law could not reach him. Then the Republicans, still led by Garfield, passed an act reducing the major generals to three. This was signed by the President, but before it could be carried into effect Meade died, and the major generals were reduced to three by God Almighty. Finally, a law was passed authorizing the President to drop one of the major generals. Before it could be carried out and Hancock become the senior Major General, he could not be dropped. The man who survived all these attempts to retire him can not be retired. The man who led them—Garfield—will, as a fitting consummation of his act, fall a victim to his intended victim. Hancock will be elected President. Garfield will be retired—at least from the Presidential field.

The Patriarch of Rattlesnakes.

From the Washington Star.

The largest rattlesnake probably that has ever been seen in this city arrived at the Smithsonian Institute on Saturday, from Florida, forwarded by Mr. James Bell, who is in that State on special duty from the Interior Department.

The snake belongs to the crotalus adamanteus, or diamond rattle family. It is about eight feet long, will measure twelve inches around the body and has twelve rattles and a button on the end of its tail. It came in a close woven canvas bag and was at once dropped into a large wooden box with wire work and a sliding cover, prepared for the reception of venomous reptiles. Not having been fed for some time, it is particularly ferocious, and its rattle is constantly on the shake whenever any one approaches or there is any noise in the room where it is kept. This monster snake is to be killed in a day or two for the purpose of taking a plaster cast of it, which will be done by A. Zeno Shindler, artist. The manner of killing for this purpose is by putting the serpent in a close vessel and admitting a sponge saturated with chloroform. This preserves the form so that a life-like cast can be taken.

GARFIELD TRIES TO LEGISLATE GEN. HANCOCK OUT OF OFFICE.

A FAITHFUL OFFICER TO BE REMOVED BECAUSE HE OBEYED THE LAW AND WOULD NOT GOVERN WITH THE SWORD.

READ THE RECORD.

In January, 1868, Andrew Johnson was President, U. S. Grant was General of the Army, and Winfield S. Hancock was Major-General in command of Louisiana and Texas.

Nov. 29, 1867, Hancock assumed command and issued his famous Order No. 40. It contained these words: "When insurrectionary force has been overthrown and peace established and the civil authorities are ready and willing to perform their duties, the military power should cease to lead, and the civil administration resume its natural and rightful dominion."

Solely impressed with these views, the General announces that the great principles of American liberty are still the lawful inheritance of this people, and ever should be. The right of trial by jury, the habeas corpus, the liberty of the press, the freedom of speech, the natural rights of persons, and the rights of property must be preserved."

From the Congressional Globe, January 13, 1868, page 489:

Mr. GARFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to offer for consideration and action a bill to reduce and improve the military establishment by discharging one Major-General.

The bill was read. It provides that the Army of the United States shall be reduced by the discharge from military service of the Major-General, who was the last commissioned in that grade before January, 1868, to take effect from its passage, so there shall be but four Major-Generals in the Army.

Mr. GARFIELD. I hope the bill will be allowed to come in, and then we can act on it in the morning.

Objection was made, and Mr. Garfield said he would bring it up the first thing on Monday next.

Major-General Winfield S. Hancock was commissioned Major-General on July 26, 1866, and he was the last person commissioned in that grade before January, 1868.

This bill was not heard of again, but House Bill No. 439 came from the Committee on Reconstruction on that day (January 13, 1868), through Mr. Bingham.

The bill contained the following sections: The following are sections 2, 3 and 5 of House Bill No. 439:

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That for the speedy enforcement of the act entitled "An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States," passed March second, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven, and the several acts supplementary thereto, the General of the Army of the United States is hereby authorized and required to enjoin by special orders upon all officers in command within the several military departments within said several States, the performance of all acts authorized by said several laws above recited, at his discretion, by his order from command any or all of said commanders, and detail other officers of the United States Army, not below the rank of colonel, to perform all the duties and exercise all the powers authorized by said several acts, to the end that the people of said several States may speedily reorganize civil governments, Republican in form, in said several States, and be restored to political power in the Union.

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That the General of the Army may remove any or all civil officers now acting under the several provisional governments within said several disorganized States, and appoint others to discharge the duties pertaining to their respective offices, and may do any and all acts which by said several laws above mentioned are authorized to be done by the several commanders of the military departments within said States; and so much of said acts, or of any act, as authorizes the President to detail the military commanders to said military departments, or to remove any officers who may be detailed as herein provided, is hereby repealed.

