

impression. I only beg that in like manner you will not ask impossibilities of me.

"If you think you are not strong enough to take Richmond just now, I do not ask you to try just now. Save the army, material and personal, and I will strengthen it for the offensive again as fast I can."

On the 3d of July, after the army had reached Harrison's Bar, General McClellan writes to the Secretary of War:

"I am in hopes that the enemy is as completely worn out as we are; he was certainly very severely punished in the last battle."

It is, of course, impossible to estimate as yet our losses, but I doubt whether there are to day more than 30,000 men with their colors."

To accomplish the great task of capturing Richmond, and putting an end to this rebellion, re-enforcements should be sent to me rather much over than less than 100,000 men."

THE ARMY REPLENISHES.

The retreat of the army from Malvern to Harrison's Bar was very precipitate. The troops upon their arrival there, were huddled together in great confusion, the entire army being collected within a space of about three miles along the river. No orders were given the first day for occupying the heights which commanded the position, nor were the troops so placed as to be able to resist an attack in force by the enemy, and nothing but a heavy rain, thereby preventing the enemy from bringing up their artillery, saved the army there from destruction. The enemy did succeed in bringing up some of their artillery, and threw some shells into camp, before any preparations for defense had been made. On the 3d of July the heights were taken possession of by our troops and works of defense commenced, and then, and not until then, was our army secure in that position.

NUMBER OF TROOPS.

By reference to the testimony of Mr. Tucker, Assistant Secretary of War, it will be seen that prior to the 5th of April, 1862, 121,500 men had been landed on the peninsula shortly after Gen. Franklin's division of General McDowell's corps, numbering about 12,000 men, was sent down. In the early part of June Gen. McClellan's division, of the same corps, of about 10,000 men, was sent down, together with about 11,000 men, from Ballin's and Forts Monroe, and about the last of June some 5,000 men of General Shields' division were also sent down. Total, 159,500 men.

On the 20th of July, 1862, according to the returns sent to the Adjutant General's office by Gen. McClellan, the army of the Potomac, under his command, was as follows: Present for duty, 101,901; special duty, sick, and in arrest, 17,828; absent, 38,795; total, 168,314. This included the corps of Gen. Dix, amounting 9,997, present for duty, or, in all, 11,778 men.

LIARS SHOULD HAVE GOOD MEMORIES.

The editors of the Copperhead organ in this place, in their issue of last week, (April 15th, 1863), make the following bold, defiant and unequivocal assertion:

"We defy these foul-mouthed slanderers to point to a single resolution, speech, or publication, for which the Democratic party is in any sense responsible, favoring an unconditional or dishonorable peace. If they cannot do this—and we know they cannot—then are their souls blackened with the damning guilt of bearing false witness against their neighbors."

We have pronounced the charge of our neighbor as maliciously false, and demanded that he be held up before the community as a public calumniator, unless he substantiates his charges. Having done so, we now promise to be tried by the same ordeal before which we arraign him."

Very well, neighbors; you have thrown out the challenge and appointed the "ordeal." Now, for the evidence. Here it is:

"Other classes, embracing seven-eighths of the whole population, we venture to say that four-fifths of them will raise their voices any day in favor of ANY compromise or 'parley' that will restore peace to the nation."

Now for the satisfaction of this editorial trio, and to enable them to know exactly where to go when they determine to put their blood-hounds on the scent for victims to satiate their thirst for blood, we take this opportunity to inform them that we are just that kind of "traitors," we are in favor of ANY compromise, "parley," armistice, or cessation of hostilities, that will give the faintest hope of preserving our present government, our Constitution and free institutions, and restoring prosperity to the country."

It will be observed that the evidence is positive—conclusive. The editors of the Copperhead organ, in their issue of July 3d, 1868, say that they are "in favor of any compromise, parley, armistice, or cessation of hostilities," that will "restore peace" and "preserve the present form of government."

In view of this unequivocal testimony, the "ordeal"—the "community"—before which they "arraigned" themselves, we think, cannot fail to pronounce a proper verdict. And what is that verdict to be? According to the authority first above quoted, the "ordeal" will pronounce, the editors of the Copperhead organ in Clearfield, a set of self-convicted public calumniators and foul-mouthed slanderers, whose "souls" are "blackened with the damning guilt of bearing false witness against their neighbors."

