THE DAILY EVENING BULLETIN.-PHILADELPHIA, MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1868.

HADDEUS STIVINS'S SPEECH

188

[Continued from the First page.]

or removal, the officer shall be considered removed from his effice: but if the Sonate shall not deem the reasons sufficient for such suspension or removal, the officer shall forthwith resume the functions of his office, and the person appointed in his place shall cease to discharge such duties. On the 12th day of August, 1867, the Senate On the 12th day of Argust, 1867, the Senate then not being in seesion, the President suspend-ed Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of the Depart-ment of War, and appointed U. S. Grant, Gene-ral, Secretary of War ad interim. Oa the 12th day of December, 1867, the Senate being then in in session, the reported, according to the require-ments of the act, the causes of such suspension to the Senate, which duly took the same into consideration. Before the Senate had concluded its examination of the question of the sufficiency its examination of the question of the sumclency of such reasons, he attempted to enter into ar-rangements by which he might obstruct the due execution of the law, and thus prevent. Edwin M. Stanton from forthwith resuming the func-tion of the other science and the sum of the M. Stanton from forthwing resuming the future tions of his office as Secretary of War, according to the provisions of the act, even if the Senate should decide in his favor. And in furtherance of said attempt, on the 21st day of February, 1868, he appointed one Lorenzo

day of February, 1868, he appointed one Lorenzo Thomas, by letter of authority or commission, Secretary of War ad interim, without the advice and consent of the Senate, although the same was then in session, and ordered him (the said Thomas) to take possession of the Department of War and the public property appertaining thereto, and to discharge the duties thereof.

We charge that, in define of frequent warn-ings, he has since repeatedly attempted to carry those orders into execution, and to prevent Edwin M. Stanton from executing the laws ap-pertaining to the Department of War, and from discharging the duties of the office.

The very able gentleman who argued this case for the respondent has contended that Mr. Stan-* 'n's case is not within the provisions of the act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices," and that therefore the President cannot be convicted of violating that act. His argument in demonstrating that position was not, I think, quite coust to his searcity in discovering where the great strength of the prosecution was lodged. the great strength of the prosecution was lodged. He contended that the proviso which embraced the Secretary of War did not include Mr. Stan-ton, because he was not appointed by the President in whose term the acts charged as misdemeanors were perpetrated; and in order to show that, he con-tended that the *term* of office mentioned during which he was entitled to hold meant the time during which the President who appointed him

which he was childred to had mean the third actually did hold, whether dead or alive; that Mr. Lincola, who appointed Mr. Stanton, and under whose commission he was holding indefinitely, being dead, his *term* of office referred to had expired, and that Mr. Johnson was not holding during a part of that term. That depends upon the Constitution, and the laws made ruder it. By the Constitution, the whole time from the adop-tion, of the Government was intended to be tion of the Government was intended to be divided into equal Presidential periods, and the word "term" was technically used to designate the time of each. The first sec-tion of the second article of the Constitution provides "that the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the View of the view and regular with the View term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as follows. &c. Then it provides that "in case of removal from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the duties of said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, designating what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall then act accordingly until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected."

A ...

15

The learned counsel contends that be decided. President, who accidentally accedes to the duties of President is serving out a new Presidential term of his own, and that, unless Mr. Stanton was appointed by him, he is not within the proviwas appointed by him, he is not within the provi-sions of the act. It happened that Mr. Stanton was appointed by Mr. Lincoln in 1862 for an in-definite period of time, and was still serving as his appointee, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Mr. Johnson never appointed him, and, unless be held a valid commission by virtue of Mr. Lincoln's appointment, he was acthim, and, unless behead a valid commission by virtue of Mr. Lincoln's appointment, he was act-ing for three years, during which time he expended billions of money and raised hundreds of thousands of men, without any commission at all. To per-the one might be adduced as an argument in favor of the other. But, since the action of any of the Presidents to which he refers, a law had been with the Executive, denying that right and prohibiting it in future, and imposing a severe penalty upon any executive offleer who should exercise it. And that, too, after the President had himself made issue on its constitutionality and been de-feated. No pretext, therefore, any longer exista that such right was vested in the President by virtue of his office. Hence the attempt to shield himself under such practice is a most lame evaeich of the question at issue. Did he "take care that this law should be faithfully" excented : He answers that acts, that would have violated the law had it existed, were practiced by his pre-decessors. How does that justify his own mulfeasance The President says that he removed Mr. Stan-

ton simply to test, the constitutionality of the tenure of office law by a judicial decision. He has already seen it tested and decided by the votes, twice given, of two thirds of the Senators and of the House of Representatives. It stood as a law upon the statute books. No case had arisen under that law, or is referred to by the President, which required any judicial interposition. If there had been, or should be, the courts were open to any one who felt aggreeved by the action of Mr. Stanton. But instead of enforcing that law, he takes advan tage of the name and the funds of the United States to resist it, and to induce others to resist it. Instead of attempting, as the Executive of the United States, to see that that law was faithfully executed, he took great pains and perpetrated the acts alleged in this article, not only to resist it himself, but to seduce others to do the same. He to aid him in an open avowed obstruction of the aw, as it stood unrepealed upon the statute book. He could find no one to unite

with him in perpetrating such an act, until he sunk down upon the unfortunate individual bearing the title of adjutant general of the army. bearing the title of adjutant-general of the army. Is this taking care that the laws shall be faith-fully executed? Is this attempting to carry them into effect, by upholding their validity, according to his onth? On the other hand, was it not a high and bold attempt to obstruct the laws and take care that they should not be executed? He must not excuse himself by saying that he had doubts of its constitutionality and wished to test it. What right had he to be hunting up excusos for others, as well as himself, to violate this law? Is not this confession a misdemennor in itself? Is not this confession a misdemeanor in itself?