The 5th section made any interference by force with the orders of the General of the Army (Grant), or any refusal or neglect to carry out the statute, a high misdemeanor, punishable by \$5,000 fine and two years' imprisonment.

This statute aimed at compelling Hancock to obey the orders of Grant, the General, and not of Johnson, the President; and it empowered General Grant to remove Hancock if he obeyed Johnson and not Grant. It also gave the General of the Army full power to do everything he saw fit in each of the Military Departments without any control of the President.

Its real animus was the effort of Garfield, and those who acted with him, to subordinate the civil to the military power in all the South, and to remove Hancock because he recognized the law as superior to the sword.

The bill was put upon its passage, and the Congressional Globe, of January 21, 1868, contains the following speech from James A. Garfield in its favor.

"I call attention to the oath that every officer and enlisted man takes before entering the army. It is in these words: 'I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States.'"

"I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States." "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States."

"I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States." "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States."

"I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States." "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States."

"I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States." "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true allegiance to the United States."

United States, and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to the rules and articles for the government of the Army of the United States."

Now, should the President of the United States give to the humblest officer of the Army an order contrary to the Rules and Articles of War or to the law of Congress, the subordinate can peremptorily refuse to obey, because the order has not been given in accordance with the rules and regulations of the power which commands both him and the President.

Now, if Congress can make laws assigning special duties to subordinate officers, such as judge-advocates, quartermasters, and barrack-masters, what new doctrine is this that it may not also assign special duties to the General of the Army? The volumes of statutes are full of laws of Congress commanding all classes of officers to perform all kinds of duties. It is now proposed to require of the General of the Army the performance of a special duty, namely, the duty of directing the operations of that part of the Army which occupies the States lately in rebellion.

If the General should neglect this duty the President, as commander-in-chief, can call him to account for such neglect, but he cannot prevent his obedience to the law.

So much for the constitutionality of this section. I now come to inquire why this legislation is needed. It is because this Congress, in its work of restoring to their places the States lately in rebellion, authorized the President to assign the officers of the Army to the duties prescribed in the law; and the President has made such use of that authority as to obstruct and delay the restoration of those States.

Without violating the letter of the law he has been able, in a great measure, to hinder the full and efficient execution of the law. His acts and those of his advisors are, to-day, the chief obstacles to the prompt restoration of the rebel States, and Congress proposes to remove those obstacles by transferring the power to the hands of one who has shown his loyalty to the country, and his willingness to obey the laws of the Union.

Mr. SPEAKER, I will not repeat the long catalogue of obstructions which he has thrown in the way by virtue of the power conferred upon him in the reconstruction law of 1867, but I will allude to one example, where he has found in a MAJOR-GENERAL OF THE ARMY A FACILE INSTRUMENT with which, more effectually to obstruct the work of reconstruction. This case is all the more painful because an otherwise meritorious officer, who bears honorable scars, earned in battle for the Union, has been made a party to the political madness which has so long marked the conduct of the President. This General was sent into the district of Louisiana and Texas with a law of Congress in his hand, a law that commands him to see that justice is administered among the people of that country, and that no pretense of civil authority shall deter him from performing his duty, and yet we find that officer giving lectures in the form of proclamations and orders of what ought to be the relation between civil and military departments of the Government. We see him ISSUING A GENERAL ORDER IN WHICH HE DECLARES THAT THE CIVIL SHOULD NOT GIVE WAY BEFORE THE MILITARY. We hear him declaring that he finds nothing in the laws of Louisiana and Texas to warrant his interference in the civil administration of those States. It is not for him to say which should be first, the civil or the military, in that rebel community. It is not for him to search the defunct laws of Louisiana and Texas for a guide to his conduct. It is for him to obey the laws which he was sent there to execute. It is for him to aid in building up civil governments, rather than preparing himself to be the presidential candidate of that party which gave him no sympathy when he was gallantly fighting the battles of the country."

The bill passed the House—yeas, 124, all Republicans; nays, 45, all Democrats—James A. Garfield voting yea. (See House Journal, page 219.)