This may seem to be harsh language, but we are not responsible for it. The editors of that sheet, "defy" the proof, challenge the trial, furnish the evidence, and pronounce the sentence—hence, they alone are responsible for it.

But, perhaps, they will say that the extract given is not a "resolution," "speech," or "public act," for which their party is responsible—that it is an editorial—a mere private opinion. Such special pleading will not avail them anything, however, as they claim to be "firmly Democratic," and hence, the organ of the Copperhead clique of Clearfield county, whose sentiments they undoubtedly utter—and as such, they will be held responsible, by "the community," for the "public act" of advocating "peace on any terms," and for "deliberately perpetrating a wicked, barefaced and malicious falsehood" upon their readers—and "they knew it to be such" when they wrote the article, which they published in their issue of April 15th, 1863.

A FACT.—Several years since, it was customary for the so-called "Democratic" politicians to raise a great hue and cry, on certain occasions, about the influence of "British Gold" to the detriment of the interests of this country. Now, "British Gold" builds ships for the rebels to run our blockaded ports with—"British Gold" fits out pirates and sends them forth to rob and destroy our commercial marine upon the high seas—"British Gold" buys arms and ammunition for the rebels to carry on their war against our government—in short, "British Gold" is the hope and stay and life of the rebellion, and yet, not one word of condemnation do we hear now, against this use of "British Gold," from these same fellows. Yes, on the other hand, they rejoice that such is the fact. Verily, things have changed of late!

The army vote, for Judge of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, so far as received, stands Republican 6,168, Democrat 2,216.

both's firing on them. The guns of the forts were of the heaviest calibre and most approved patterns—the English allies of the rebels having supplied them with some of their best ordnance. The artillery practice was excellent, as is proved by the fact that our nine vessels were struck five hundred and twenty times, the favors being distributed as follows: New Ironsides received of shots 65, Keokuk 90, Weehawken 60, Montauk 20, Passaic 58, Nantuxet 51, Catekill 51, Patapsco 45, Nahant 80. All this at point blank range. And yet the Keokuk was the only vessel that was fatally damaged by this terrific fire and even she, pierced and torn as she was, with nineteen shots on the water line, had enough vitality left to obey the signal to retire and rejoin the flag ship, and it was not till next morning that she sank in the waves. The New Ironsides was unmaneuverable all the day, refusing to answer her helm, and therefore she took no active part in the fight, discharging only one broadside at Fort Sumter. But the seven vessels of the Monitor pattern came out of the fiery ordeal almost unscathed. The only injury sustained by them was by the indenting of the turrets of some of them to such an extent as to prevent their revolving.

That fight is pregnant with lessons. It teaches us that vessels of the Monitor pattern are comparatively impregnable, and that no forts or defensive works can prevent their passage, if the channels remain unobstructed. If they could have been kept moving in a circle, as were the gunboats that captured the forts at Hilton Head, delivering their fire as they passed, they would not have been exposed to one tithe the risks they incurred while stationary under the concentrated fire of three hundred guns. But there was no space for any such manœuvre before Fort Sumter."

Now, the above extracts mean, if they mean anything at all, that the editors of the Copperhead organ were opposed to the war at the time of their publication. In the first, they seemingly complain of the "Democrats" being designated "Secessionists" because they are "opposed to the ruinous policy of making war upon the seceded States." And in the second they "emphatically denounce and condemn the war policy of the President, and say 'it would be folly' for him 'to expect to be sustained,' should he 'attempt the subjugation of the seceded States, and by force of arms undertake to compel them to return to their allegiance to the Union.'"

The reader should remember that these declarations were made, perhaps three months prior to the passage of the confiscation act, nearly a year previous to the abolishing of slavery in the District of Columbia, and more than sixteen months before the emancipation scheme was announced, and yet, in the face of these facts, these astute editors have the audacity to tell their readers that there was no "division in the North" and "no voice raised against the war," until after these things took place. Verily, they must consider their readers as exceedingly ignorant, or they would not dare to resort to such barefaced perversions.

A spirited engagement took place on the Nausumod river, some miles above Suffolk, on the 14th, between one of our gunboats and some rebel batteries on shore. After several hours fighting, the rebels fled.