The President asserts that he did not remove Stanton under the tenure-of-office law. This is a direct contradiction of his own letter to the Sec-retary of the Treasury, in which, as he was bound by law, he communicated to that officer the fact of the removal. This portion of the answer may therefore, be considered as disposed of by the non-existence of the fact, as well as by his subse quent report to the Senate. The following is the letter just alluded to, dated

August 14, 1867 : "Sik: In compliance with the requirements of the act entitled "An act to regulate the tenure of certain civil offices," you are hereby notified that on the 12th instant the Hon. Edwin M. Stan-ton was suspended from his office as Sceretary of War, and General U. S. Grant authorized and

mpowered to act as Secretary ad interim. "Hon. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY."

Wretched man ! a direct contradiction of his solemn answer! How necessary that a man should have a good conscience or a good mem ory! Both would not be out of place. How lovely to contemplate what was so assiduously inculcated by a celebrated Pegan into the mind of his son: "Virtue is truth, and truth is virtue." And still more, virtue of every kind charms us, yet that virtue is strongest which is effected by justice and generosity. Good deeds will never be done, wise acts will never he executed, except by the virtuous and the conscientious. May the people of this Republic remember this

good old doctrine when they next meet to select their rulers, and may they select only the brave and the virtuous!

Has it been proved, as charged in this article, that Andrew Johnson in vacation suspended from office Edwin M. Stanton, who had been duly appointed and was then executing the du-ties of Scoretary of the Department of War, without the advice and consent of the Senate; did he report the reasons for such suspension to the Senate within twenty days from the meeting of the Senate; and did the Senate proceed to consider the sufficiency of such reasons? Did the Senate declare such reasons in-sufficient, whereby the said Edwin M. Stanton became authorized to forthwith resume and exercise the functions of Secretary of War, and displace the Secretary ad interim, whose duties were then to cease and terminate: did the aid Andrew Johnson, in his official character of President of the United States, attempt to ob truct the return of the said Edwin M. Stanton and his resumption forthwith of the functions of his office as Sceretary of the Department of War; and has he continued to attempt to prevent the discharge of the duties of said office by said Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, notwithstand-ing the Scrate decided in his favor? If he has, then the acts in violation of law, charged in this article, are full and complete. The proof lies in a very narrow compass, and depends upon the credibility of one or two witnesses, who, upon this point, corroborate each other's evidence. Andrew Johnson, in his letter of the 31st of January, 1868, not only declared that such was his intention, but reproached U. S. Grant, General, in the following language : "You had found in our first conference 'that the President was desirons of keeping Mr. Stanton out of office, whether sustained in the suspen-sion or not.' You knew what reasons had insich or not.' You knew what reasons had in-duced the President to ask from you a promise; you also knew that in case your views of duty did not accord with his own convictions, it was his purpose to fill your place by another appoint-ment. Even ignoring the existence of a positive understanding between us, these conclusions were plainly deducible from various conversations. It is certain, however, that even under these circumstances you did not offer to return the place to my possession, but, according to your own statement, placed yourself in a position where, could I have anticipated your action, I would have been compelled to ask of you, as was compelled to ask of your predecessor in the War Department, a letter of resignation, or else to resort to the more disagreeable expedient of suspending you by a successor." He thus distinctly alleges that the General had a full knowledge that such was his deliberate in-tention. Haid words and injurious epithets can do nothing to corroborate or to injure the cha-racter of a witness; but if Andrew Johnson be not wholly destitute of truth and a shameless falsifier. then this article and all its charges are clearly made out by his own evidence. Whatever the respondent may say of the reply of U. S. Grant, General, only goes to confirm the fact of the President's lawless attempt to obstruct the execution of the act specified in the article. If General Grant's recollection of his conversation with the President is correct, then it goes affirmatively to prove the same fact stated by the President, although it shows that the President percevered in his course of determined obstruc-tion of the law, while the General refused to aid in its consummation. No differences as to the main fact of the attempt to violate and prevent the execution of the law exists in either state ment; both compel the conviction of the respon-dent, unless he should escape through other means than the facts proving the article. He cannot hope to escape by asking this high court to declate the "law for regulating the tenure of certain, civil offices" unconstitution dof certain, civil offices" unconstitution al and void; for it so happens, to the hope-less misfortune of the respondent, that al-most every member of this high tribunal has more than once,-twice, perhaps three times,-declared, upon his official oath, that law constitutional and valid. The unhappy man is in this condition: He has declared himself determined to obstruct that act; he has, by two several le ters of authority, ordered Lorenzo Thomas to violate that law; and he has issued commission during the session of the Senate, without the ad and consent of the Senate, in violation of vice haw, to said Thomas. He must, therefore, either deny his own solemn declarations and faisify the testimony of General Grant and Lorenzo Thomas, or expect that verdict whose least punishment is