The record is made up: It is Hancock, the soldier-civilian and the law, against Garfield, the disgraced-civilian and the sword above law.

CHOOSE YE!

Colonel McCalumet for Hancock.

WHY HE HAS CONCLUDED THAT A CHANGE IS NECESSARY.

John S. McCalumet's letter in Venango Spectator.

Since the nomination of Hancock and English by the National Democratic Convention my preference for their election has become so decided that it seems proper to give it the form of a public expression. I regret to go against General Garfield, for whose political and moral worth I have sincere regard, in spite of some specks in his record. But I cannot say as much for the nominee for Vice President on the Republican ticket. His virtual dismissal from the post of Collector of Customs at New York by an administration which recognized civil service rules is prima facie evidence of disqualification for the dignified office of President of the Senate. On the other hand, the Democratic candidates, Hancock and English, present a clean record of efficient and faithful service to their country.

The executive power of the country can be no better placed than in the hands of General Hancock. His love of justice is proverbial, his firmness for the right invincible and his honesty and integrity unquestionable. His conspicuous services are a part of the country's history, and his excellent civil attainments are firmly imbedded in the principles of Magna Charta and the common law. Nor is Mr. English wanting in my esteem. The only objection made to him is that he has been faithful in the management of his own affairs since his retirement from an honorable office, which he ably and worthily filled. He has not been charged with the misuse or the prostitution of a public trust.

The leading Democrats of the country behaved so handsomely in the last count of the electoral vote that it would now be fit that their reward should come in such a decisive majority for their ticket as to preclude in the next count all grounds for the interference of the

House of Representatives, or, what is worse, the executive army of the government.

Garfield Attempts to Secure Hancock's Removal in 1868.

Washington dispatch to New York World.

The famous Order No. 40 was issued by General Hancock November 29, 1867. Early in the ensuing session of Congress, January 13, 1868, Mr. Garfield, according to the Congressional Globe, page 489, asked unanimous consent in the House to introduce for immediate consideration and action a bill "to reduce and improve the military establishment by discharging one major-general."

The bill provided that the army should be reduced by the discharge from military service of the major-general who was the last commissioned in that grade before January, 1868, the bill to take effect from its passage, so that there should remain but four major generals in the army. As soon as the bill had been read Mr. Garfield expressed the wish that it might be acted upon the next morning. Objection being made, Mr. Garfield then said that he should bring it up the first thing on the following Monday. The bill was aimed directly at General Hancock, who had been commissioned Major General July 26, 1866, and was the last commissioned in that grade before January, 1868.

Thus it is seen that within six weeks after Hancock had issued Order No. 40, Garfield, chairman of the Military Committee, moved a bill to punish him for issuing it—not by retirement or pension, but by removal. The Garfield bill was not heard of again for the reason that on the same day, January 13, Mr. Bingham, from the Committee on Reconstruction, reported a bill that answered nearly the purpose sought by Garfield. It was in three wordy sections, but its purport was to compel Hancock to obey Grant, the general, rather than Johnson, the President, and investing in Grant the power to remove Hancock if he obeyed Johnson. It also gave Grant the power to do anything he might see fit in each of the military departments, regardless of the President. In broader terms, it meant that the powers granted the President by the Constitution should be overthrown by statute. The bill was put upon its passage January 17, and on that day Garfield made a speech from an alleged constitutional standpoint. After he had disposed of what he called its constitutionality he let the light in on his real purposes by arraighing Hancock for issuing Order No. 40. The language of the arraignment was repeated by Mr. Lawrence at Rocky Point yesterday. Mr. Bingham's bill passed the House, after Mr. Garfield's speech, by a strict party vote of 124 Republicans to 45 Democrats, Garfield of course voting yea. It was not heard of again in Congress for the reason given by Garfield to Hinsdale that Hancock afterward "kept his place." The speech, however, places Garfield in square antagonism not only to General Hancock's doctrines, but also to those which he has permitted his party associates of late to attribute to himself, at least so far as it embodies what he was pleased to consider his opinions of the relations of the civil and military powers as warranted by the Constitution.

From the New York Independent.