THE RECENT CANVASS FOR U. S. SENATOR.

Report of the Majority.

The Committee appointed under the resolution of the 20th of January last, to inquire whether unlawful means were employed to secure the election of a United States Senator, with authority to send for persons and papers, beg leave to offer the following report:

That they have held for thirty-three sessions since that time, and examined three witnesses.

The first witness was T. J. Boyer.

He testified precisely as he wrote in his letter published after the election.

Now, if this statement of Mr. Boyer is true, there can be no doubt about the employment of unlawful means to secure the election of General Simon Cameron to the Senate of the United States. But the Committee had other testimony before them in regard to the transactions related by Dr. Boyer; and it becomes necessary, in the sight of that testimony, to examine his claims to truthfulness.

That there were, within a few days previous to the Senatorial election, repeated interviews between Mr. Brobst and Mr. Boyer cannot be doubted, because they not only both testify to this fact, but their testimony is corroborated by that of Capt. Chritzman, Dr. Early, Michael K. Boyer, and Mr. Vaughan.

They also agreed in regard to the private interviews had between Dr. Boyer and General Cameron, first at the State Capital Bank, and afterwards at Dr. Boyer's room, in the Pennsylvania House; and in this they are sustained by the testimony of Capt. Chritzman, Dr. Early, and Mr. Vaughan. They agree, moreover, as to the arrangements and preparations which were made to visit Gen. Cameron at his own house at the request of Mr. Brobst; and as to the fact that such preparations were made, and that they were made by Dr. Early.

There is also a marked agreement between the testimony of Dr. Boyer and that of John J. Patterson. They both testify that they met in Harrisburg on the Friday immediately preceding the Senatorial election; that they went to Reading on the afternoon of that day on the Lebanon Valley cars, and that Gen. Cameron was on the same train; that arrangements were there made between Mr. Patterson and Dr. Boyer to meet Gen. Cameron at the house of his son, J. D. Cameron, on the next evening; that the next morning, on the next day, the day of the Senatorial election, Dr. Boyer, at the request of Mr. Patterson, went to Patterson's room, in Herr's Hotel, where he found Gen. Cameron, and afterwards met Dr. Fuller.

These are only a few of the numerous points of coincidence between the testimony of Dr. Boyer and that of Messrs. Brobst and Patterson. Indeed, there is almost a point-by-point agreement between them, except in regard to the alleged money transactions. It must be evident to every one that, in the interviews which Mr. Brobst and Mr. Patterson had with Dr. Boyer, their only object was to influence him, by some means or other, to vote for Gen. Cameron for United States Senator. But by what means did they attempt to accomplish this object?

Here the testimony of these three witnesses involves a direct contradiction. Dr. Boyer asserts that Mr. Brobst told him he was authorized by Gen. Cameron to offer five thousand dollars for a vote, which Mr. Brobst denies, and that Gen. Cameron and Mr. Patterson positively agreed to give him twenty thousand dollars, and finally, twenty-five thousand dollars, in order to secure his vote for Simon Cameron, which is emphatically denied by Mr. Patterson. We are, therefore, bound to conclude either that the statements of Dr. Boyer, on the one hand, or those of Mr. Patterson and Mr. Brobst on the other, in regard to the pecuniary considerations, are downright and deliberate falsehoods.

Men always act from motives. It is, therefore, legitimate to inquire what motive could have influenced Dr. Boyer in this single case? It could not have been fear, for surely he had

no more to fear from telling the truth than from a declaration of falsehood. It could not have been the hope of gain, for it is impossible for any one to see how he could have expected any benefit from the utterance of any such false statement. Nor could he have been actuated by a malevolent or revengeful feeling, for there is no evidence of the existence of any such feeling on the part of Dr. Boyer against Gen. Cameron or any of his friends. Moreover, to suppose any man could falsify and knowingly charge upon his fellow-man, without some strong motive, a crime which would forever blot the reputation of its perpetrator in the community, and then call upon God in the most solemn manner, in attestation of the truthfulness of his charge, would be to ascribe to him an unaccountable degree of moral depravity.

