

Amusements, &c.
BARNUM'S AMERICAN MUSEUM—Day and Evening.
BROADWAY THEATRE—This Evening.
HUNYAN HALL, Union Square—This Afternoon and Evening.
CONSERVATORY HALL, No. 82 Fifth-ave.—This Evening.
DORWORTH HALL—This Evening.
EXHIBITION OF THOMAS BALDWIN'S STATE OF ENDS.

Business Notices.
STARR & MARCUS.
At Retail—Sole Importers of the celebrated...
TRUSSARDI & CO.—MARCH & CO.'S Radical Cure...
CHICKERING & SONS, Manufacturers of...
A GREAT OFFER.—HOWARD WATERS & CO., 481...
PHYSICIANS, MEDICAL PROFESSORS, AND THE GREAT...
INVESTIGATE THE NERVE FLUID AND YOU REVEAL...

CATARRH AND BRONCHITIS NEVER CURED—Unless...
FURNITURE.
AMERICAN (Waltham) WATCHES.
Recommended by Railroad Engineers, Conductors, Expressmen, and other experts...

New-York Daily Tribune.
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1868.
TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.
DAILY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$10 per annum.
SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$4 per an.
WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$3 per annum.

Advertising Rates.
DAILY TRIBUNE, 3c., 30c., 40c., 60c., and \$1 per line.
SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE, 25 and 50 cents per line.
WEEKLY TRIBUNE, \$1 50 and \$2 per line.
According to position in the paper.
Address, THE TRIBUNE, New-York.

TRIBUNE CAMPAIGN SHEETS.
THE FIRST NUMBER, NOW READY, contains Senator Morton's speech on Reconstruction, delivered in the Senate, Jan. 24, together with the speech of Senator Williams on the same subject.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
No action can be taken of Anonymous Communications.
Advertisements for this week's issue of THE TRIBUNE should be handed in to-day.
The Chicago and Rock Island Suit, and Letters from the People, are on the second page this morning; the Courts, the Money Article, Shipping News, and a Talk with Alexander H. Stephens, on the third; Literary Items on the sixth, and Real Estate on the seventh.

promotion which Mr. Johnson proposed to confer upon him. The people would heartily approve any honor done to so gallant and patriotic an officer; but there is no honor in the President's brevets in the present posture of affairs. Gen. Thomas's dispatch to Mr. Wade is just what might have been expected from the honest victor of Nashville.
All honor to Edwin M. Stanton for his noble and self-denying devotion to the cause of constitutional freedom. Let him be honored as a man that the nation cannot but delight to honor.

The Associated Press reporter telegraphs us from Washington that from a canvass of the House it is ascertained that the Republican party will be a unit on the question of impeachment. This is well. Let our friends go through this new trial standing shoulder to shoulder, and drive from his place the greatest enemy, with the exception of Jefferson Davis, that constitutional freedom has known.

The illustrious Gen. Geo. H. Thomas indignantly spurns the bribe which the President has offered him, and declines the appointment of General. This is what we expected. Soldiers like Sherman and Thomas did too much toward crushing the Rebellion under Davis to think of surrendering to the Rebellion under Johnson.

There is a rumor that that brilliant, gallant, and intrepid marine, the Hon. Gideon Welles, has offered the services of himself and two hundred other marines to the President to put down Stanton and the Radicals. We have directed our special artist to take a portrait of Welles at the head of his troop, which we intend to have painted in chrome yellow and red, for presentation to Congress for one of the vacant panels of the Capitol. We presume that as soon as Congress hears that Welles has taken command of his brave marines, that body, following the natural instinct of self-preservation, will adjourn to Baltimore. With Welles in arms, Congress is indeed in danger.

THE PRESIDENT MUST BE IMPEACHED.
We do not see how the House can refuse to arraign the President before the Senate for high crimes and misdemeanors. Impeachment is not a desirable proceeding. It is cumbersome and tedious. It may arrest legislation, and present a new issue to the country at a time when new issues are not wanted. It is not, perhaps, a wise precedent to make. It gives to power a temptation which passion cannot always resist. It is a high, solemn, sacred trust, only to be used, when absolutely necessary for the salvation of the country.