decide in his favor; and the President and U.S. Grant, General, in their angry correspondence of the date heretofore referred to, made an issue of verselty-the President asserting that the General had promised to aid him in defeating the execu-tion of the laws by preventing the immediate rethe of the laws is preceding the interact of the remption of the functions of Secretary of War by Edwin M. Stanton, utid that the General vio-hated his promise; and U. S. Grant, General, denying ever having finally made such promise, although he agrees with the President that the President did attempt to induce him to make such promise and to enter into such an arrangement. Now, whichever of these gentlemen may have lost his mimory, and found in lieu of the trath the vision which issues from the Ivory Gate— though who can besitate to choose between the words of a gallant soldier and the pettifogging of a political trickster—is wholly immaterial, so far as the charge against the President is con-cerned. That charge is that the President did attempt to prevent the due execution of the tenure-of-cillee law by entingling the General in the arrangement; and unless both the President and the General have lost their memory and mistaken the truth with regard to the promises with each other, then this charge is made out. In short, if either of these gentlemen has correctly stated these facts of attempting the obstruction of the law, the President has been guilty of violating the law and of misprision of official perjury.

But, again, the President alleges his right to violate the act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices, because he says the same was in-operative and vold, as being in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Does it lie in his mouth to interpose this plea? He had acted under that law, and issued letters of authority, both for the long and short term, to several per-sons under it, and it would hardly lie in his mouth after that to deny its validity, unless he confessed himself guilty of law-breaking by issu-Let us here look at Andrew Johnson accepting

the oath "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

fully executed." On the 2d of March, 1867, he returned to the Senate the 'tenure-of-office bill," where it origi-nated and had passed by a majority of more than two-thirde—with reasons elaborately given why it should not pass finally. Among these was the allegation of its unconstitutionality. It passed by a vote of 35 yeas toril nays. In the House of Kentr containers it passed by more than a two-Representatives it passed by more than a two-birds majority; and when the vote was an-nounced, the Speaker, as was his custom, proclaimed the vote, and declared in the language of the Constitution, "that two-thirds of each House having voted for it, notwithstanding the objec-tions of the President, it has become a law."

I am supposing that Andrew Johnson was at this moment waiting to take the oath of office as President of the United States, "that he would being about to depart, he turned to the years being about to depart, he turned to the person administering the oath, and says: "Stop: I have a further oath. I do solemnly swear that I will not allow the act entitled, 'An act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices, just passed by Congress over the Presidential veto, to be executed; but I will prevent its execution by virtue of my own constitutional power." How shocked Congress would have been-what

would the country have said to a scene equalled only by the unparalleled action of this same official, when sworn into office on that fatal fifth day of March, which made him the successor of Abraham Lincoln! Certainly he would not have been permitted to be inaugurated as Vice-Presi-dent or President. Yet such in effect has been his conduct, if not under oath, at least with less his conduct, if not under oath, at least with least excuse, since the fatal day which inflicted him upon the people of the United States. Can the President hope to escape if the fact of his violating the law be proved or con-fessed by him, as has been done? Can he ex-pect a sufficient number of his tryers to pro-nounce that has unconstitutional and void—those nounce that law unconstitutional and void—those same tryers having passed upon its validity upon several occasions? The act was originally passed by a vote of 29 yeas to 9 nays. Those who voted in the affirmative were Messra. Anthony, Brown, Cattell, Chandler, Conness, Cragin, Edmunds Fogg, Foster, Freilinghuysen, Grimen, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Lane Morgan, Morrill, Poland, Ramery, Sherman, Sprague, Sum-ner, Van Winkle, Wade, Willey, Williams, Wilson, Yates-29. Sub-(quently the House of Representatives