We cannot forget that Garfield was more deeply involved in the sad Credit Mobilier difficulty than any other member of the House of Representatives—excepting, of course, Ames and Brooks. After such an experience, he ought to have been extremely cautious. But the testimony taken in the investigation of the District of Columbia frauds shows that Mr. Garfield received \$5,000 for his aid in getting through a pavement contract accepted by the District government. Every cent of money voted to the District had to come through him. Shepherd could not afford to refuse him anything that he asked, and Mr. Garfield knew it when he asked and received for his services a fee which would have been grossly extravagant but for his official position.

From the Albany Times.

Maj. Bundy's "Life of Garfield" is not as exhaustively written as it should be. It makes no reference whatever to the anecdote in which it is related that Carter Harrison, then a member of Congress and now Mayor of Chicago, said to the Credit Mobilier statesman, referring to his action as member of the Electoral Commission: "Garfield, how could you do it?" Garfield replied: "Carter, if you had held the cards, would you not have played them?"

Something Bundy Left Out.

From the Albany Times.

THIS SCHOOL, as at present constituted, offers the very best facilities for Professional and Classical Education.

Location beautiful and easy of access. Surrounding scenery unsurpassed. Teachers experienced, efficient, and able to their duties. Discipline, firm and kind, uniform and thorough. Expenses moderate. Fifty cents a week deduction to those preparing to teach.

Students admitted at any time. Courses of study prescribed by the State: I. Model School, II. Preparatory, III. Elementary, IV. Scientific.

ADJUNCT COURSES: I. Academic, II. Commercial, III. Music, IV. Art. The Elementary and Scientific courses are Professional, and students graduating therein receive Diplomas, conferring the following corresponding degrees: Master of the Elements, and Master of the Sciences. Graduates in the other courses receive Normal Certificates of their attainments, signed by the Faculty.

The Professional courses are liberal, and are in thoroughness not inferior to those of our best colleges. The State requires a higher order of citizenship. The times demand it. It is one of the prime objects of this school to help to secure it by furnishing intelligent and efficient teachers for her schools. To this end it solicits young persons of good abilities and good purposes—those who desire to improve their time and their talents, as students. To all such it promises aid in developing their powers and abundant opportunities for well-paid labor after leaving school.

For catalogue and terms address the Principal.

Stockholders' Trustees—J. H. Barton, M. D., A. H. Best, Jacob Brown, S. M. Beckford, Samuel Christ, A. N. Rash, R. G. Cook, T. G. Hinkle, J. G. Kintner, E. P. McCormick, Esq., W. W. Rankin, Wm. H. Brown, State Trustees—Hon. A. G. Curtin, Hon. H. L. Duffek, Hon. G. M. Merrill, Hon. William Bigler, J. C. C. Whaley, S. Miller McCormick, Esq.

WOODWARD SEMINARY.

Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies and Little Children.

SECOND AND LOCUST STREETS, HARRISBURG, PA.

Regular term will begin SEPTEMBER 30, 1879. Course of study—Classical and Scientific, with Music and Art. Board and tuition from \$250 to \$350 a year and no extra. For circulars and all desirable information address 21-2m PRINCIPAL.

PATENTS procured upon Inventions. No ATTORNEY'S FEE IN ADVANCE. Our Office was established in 1830. We file CAVEATS, and obtain TRADE MARKS, DESIGN PATENTS, &c.

INVENTORS send us a Model of your Invention, with your own description of it, for our opinion as to patentability. No ATTORNEY'S FEE UNLESS PATENT IS SECURED. Our Book of Instructions, &c., "HOW TO PROTECT PATENTS," sent free on request; also sample copies of the Scientific Record, the Inventor's Journal.

R. S. A. P. LACEY, Patent Attorney, 604 F St., near Patent Office, Washington, D. C.

MONEY To Loan at 6 per Ct. BY THE MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF NEW YORK, no first mortgage, on improved farm property, in sums not less than \$1,000, and not exceeding one-third of the present value of the property. Any portion of the principal can be paid off at any time, and it has been the custom of the company to permit the principal to remain as long as the borrower wishes, if the interest is promptly paid. Apply to

CHARLES F. SHERMAN, Attorney-at-Law, 537 Court Street, Reading, Pa. or to DAVID E. KLINE, Co's Agent, Belleville, Pa.

GARMAN'S HOTEL, Opposite Court House, BELLEVILLE, PA. TERMS \$15 PER DAY. A good Livery attached. 1-17