Here another question will naturally arise. Can any motive be discovered on the part of Messrs. Brobst and Patterson which might incline either of them to a denial of the truth, in regard to this money transaction? The answer is easy. If the feature of the statement of Mr. Boyer be true, they have both been guilty of attempting to bribe a member of this Legislature, which is, under our laws, a high misdemeanor, subjecting the offenders to a severe penalty.

But who does not know that the fear of exposure and punishment and of the odium that must necessarily result from the commission of such a crime would be one of the strongest motives to impel them to falsehood. It is not reasonable to expect men to criminate themselves.

Let us look at this testimony from another standpoint. Truth is always consistent with itself. The statement of Mr. Boyer is plain, straightforward, circumstantial, bears upon the face of it the appearance of truth. It is corroborated in nearly all its leading details by the testimony of Messrs. Brobst and Patterson, and in several particulars by that of Capt. Chritzman, Dr. Early, Mr. Vaughan, Michael K. Boyer, and Dr. Fuller, all of which may be seen by a reference to the testimony of these gentlemen, herewith submitted. But

let us take a brief survey of the sentiments of Messrs. Brobst and Patterson, before the meeting of the Legislature, but no conversation passed between them in regard to the election of a United States Senator. Subsequently, without any request from any one, and of his own accord, he came to Harrisburg, went the same evening to see General Cameron, and offered him his services, without being asked to do so, to secure his election to the Senate of the United States. He again returned to Harrisburg, stopped at Herr's Hotel, but soon removed to the Pennsylvania House, where Dr. Boyer then had his rooms.

Here he met with Dr. Boyer, and had repeated interviews with him; invited him to Gen. Cameron's house; provided horses and carriages on two occasions to convey him there; visited the General three or four times at his residence; became the medium of communication between him and Boyer, and made the arrangements for several meetings between them.

All this was done by Mr. Brobst, be it remembered, and without any arrangement whatever with Gen. Cameron, or any body else, by which he was to be reimbursed. This is possible, but is it at all probable?

But again: Mr. Brobst is positively implicated, as other testimony than that of Dr. Boyer proves, in an alleged bribery.

Mr. John Hancock testifies that Mr. Brobst told him he had the authority of Gen. Cameron to use money to secure the election, and that any arrangements he might make, within a reasonable amount, would be immediately complied with by Cameron.

The testimony of Michael Boyer on this subject is, that Mr. Brobst told him that he was authorized to offer ten thousand dollars. It is also in evidence that Mr. Brobst told Mr. Foltzger, a member of the House, that if he would vote for Gen. Cameron he would guarantee to him five thousand dollars in hand, and a position worth forty thousand dollars; that if he would name the day he would bring Gen. Cameron down to Berks county to make a final bargain on that; he had better let party go to the devil and make his money.

The testimony of John P. Patterson, as already intimated, corroborates that of Mr. Boyer in nearly every point. They agree as to their trip to Reading on the Lebanon Valley Railroad; their interview on the cars; their arrangements to meet Gen. Cameron at the house of his son previous to the Senatorial election; a meeting, according to this arrangement, to have an interview between Gen. Cameron, Dr. Boyer and Senator Fuller, in Mr. Patterson's room, at Herr's Hotel. But Mr. Patterson denies most emphatically that he or Gen. Cameron offered Dr. Boyer money or any other consideration to induce him to vote for Cameron. This, whether true or false in itself, is what might be expected under the circumstances, according to the statement of Dr. Boyer, of what Mr. Patterson said he would testify, if the investigation should be instituted.

There are other statements in the testimony of Mr. Patterson that are worthy of consideration. He testifies that he was present at the request or suggestion of Mr. Brobst, on the 5th and 6th of January, between five and six o'clock in the afternoon. That after supper he met General Cameron by accident at the Post Office, and was informed by him that he was not a candidate for United States Senator. On the next day he sought an interview with Dr. Boyer, in order to ascertain whether he really intended to vote for General Cameron. That after having some conversation with Dr. Boyer, on their way to Reading, he had no faith in him, and concluded that he would advise General Cameron not to trust him, and that General Cameron had said he would have nothing to do with him. Still, however, as the testimony of Dr. Boyer and Mr. Patterson shows, they persisted in holding interviews with Dr. Boyer, in order to secure his vote for General Cameron.