passed the bill with amendments, which the Senate disagreed to and the bill was afterward re-ferred to a committee of conference of the two bouses, whose agreement was reported to the Senate by the managers, and was adopted by a vote of 22 yeas to 10 nays. Those who voted in the voit of 22 yeas to 10 nays. Inose who voited in the affirmative were Messre. Anthony, Brown, Chand-ler, Conness, Fogg, Fowler, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Lane, Morgan, Morill, Rumsey, Ross, Sberman, Stewart, Summer, Trumbull, Wade, Williams, Wilson and Yates—22. After the veto, upon reconsideration of the bill in the Senate, and after all the arguments against ite validity were spread before that body, it passed by a vote of 35 yeas to 11 nays. It was voted for by the following Senators: Messrs. Anthony, Cattell, Chandler, Conness, Cragin, Edmunds, Fersenden, Fogg, Foster, Fowler, Frelinghuysen, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Kirkwood, Lane, Morgan, Morrill, Nye, Poland, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Ross, Shern ar, Sprague, Stewart, Sum-ner, Trumbull, Van Winkle, Wade, Willey, Williams, Wilson, Yates-25. But there is a still more conclusive answer The first section provides that every person held-ing eivil office who has been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, and every peron that hereafter shall be appointed to any office, shall be entitled to hold such office until a successor shall have been in like manner an vise provided Then comes the provise which the defendant's counsel say does not embrace Mr. Stanton, because he was not appointed by the President in whose term he was removed. If he was not embraced in the proviso, then he was now here specially provided for, and was consequently embraced in the first clause of the first section, which declares that every person holding any civil office not otherwise provided for comes within the provisions of this act. The President contends that by virtue of the Constitution he had the right to remove heads of departments, and cites a large number of cases where his predecessor had done so. It must be observed that all those cases were before the pastage of the tenure-of-oilice act, March 2, 1867. Will the respondent say how the having done an act when there was no law to forbid it justifies the repetition of the same act after a law has been passed expressly prohibiting the same? It is not the suspension or removal of Mr. Stauten that is complained of, but the manner of the suspension. If the Presi-dent thought he had good reasons for suspending or removing Mr. Stanton, and had done so, sending those reasons to the Senate, and then obeyed the decision of the Senate in their finding, there would have been no complaint; but instead of that he suspends him in direct definance of the tenure of-office law, and then enters inte an arrangement, or attempts to do so, in which he thought he had succeeded, to prevent the due execution of the law after the decision of the Senate. And when the Senate ordered him to re store Mr. Stanton, he makes a second removal by virtue of what he calls the power vested in him by the Constitution The action of the Senate on the message of the President, communicating his reasons for the suspension of E. M. Stanton, Secretary of War, under the act entitled an act to regulate the tenure of certain civil offices, was as follows:

who have thus related him in a constitution of manner, and blds them defined. How can be escape the just vengeance of the law? Wretched receipt the just vengence of the nw r w retained man, standing at bay, surrounded by a cordon of living men, each with the axo of an executioner uplifted for his just pun-istment. Every Senator now trying him, excet (such as had already adopted his policy, voted for this same resolution, pronouncing his solemn doom. Will any one of them vote for his acquittal on the ground of its unconstitution shify? I know that Senators would venture to any ne cessary act if endorsed by an honest conscience and an enlightened public opinion, but neither for the sake of the President nor of any one else, would one of the a suffer himself to be tortured on the gibbet of everlasting obloquy. How long and dark would be the track of infamy which must mark his name, and that of his posterity! Nothing is therefore more certain than that it

requires no gift of prophecy to predict the fate of this unhappy victim. I have now discussed but one of the numerous articles, all of which I believe to be fully sus-twined, and few of the almost innumerable offonces charged to this wayward, unhappy official. I have alluded to two or three others which I could have wished to have had time to present and discuss, not for the sake of punishment. but for the benefit of the country. One of these yas an article charging the President with usurping the legislative power of the nation, and at-tempting still his usurpations.

With regard to usurpations, one single word will explain my meaning. A civil war of gigantic proportions, covering sufficient territory to con-stitute many States and nations, broke out, and embraced more than ten millions of men, who formed an independent government, called the Confederate States of America. They rose to the dignity of an independent belligerent, and were so acknowledged by all civilized nations, as well as by ourselves. After expensive and bloody well as by ourselves. After expensive and bloody strife, we conquered them, and they submitted to our arms. By the law of nations, well un-derstood and undisputed, the conquerors in this unjust war had the right to deal with the van-quished as to them might seem good, subject only to the laws of humanity. They had a right to confiscate their property to the extent of in-demniting the understand their different to dennifying themselves and their clitzens; to annex them to the victorious nation, and pass inst such laws for their government as they might think proper. This doctrine is as old as Grotins, and as fresh as the Dorr rebellion. Neither the President nor the judiciary had any right to in-teriere, to dictate any terms, or to ald in recon-struction, further than they were directed by the sovereign power. That sovereign power is this Republic is the Congress of the United States. Whoever, besides Congress, undertakes to create new States or to rebuild old ones, and fix the condition of their citizenship and union, usurps powers which do not belong to him, and is danger ous or not dangerous, according to the extent of his power and his pretensions. Andrew Johnson did usurp the legislative power of the nation by building new States, and reconstructing, as far as in him lay, this empire. He directed the defanct States to come forth and live by virtue of his breathing into their nostrils the breath of life He directed them what constitutions to form, and fixed the qualifications of electors and of office holders. He directed them to send forward members to each branch of Congress, and to aid him in representing the nation. When Congress passed a law declaring all these doings unconstitutional, and fixed a mode for the admission of this new territory into the nation, he proclaimed it unconstitutional and advised the people not to submit to it, nor to obey the commands of Congress. I have not time to enumerate the particular acts which con-stitute his high-handed usurpations. Suffice it to say, that he seized all the powers of the Gov-crimient within these States, and had he been permitted, would have become their absolute

withstanding Congress declared more than once all the governments which he thus created to be void and of none effect. But I promised to be brief, and must abide by the promise, although I should like the judg-ment of the Senate upon this, to me, seeming vital phase and real rurpose of all his misde meanors. To me this seems a sublime spectacle A nation, not free, but as nearly approaching it as human institutions will permit of, consisting of thirty millions of people, had fallen into conflict, which among other people always ends in anarchy or despotism, and had laid down their arms, the mutineers submitting to the conquerors. The laws were about to regain their accustomed sway, and again to govern the nation by the punishment of treason and the reward of virtue. Her old institutions were about to be reinstated so far as they were

good as to tell us by what authority he became the obstructor of an unrepealed law instead of its executor, especially alaw whose constitutionality d twice tested? If there were nothing ela than his own statement, he deserves the contempt of the American people, and the punishment of its highest tribunal. If he were not willing to excerte the laws passed by the American Con-gress, and unrepealed, let him resign the offlice which was thrown upon him by a horrible convutsion, and retire to his village obscurity. Let him not be so swollen by pride and arrogance, which sprang from the deep misfortune of his country. as to attempt an entire revolution of its internal vants of his lamented predecessor. OITY NOTIOES

OTTY NOTTOES WHEN WILL QUARER WEEK END?—This is not a conundrum, only an anxiety about the continued wet weather makes us search around for some care of it. We have tried staying in the house, and tried goine out; but our only hope is in the disbandment of the broad-brim hats and pipe-bowl bonnets of the Arch street neeting We look forward to a day of settlement for everything, including the weather. When that comes we can appear in our spring suite, purchased, we contees, rather prematurely at Charles Stokes & Co.'s, under the Continental. A STUBBORN COUGH that will not yield to ordi-

nary remedies, may be thoroughly cured by Jayne's Rypectorant, a most effective medicine in all Bron-chial and Pulmonary Disorders. Sold everywhere. SPRING brings unto us genial skies, budding

fowers and all that goes to make mother earth beau-tiful, but none of its blessings are bolked for with more anxiety than the spring styles of Boots and Shoes sent forth by Bartlett, of 33 South Sixth atreet, above Chestant. Exquisitely becoming in shape, unrivalled for finish, remarkable for comfort and durability. ALL first-class Family and Manufacturing Sow-

ing Machines, sold on installments, exchanged, and for rent, at the Sewing Machine Exchange, No. 701 Chestnut street, second floor. Braing Hats. Spring Hats, Of the rewest and latest styles, at The very lowest prices. Oakfords', Continental Hotel.

GROVER & BAKER'S Highest Premium Sewing Machines, 730 Chestnut street.

ALEXANDER'S SILAMEAU imparts with a single application a natural brown or black color to the hair, without staining the skin, and without any pre-paration—at the same time giving it a lively, soft and

glossy appearance. Sold retail by Frederick Brown, Fifth and Chestnut; Hassard & Co., Twelfth and Chestnut; wholesale by R. and G. A. Wright, 624 Chestnut street.

SPRING HATS. Spring Hats, Of the newest and latest styles, at The very lowest prices. Oakfords', Continental Holel.

AMERICAN WALTHAM WATCHES.—The Best. The Cheapest. Recommended by Railway Conduc-tors, ergineers and expressmen, the most exacting class of watch-wearch, as superior to all others for

Unservice and the set of the set

For sale by all respectable dealers.

PAINFUL.—There are few operations more pain-ful than cutting teeth. A little of Bower's Infant Cor-dial rubbed upon the gum of teething infants is a great soother.

BFRCIALTY.--All those gents desiring elegant-fitting pantaloons will find them at C. C. Dittrich & Co., Continental Hotel, Ninth street, as this branch of Tailoring is made a specialty, and really warrants an invitation. Always a fine stock of goods on hand.

FLORENCE SEWING MACHINE. Florence Sewing Machine, Florence Sewing Machine, Florence Sewing Machine, Office, 1123 Chestnut street, Philadelphta,

DEAFNESS, BLINDNESS AND CATARREL . Isnacs, M. D., Professor of the Eye and Esr, treats J. Isaacs, M. D., Professor of the Eye and Ear, treats all diseases appertaining to the above members with the utmost success. Testimonials from the most re-liable sources in the city can be seen at his office, No. S05 Arch street. The medical faculty are invited to accompany their patients, as he has no secrets in his practice. Artificial eyes inserted. No charge made for examination. withstanding Congress declared more than once

SPRING HATS. Spring Hats, Of the newest and latest styles, at The very lowest prices. Oaktords', Continental Hotel.

. III



Respectfully invite the attention of THE TRADE to their large Stock of **CARPETINGS** of their own and other Manufactures, No. 509 CHESTNUT STREET. REMOVAL 1868. 1868. OF OUR **RETAIL DEPARTMENT** From 519 Ohestnut Street TO NO. 609 CHESTNUT STREET. Where we are now opening AN IMMENSE NEW STOCK FOREIGN CARPETINGS. Embracing all the latest and choicest styles of AXMINSTER, ROYAL WILTON, BRUSSELS, TA-PESTRY, VELVETS, TAPESTRY BRUSSELS, DA MASK, AND PALATINE VENETIANS; ALSO, ENG-LISH OIL CLOTHS, together will a full line of DOMESTIC CARPETINGS. BRUSSELS, TAPESTRY BRUSSELS and VENE TIANS, for HALLS and STAIRS, with extra burders. MoCALLUM, OBEASE & SLOAN. CARPETS, OIL CLOTHS, CANTON MATTINGS, &o., Just received per late steamer. E. H.GODSHALK & CO. 728 Chestnut Street. THEO. E. WIEDERAGTER E. H. GODBILALE. NEW CARPETS. JAMES H. ORNE, SON & CO.,

CARPICTINGS AND GIL UDOTHS.