All this service Mr. Patterson performed without fee or reward from any one. There is one other point in Mr. Patterson's testimony that may be noticed. He says that he was present during the whole time of the interview between Senator Fuller, Gen. Cameron, and Dr. Boyer, at his own room in Herr's Hotel. Accordingly, he relates in his testimony the conversation which took place on that occasion.

But the testimony of Senator Fuller is that Mr. Patterson was not in the room when he was there. Here, then, is a flat contradiction between these two witnesses; but the contradiction is not a contradiction, for the evidence before them, and from all the circumstances of the case, that the testimony of Senator Fuller is all literally true.

Mr. Wolf's testimony is that Mr. Henry Thomas said to him: "Go for Gen. Cameron and you will be well paid; state how much you will take to vote for Gen. Cameron; put down the figures." It is also in evidence that John T. Hammer told Mr. Wolf that he could make \$5,000 by voting for Gen. Cameron, and again that he (Mr. Wolf) could make a nice thing of it.

The report concludes with the assertion that if the testimony of these men is true then Gen. Cameron and those already implicated are guilty.

The testimony in this case, as taken before the committee, is very voluminous, occupying over 132 pages of large bill paper.

more to fear from telling the truth than from a declaration of falsehood. It could not have been the hope of gain, for it is impossible for any one to see how he could have expected any benefit from the utterance of any such false statement. Nor could he have been actuated by a malevolent or revengeful feeling, for there is no evidence of the existence of any such feeling on the part of Dr. Boyer against Gen. Cameron or any of his friends. Moreover, to suppose any man could falsify and knowingly charge upon his fellow-man, without some strong motive, a crime which would forever blot the reputation of its perpetrator in the community, and then call upon God in the most solemn manner, in attestation of the truthfulness of his charge, would be to ascribe to him an unaccountable degree of moral depravity.

Here another question will naturally arise. Can any motive be discovered on the part of Messrs. Brobst and Patterson which might incline either of them to a denial of the truth, in regard to this money transaction? The answer is easy. If the feature of the statement of Mr. Boyer be true, they have both been guilty of attempting to bribe a member of this Legislature, which is, under our laws, a high misdemeanor, subjecting the offenders to a severe penalty.

But who does not know that the fear of exposure and punishment and of the odium that must necessarily result from the commission of such a crime would be one of the strongest motives to impel them to falsehood. It is not reasonable to expect men to criminate themselves.

Let us look at this testimony from another standpoint. Truth is always consistent with itself. The statement of Mr. Boyer is plain, straightforward, circumstantial, bears upon the face of it the appearance of truth. It is corroborated in nearly all its leading details by the testimony of Messrs. Brobst and Patterson, and in several particulars by that of Capt. Chritzman, Dr. Early, Mr. Vaughan, Michael K. Boyer, and Dr. Fuller, all of which may be seen by a reference to the testimony of these gentlemen, herewith submitted. But

let us take a brief survey of the sentiments of Messrs. Brobst and Patterson, before the meeting of the Legislature, but no conversation passed between them in regard to the election of a United States Senator. Subsequently, without any request from any one, and of his own accord, he came to Harrisburg, went the same evening to see General Cameron, and offered him his services, without being asked to do so, to secure his election to the Senate of the United States. He again returned to Harrisburg, stopped at Herr's Hotel, but soon removed to the Pennsylvania House, where Dr. Boyer then had his rooms.

Here he met with Dr. Boyer, and had repeated interviews with him; invited him to Gen. Cameron's house; provided horses and carriages on two occasions to convey him there; visited the General three or four times at his residence; became the medium of communication between him and Boyer, and made the arrangements for several meetings between them.

All this was done by Mr. Brobst, be it remembered, and without any arrangement whatever with Gen. Cameron, or any body else, by which he was to be reimbursed. This is possible, but is it at all probable?

But again: Mr. Brobst is positively implicated, as other testimony than that of Dr. Boyer proves, in an alleged bribery.

Mr. John Hancock testifies that Mr. Brobst told him he had the authority of Gen. Cameron to use money to secure the election, and that any arrangements he might make, within a reasonable amount, would be immediately complied with by Cameron.