1868. CARPETINGS. 1868

GLEN ECHO MILLS,

Germantown, Philadelphia.

MCCALLUM, CREASE & SLOAN

BOWER'S SENNA FIGS, FOR CONSTIPATION-626 Chestnut Street, FOR SALE. FOR SALE. Have opened New Carpets, Oil Cloth, Druggets, Canton nd Cocos Matting, Rugs, &c. The Elegant BROWN-STONE HOUSE Wiltons, Brussels, 2102 WALNUT Street. Velvets, Extra Tapestries. OPEN EVERY DAY. The above are our own Patterns. APPLY AT English Ingrains, Three Plys, 129 South Seventh Street. st:56trp\$ Oil Cloths, Iruggets, sit56trp3 FOR SALE - BEAUTIFUL AND VALUABLE The undersigned offers for sale the following pro-perty at Oincy, in the Dwenty-second Ward of the city of Hiladelphia, absut five miles north of Market Street, on the Second Street Turapike. This very desh able property embraces, from its prox-in ity to built up portion of the city, both town and coun-try, and compress a continuous front on the cast side . (the Turnpike of half a mile, and extends in the same di-rection to the Theory Greek, south to the Oiney road, on which it fronts about 1,800 feet, and contains nearly sixts acts of land, which is in a high state of improvement and cultivation. English Venetian, Cocoa Matting, Straw Matting. OF OUR OWN IMPORTATION THIS SPRING, The building belonging to the estate are all of the first cultivation. The buildings belonging to the estate are all of the first class, and consist of a mansion house of over 20 rooms. —etrecied under the supervision of Samuel Bloan, Esq., Architect.—farm house, gardener's house, carriage house, spacious harn, with stables underneath ; green house, stocked with choice variety of grapes; hot-bads ice house, corneril, dec., dec, and are new, built of stone, in the very best manner. The mansion house and out-buildings, with about 20 acres of land, will be sold separately, if desired. BAMUEL C. FORD, p27.613 No. 137 South sourch street. Bome very superior, all of which we offer at lowest prices. JAMES H. ORNE, SON & CO., Chestnut, below Seventh. Ap27.613 No. 127 South south street. FOR BALE -HANDSOME FARM AND COUN-Erg., President of Girard Collego -contaming 70 acres, situate in Bensalem Townshio, Bucks county, sight minute-walk from Cornel's Station, on the Philadel-phiand Trenton Railroad, fourteen miles from the city. The improvements consist of a handsome readence, con-taining fifteen rooms, frame cottage, stone tenant house, barn, dc. Beautifully situated on the Delaware, on which it has a front of about 1,000 feet. EWIS H. REDNER, ap37 m w3t) FOR SALE.-HANDSOME RESIDENCE, No. 1815 Spruce street. LEWIS H. REDNER, ap37 385 REAL ESTATE SALES. CANTON MATTING. Our Own Importation This Spring. SOME VERY SUPERIOR 8-4, 7-8, 4-4, 5-4, 6-4 white and red check STRAW MATTINGS. JAMES H. ORNE, SON & CO.,
Provide
Provide

ADMINISTRATRIX'S
PEREMPTORY

ADMINISTRATRIX'S
PEREMPTORY

By order of the Urphane' Court.--Extate of Hamilton

Created and the Urphane's Court.--Extate of Hamilton

Court of the City and County of Philadelphia

El o'clock, noon, at the Philadelphia Exchange, the foil

oving described propert, isto of Hamilton Creas, dec'd.

viz.:
All that 22-story double stone residence and lot of

germand, situate on Checknut's.ill, in the late township of

germand, situate on Checknut's.ill, in the late township of

germands a stone, and south 50 deg. 15 min., east 19 perches

Effect for herds... and south 50 deg. 15 min., east 41 9-10

perches to a stone, and south 50 deg. 15 min., east 41 9-10

perches, is a stone, and south 50 deg. 15 min., east 41 9-10

perches, is a stone, and south 50 deg. 15 min., east 41 9-10

perches, is a stone, and sout 626 Chestnut St., below Seventh. REAL ESTATE SALES. ap9 2mrp3 CARPETS, OIL CLOTH, MATTINGS, &o., WHOLESALE AND RETAIL. We are now receiving our Spring supply. and are pared to sell at a great reduction from former prices. LEEDOM & SHAW, 910 Arch Street,

nit this to be one without any valid commis-sion would have been a misdeameanor in itself. But if he held a valid commission, whose com-mission was it? Not Andrew Johnson's. Then in whose term was he serving, for he must have been in somebody's term? Even if it was in Johnson's term, he would hold for four years unless sooner removed, for there is no term spoken of in the Constitution of a shorter period for a Presidential term than four years. But i makes no difference in the operation of the law whether he was holding in Lincoln's or Johnson's term. Was it not in Mr. Lincoln's term? Liucoln had been elected and re-elected, the second term to commence in 1865, and the Constitution expressly declared that that term should be four ycars.

By virtue of his previous commission and the uniform custom of the country, Mr. Stanton continued to hold during the term of Mr. Lincoln, unless sooner removed. Now, does one pretend that from the 4th of March, 1865, a new Presidential term did not commence? For it will be seen upon close examination that the word "têrm" alone marks the time of the Presdential existence. so that it may divide the dential existence, so that it may divide the different periods of office by a well-recognized rule. Instead of saying that the Vice President shall become President upon his death, the Constitution says, "in case of the re-moval of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President?" What is to devolve on the Vice President? What is to devolve on the Vice President? Not the Pre-sidential commission held by his predecessor but to devolve on the Vice President? Not the Pre-sidential commission held by his predecessor, but the "dutics" which were incumbent on him? If he were to take Mr. Lincoln's term he would serve for four years, for term is the only limita-tion to that office, defined in the Constitution, as I have said before. But the learned counsel has contended that the word "term" of the Presiden-tial office means the death of the President. Then it would have been better expressed by saying that the Presidet shall hold his office during the term between two assassinations, and then the assassination of the President would mark the period of the operation of this law.

If, then, Mr. Johnron was serving out one of Mr. Lincoln's terms, there seems to be no argument sgainst including Mr. Stanton within the meaning of the law. He was so included by the President in his notice of removal, in his reasons therefore given to the Senate and in his notifica-tion to the Secretary of the Treasury; and it is too late, when he is caught violating the very law under which he professes to act, to turn round and deny that that law affects the case. The gentleman treats lightly the question of estoppel; and yet really nothing is more powerful, for it is an argu-ment by the party himself against himself, and although not pleadable in the same way is just as potential in a case in pais as when pleaded in a case of record.

The respondent, in violation of this law, ap-pointed General Thomas to office, whereby, ac-cording to the express terms of the act, he was guilty of a high misdemeanor. But whatever may have been his views with regard to the tenure-of office act, he knew it was a law, and so recorded upon the statutes. I disclaim all necessity, in a trial of impeachment, to prove the wicked or unlawful intention of the respondent,

wicked or unlawful intention or the responses. and it is unwise ever to aver it. In impeachments, more than in indictments, the averring of the fact charged carries with it it is necessary to say about intent. In all that it is necessary to say about intent. indictments you charge that the defendant, "instigated by the devil," and so on: and you might as well call on the prosecution to prove the pres-ence, shape, and color of his majesty, as to call apon the managers in impeachment to prove in-tention. I go further than some, and contend tention. I go further than some, and contend that no corrupt or wicked motive need instigate the acts for which impeachment is brought. It is enough that they were official violations of law. The counsel has placed great stress upon the necessity of proving that they were wilfully done. If by that he means that they were vol-untarily done, I agree with him. A more acci-dental trespass would not be sufficient to convict. But that which is coluntarily done is wilfully done, according to every honest definition; and whataccording to every honest definition; and whatever malteasance is willingly perpetrated by an office-holder is a misdemeanor in office, whatever he may allege was his intention. The President justifies himself by asserting that

all previous Presidents had exercised the same right of removing officers, for cause to be judged of by the President alone. Had there been no law to prohibit it when Mr. Stanton was re-moved, the cases would have been parallel, and

removal from office. But the President denies in his answer to the first and the eleventh articles (which he intends has a joint answer to the two charges) that he had attempted to contrive means to prevent the due execution of the law regulating tenure of ertain civil offices, or had violated his oach 'to take care that the laws be faithfully execu-ted." Yet while he denies such attempt to de-feat the execution of the laws, in his letter of the Sist of January, 1868, he asserts and reprachas

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, Jantary 13, 1868. Resolved, That having considered the evidence

and reasons given by the President in his report of December 12, 1867, for the suspension from the office of Secretary of War of Elwin M. Stanton, the Senate do not concur in such suspension And the same was duly certified to the Presi-ent, in the face of which he; with an impudence and brazen determination to usurp the powers of the Senate, again removed Edwin M. Stanton, at d appointed Lorenzo Thomas Secretary ad interim in his stead. The Senate, with calm manifsees, rebukid the usurper by the following reso-IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, SLAATE OF THE U. S.,

tornary 21, 1868. Whereas, The Senate has received and consi-

and the communication of the President stating that he had removed Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, and had designated the Adjutant-General of the army to act as Secretary of War ad interim; therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That Resoluted by the Schule of the United Stotes, That in der the Constitution and haws of the United States, the President has no power to remove the Secretary of War, and to designate any other officer to perform the duties of that office ad feat the execution of the laws, in his letter of the Stat of January, 1868, he asserts and reproaches Gen. Grant by the assertion, that the General knew that his object was to prevent Edwin M. Stanton rom forthwith resuming the functions of his office, notwithstanding that the Senate might