The testimony of Michael Boyer on this subject is, that Mr. Brobst told him that he was authorized to offer ten thousand dollars. It is also in evidence that Mr. Brobst told Mr. Foltzger, a member of the House, that if he would vote for Gen. Cameron he would guarantee to him five thousand dollars in hand, and a position worth forty thousand dollars; that if he would name the day he would bring Gen. Cameron down to Berks county to make a final bargain on that; he had better let party go to the devil and make his money.

The testimony of John P. Patterson, as already intimated, corroborates that of Mr. Boyer in nearly every point. They agree as to their trip to Reading on the Lebanon Valley Railroad; their interview on the cars; their arrangements to meet Gen. Cameron at the house of his son previous to the Senatorial election; a meeting, according to this arrangement, to have an interview between Gen. Cameron, Dr. Boyer and Senator Fuller, in Mr. Patterson's room, at Herr's Hotel. But Mr. Patterson denies most emphatically that he or Gen. Cameron offered Dr. Boyer money or any other consideration to induce him to vote for Cameron. This, whether true or false in itself, is what might be expected under the circumstances, according to the statement of Dr. Boyer, of what Mr. Patterson said he would testify, if the investigation should be instituted.

There are other statements in the testimony of Mr. Patterson that are worthy of consideration. He testifies that he was present at the request or suggestion of Mr. Brobst, on the 5th and 6th of January, between five and six o'clock in the afternoon. That after supper he met General Cameron by accident at the Post Office, and was informed by him that he was not a candidate for United States Senator. On the next day he sought an interview with Dr. Boyer, in order to ascertain whether he really intended to vote for General Cameron. That after having some conversation with Dr. Boyer, on their way to Reading, he had no faith in him, and concluded that he would advise General Cameron not to trust him, and that General Cameron had said he would have nothing to do with him. Still, however, as the testimony of Dr. Boyer and Mr. Patterson shows, they persisted in holding interviews with Dr. Boyer, in order to secure his vote for General Cameron.

All this service Mr. Patterson performed without fee or reward from any one. There is one other point in Mr. Patterson's testimony that may be noticed. He says that he was present during the whole time of the interview between Senator Fuller, Gen. Cameron, and Dr. Boyer, at his own room in Herr's Hotel. Accordingly, he relates in his testimony the conversation which took place on that occasion.

But the testimony of Senator Fuller is that Mr. Patterson was not in the room when he was there. Here, then, is a flat contradiction between these two witnesses; but the contradiction is not a contradiction, for the evidence before them, and from all the circumstances of the case, that the testimony of Senator Fuller is all literally true.

Mr. Wolf's testimony is that Mr. Henry Thomas said to him: "Go for Gen. Cameron and you will be well paid; state how much you will take to vote for Gen. Cameron; put down the figures." It is also in evidence that John T. Hammer told Mr. Wolf that he could make \$5,000 by voting for Gen. Cameron, and again that he (Mr. Wolf) could make a nice thing of it.

The report concludes with the assertion that if the testimony of these men is true then Gen. Cameron and those already implicated are guilty.

The testimony in this case, as taken before the committee, is very voluminous, occupying over 132 pages of large bill paper.

Report of the Minority.

The minority of the Committee appointed to investigate the allegation that unlawful means were employed to procure the election of United States Senator, respectfully report as follows:

Said Committee was appointed pursuant to the following preamble and resolution of the House, viz:

WHEREAS, it is of vital importance to the perpetuity of our free institutions and to the citizens of Pennsylvania and to the electoral franchise be preserved inviolate; and whereas, it has been extensively reported and is believed by many that unlawful means were employed to procure the election of United States Senator on Tuesday last; and whereas, it is due to those on whom suspicion may rest, as also to the citizens of this great Commonwealth, that this subject be investigated; therefore

Resolved, That a committee of four (subsequently increased to seven) be appointed to examine the facts in the case, with power to send for persons and papers, and that they report to this House.

We believe that the duty imposed upon the Committee by the resolution recited, was fully completed when the testimony was taken and reported to the House. Neither the Committee nor the House have power to enter legal judgment against or inflict punishment upon persons implicated, and in view of the probability that the matters submitted to the Committee, there would seem to be much propriety in submitting the testimony taken, without argument or comment.

The majority of the Committee have thought otherwise, and in their report, and accompanying an abstract of the principal testimony taken, they have submitted to the House arguments, inferences and deductions, founded upon, and as they think, resulting from the facts in proof. After reciting the testimony of Doctor Boyer, the majority of the Committee, singularly enough, address themselves with zeal to an examination of his, Boyer's, claims to truthfulness.

After reciting various nonessential points, in which Doctor Boyer is corroborated by other witnesses, the majority report says "there is almost a perfect agreement between them, except in regard to the alleged money transactions."

It appears to us that what is thus called "the alleged money transactions" was the only important point in the whole investigation, and the only point on which it was necessary to inquire for corroborative testimony. If, on that point, the report states, and we do not dissent from the statement, that either Doctor Boyer on the one hand, or both Brobst and Patterson on the other, are guilty of "downright and deliberate falsehood."

We do not now propose to discuss the relative claims of Boyer, Brobst and Patterson to credibility; but as the report already submitted omits no occasion to commend the testimony of Boyer, and as the majority have not been able to see anything in his agency in the matter but what entitles him to commendation, and it may not be inappropriate to inquire whether the zeal of the majority to aim at certain conclusions has not blinded them to some cases of probable guilt which presented themselves at the outset of our examination, and reappeared in the testimony of many of the witnesses.

In the statement of Dr. Boyer, published in the Patriot and Union, and which he swears is his statement, he says he conceived the project of putting himself in the way of the operations, for the purpose of seeing how far they would go. Once conceived, (to use his own language,) "I determined to act upon it."

In the evidence submitted with the addition of his interviews with Gen. Cameron and his friends. He further states that he did conclude a bargain by which he agreed to vote for Gen. Cameron in consideration of \$20,000, which Gen. Cameron agreed to pay him.

By the act of 1860 it is provided that if any member of assembly shall agree to accept any bribe offered to him, the purpose of influencing his vote as a legislator, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction, shall pay a fine not exceeding \$1,000, and suffer imprisonment not exceeding five years. Dr. Boyer, if his own statement is believed, did so agree, and it does not matter whether he did or did not intend to live up to his agreement. The act is leveled against corrupt influences, and places him who offers and him who agrees to accept a bribe upon the same level. The mischief which the law was intended to guard against has been accomplished, and the intention not to comply with the agreement is immaterial—the only question being, did the party agreeing to accept the bribe intend so to agree, or did he design to entice another into a violation of the law? If this reasoning be correct, it follows that T. J. Boyer, a member of this House, is guilty of resorting to unlawful means to secure the election of a United States Senator.

It is a well established rule of law that he who counsels, advises, and encourages another in the perpetration of an offence of the grade of a misdemeanor, is himself an offender of the same grade of the principal actor. The report already presented implicates no person or persons as the advisers of Mr. Boyer in his scheme to entice Gen. Cameron or his friends into a violation of the law by offering money to secure a vote for United States Senator. The majority of your Committee failed (doubtless through inadvertence) failed to discover spot or blemish upon Mr. Boyer, by the same inadvertence, fail of course, to discover any thing wrong in the conduct of those who were privy to his schemes and his counsellors therein.

Dr. Boyer states that during the progress of his negotiations with Gen. Cameron, and his friends, he was in consultation with Mr. Wallace, of the Senate, Dr. Early, of the House, and one Robert Vaughan, the proprietor of the Pennsylvania House at Harrisburg. He also states that he communicated what he was doing to his father, Mr. P. Boyer, and one or two others.

It is but fair to Senator Wallace, Dr. Early, and the father of T. J. Boyer, to state that they all deny this statement so far as it might be inferred therefrom that they were cognizant of the fact that he (Boyer) had, or intended to consummate a bargain for the sale of his vote. Indeed, Dr. Boyer's father states that he knew nothing of the part his son was acting until he saw it in the papers, when he made inquiry as to its truth.

With reference to Mr. Vaughn, however, the case is different. His own testimony corroborates that of Mr. Boyer, stating as he substantially does that he advised Boyer if he could save the Democratic party from defeat by agreeing to accept a bribe it was his duty to do so.

If the statement of Mr. Boyer, corroborated as it is by Mr. Vaughn's oath, be true, it follows that Robert Vaughn, of the city of Harrisburg, is guilty of resorting to unlawful means to secure the election of United States Senator.