applicable, according to the judgment of the con Then one of their inferior servants, in nerors. stigated by unholy ambition, sought to seize aportion of the territory according to the fashion of neighboring anarchies, and to convert a land of freedom into a land of slaves. This people the upon his trial, and dave put the chief of them upon his trial, and demand judgment upon his misconduct. He will be condemned, and his sentence inflicted without turmoil, tumult, or bloodshed, and the nation will continue its accustomed course of freedom and prosperity, without the shedding any further of human blood and with a milder punishment than the world has been accustomed to see, or perhaps than ought now to be inflicted. Now, even if the pretext of the President were

true and not a mere subterfuge to justify the chief act of violation with which he stands charged, still that would be such an abuse of the patronage of the Government as would demand s impeachment for a high misdemeanor. us again for a moment examine into some of the circumstances of that act. Mr. Stanton was appointed Sceretary of War in 1862, and continued to hold upder Mr. Johnson, which, by all usage is considered a reappointment. Was he a faithful officer, or was he removed for corrupt purposes? After the death of Mr. for corrupt purposes? After the death of Mr. Lincoln, Andrew Johnson had changed his whole code of politics and policy, and instead of obey ing the will of those who put him into power, he determined to create a party for himself to carry out his own ambitious purposes. For every honest purpose of the Government, and for every bonest purpose for which Mr. Stanton was ap-pointed by Mr. Lincoln, where could a better man be found? None ever organized an army of a million of men and provided for its subsistence and efficient action more rapidly than Mr. Stanton and his predecessor. It might, with more propriety, be said of this officer than of the celebrated Frenchman, that he "organized vic He raised, and by his requisitions distory.' tributed more than a billion of dollars annually without ever having been charged or suspecte with the malappropriation of a single dollar; and when victory crowned his efforts he disbanded that immense army as quietly and peacefully as f it had been a summer parade. He would not a suppose, adopt the personal views of the Presi-dent; and for this he was suspended until restored by the emphatic verdict of the Senate. Now if we are right in our narrative of the conduct of these parties and the motives of the President, the very effort at removal was a high handed usurpation as well as a corrupt misdemeanor, for which of itself he ought to be impeached and thrown from the place he was abusing. But he says that he did not remove Mr. Stanton for the Then he forgot the truth in his controversy with the General of the Army. And because the General did not aid him and finally admit that he had agreed to ald him in resisting that law, he railed upon him like a very drab.

The counsel for the respondent allege that no removal of Mr. Stanton ever took place, and that therefore the sixth section of the act was not vio They admit that there was an order of related. moval and a recision of his commission : but as he did not obcy it, say it was no removal. That anggests the old saying that it used to be thought that "when the brains were out the man was dead." That idea is proved by learned counsel to be absolutely failacious. The brain of Mr. Stanton's commission was taken out by the order of removal—the recision by of of his commission—and his head was absolutely cut off by that gallant soldier, General Thomas, the night after the masquerade. And yet, according to the learned and delicate counsel, until the mortal remains, everything which could putrify was shovelled out and hauled into the muck-yard, there was no removal. But it is said that this took place merely as an experiment to make a judicial case. Now, suppose there is anybody who, with the facts before him, can believe that this was not an afterthought, let us see if that palliates the offence. The President is sworn to take what part of the Constitution or laws does he find it to be his duty to search out for defec-tive laws that stand recorded upon the statutes, in order that he may advise their infraction? the tenure of office bill Who was aggrieved by that he was authorized to use the name and the funds of the Government to relieve? Will he be so Between Ninth and Tenth Streets. fe29-3mrp3 CARPETS, OIL CLOTHS, MATTINGS.

THE HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, &C., THE HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE and in accellent or, Embracing some very desirable articles, in excellent or, der, together with all the farming utenaits, agricultural implements, huy wagon, cart, des room, de. Also, a pair of valuable bay mares, two cows, one calf, and a lot of civitation of the control of the sold to the civitation of the control of the sold to the

of viluable bay indice stabilishment will be solut to service its in the state of the stabilishment will be solut to stabilishment will be solution to the highest bidder. Teina-Personal Property, Cash ; Real Estate, one-half my remain on mortgage, behance Cash ; five hundred dol-lath to be paid at time of sale. Definition of the solution of th

TOWNSEND & CO.. No 59 N. Second St , below Aroh. STOLES. STOLEN-ON THE 22d INSTANT-NINE 31,000 Donds of the Susquehanna Canal Company, numbered 525, 527, 1043, 219, 504, 45, 7, 8, All persons are warned again t receiving the above. CTFAMBHIP SAXON, FROM BOSTÓN, CON-Seiguees of indse, per above siteamer, will please send for theil goods now landing at Pine St, Wharf, ap27.8t HENRY WINSOR & CO.

IMPORTATION OF 1868,

All the Latest and Best Styles

AΤ

REDUCED PRICES.

ap27.32 HEIMAI WINDOW C FOR SALE.-TO MERCHANTS, STOREKEEPERS, Hotels and dealers-200 Cases Champagne and Crab Cider. 250 bbls. Champagne apd Crab Cider. 1200 Pear street.