Dr. Boyer further states that on the Sunday preceding the election, and after he had, as he testifies, concluded a bargain for the sale of his vote, Mr. Buckalew (since elected to the Senate) called upon him; that he informed Mr. Buckalew of the arrangements he had made; that Mr. Buckalew advised him to be cautious, to which he replied that he under-

stood him, or to that effect. This testimony standing by itself would not be very important, but taken in connection with other facts, it, in our opinion, justifies the inquiry: Did Charles R. Buckalew, prior to this interview, know of the part Mr. Boyer was acting and its purposes? Was he privy to it and an adviser therein?

It is to be borne in mind, that Mr. Buckalew was at this time a prominent (perhaps the most prominent) candidate for the Democratic caucus nomination. It was natural and certainly not improper that he should feel some degree of anxiety that the caucus nomination should succeed in the election, and that efforts to prevent such success should in some manner be thwarted.

Mr. Boyer states that it was generally reported that unlawful means would be resorted to to defeat the Democratic nominee. He also informs us that he kept several of his party friends informed of what he was doing and the progress he was making. Now it is possible that Mr. Buckalew (the person in all others the most deeply interested in the success of Mr. Boyer's scheme,) might, while his party friends were fully informed, have been left in total ignorance of it, but to use the language of the majority report, "is it probable?"

Mr. Boyer has reason to believe that he was privy to Boyer's proceedings at the time, he sought his society on the Saturday preceding the election, it was but natural that these proceedings should be the subject of consultation and in that consultation Mr. Buckalew must have been either passive, expressing neither approbation nor disapprobation of Boyer's action; or he must have disapproved of it or he must have approved it. To suppose that he was entirely passive would be to suppose that he is constituted different from all other men, and that he disapproved of it would be to run counter to the testimony of Boyer.

That he approved of Boyer's course—that he counseled him to be cautious; that such caution had reference to the further interviews which Boyer had arranged to have with Gen. Cameron and his friends—that it was merely a caution to so conduct himself as to avoid detection, are inferences we think very clearly deducible from the evidence. If this reasoning be correct, and if Mr. Buckalew's testimony be true, it follows that Charles R. Buckalew is guilty of resorting to unlawful means to secure the election of U. S. Senator.

Mr. S. P. Hancock, a member of this House, testifies that soon after the election, he met Mr. William Goodwin, formerly a member of the State Senate, in the city of Philadelphia; that Mr. Goodwin informed him (referring to the Boyer transaction) that "Mr. Buckalew set the whole thing in motion, and he carried it through." Mr. Goodwin states that there was an arrangement between himself, Mr. Buckalew, and others to get Gen. Cameron to offer a bribe, or to get some person to offer to be bribed. Mr. Goodwin (the party thus implicated) denies this substantially. If the testimony of Mr. Hancock be true, it follows that Mr. William Goodwin, of the city of Philadelphia, is chargeable with resorting to unlawful means to secure the election of U. S. Senator.

Thus far we have spoken only of the statutory offence of which T. J. Boyer, if his testimony is true, is guilty, and if guilty (which offence being a misdemeanor to which there can be no accessories) it follows that all the parties who were in consultation with him, aiding, counselling and advising, are also guilty as principals.

If our conclusions are not well drawn from the premises, there is still another view of the subject, overlooked by the majority, upon which, in our judgment, there can be no two opinions.

The offense of conspiracy at common law is a combination of persons to do an unlawful act, or to do a lawful act in an unlawful manner. If T. J. Boyer's testimony be true, he acted together with the persons with whom he conspired, and who advised and encouraged him, are guilty of a conspiracy to entice Gen. Cameron and others into a breach of the law by offering money or using other undue influence to secure a vote for Senator, and it does not matter whether the primary purpose of such combination—as to defeat General Cameron and to ensure the success of the Democratic nominee.

The late hour at which the majority report was necessarily made—the mass of testimony in the case and the other duties devolving upon us have precluded anything like a thorough review of the evidence, and we are obliged to content ourselves with a hasty review of the principal testimony bearing on the subject of our inquiry, and in our judgment, disclosing some instances of unlawful means used to secure the election of United States Senator, which were overlooked in the majority report.</