We believe the salvation of the country demands the impeachment of the President. We have all along felt that we might submit to Mr. Johnson's Administration, evil as it has been, rather than force an angry and doubtful question upon the country. With the Congress overwhelmingly Republican, there was no reason why we should not compel the President to pursue a wise policy. We reasoned upon the presumption that it was better to have impeachment held over him as a check than to begin a trial that might be as long as that of Warren Hastings. It was a debatable question. The evidence was far from being conclusive. Morally, there was no doubt that Mr. Johnson should be impeached. But impeachment is a question of law and evidence, not of moral belief. As a Republican, there were a hundred reasons why he should be removed. This would be a good plea in a Republican Convention, not before the Senate of the United States. Until impeachment became an inevitable, overwhelming necessity, without doubt as to the meaning of the law, and the force of the evidence, to enter upon it was only to give the President a chance to make himself a martyr before the country. Therefore we have constantly opposed impeachment, although at times we stood alone among the Republican press. There is no longer any doubt. The issue is as clear as it was when Gen. Beauregard opened his batteries upon Fort Sumter. Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, tramples upon a law, defies the authority of Congress, and claims to exercise absolute and despotic power. Congress must impeach him immediately.

All other questions sink before the present. It would be difficult to have our course clearer. A law is passed, which defines it to be the duty of the President to consult with the Senate before removing a certain officer. This law may or may not be constitutional. The President has no business with that. It is constitutional until the Supreme Court decides otherwise. It is law until the Court interposes and invalidates it. The President's sworn duty is to execute it—to obey it—to see that it is carefully and studiously obeyed. He may not like it. He may think it unconstitutional. That is of no more consequence than the opinion of any private citizen. His duty is not to execute laws which he may think constitutional, but to EXECUTE THE LAWS. If he had been clothed with judicial power, if the founders of the Constitution had felt that it was wise to give the President any option in the matter, they would have so expressed it and declared that he might execute all laws only when the Supreme Court decided their constitutionality. If the President has the right to select his laws, and say "This act I will execute because it suits me, and the other I will not enforce because it strikes me to be unconstitutional," then Congress and the Supreme Court might as well adjourn without day. For the right to do as he pleases with any law, to assume to be its sole arbiter and judge, may become a tyranny more absolute than that of the Emperor of Russia. It is a comparatively small matter now. Apparently, it affects only the right of Mr. Stanton to hold the War-Office, and of the President to select his constitutional advisers. This is not the question, but only the merest incident of it. If the President has the right to remove Mr. Stanton in defiance of law, he may remove Mr. Chief-

Justice Chase and Gen. Grant, and indeed the whole Senate. For the law by which Mr. Stanton holds his place is as much a law, as sacred and as binding; as that by which Mr. Chase presides over the Supreme Court, and Gen. Grant commands the army. If he may with impunity order Lorenzo Thomas to take possession of the War Department—a building which is not the property of Mr. Johnson, but of the American people—he may also direct Mr. Coyle to open the next Supreme Court, and Gen. Hancock to assume command of the army. It may be said that there is a law which provides the form in which Mr. Chase may be removed, and another law which directs the manner for the removal of Gen. Grant. To this we reply that there is also a law which provides how Mr. Stanton may be removed, that one law is as binding as the other, and that if we permit the President to violate one, he may with impunity violate all.

There is no avoiding this conclusion. There is no explaining it away. There is no middle course. The President has assumed the responsibility of breaking a law. Congress must assume the responsibility of impeaching him. Not to do so in the face of this flagrant and insolent proceeding is to become a partner in the crime. It is no time to consider the party influence of impeachment, or its effect upon Presidential candidates. We would rather see the Republican party, candidates and all, driven into the deserts of Arabia than to have them tremble one moment in the presence of this high duty. Questions of expediency were all well enough so long as the President stood within the pale of the law. But now when he presumes to be the executive, legislative, and judicial power, when he claims to decide which laws Congress may pass, and what acts are constitutional, to hesitate a moment is criminal.

We are sure there will be no hesitation. The time has come to cease trifling with Andrew Johnson. This man, who reeled into the Presidency; who has debased his high office by unseemly and indecent demonstrations; who has surrounded himself with the worst members of the worst phase of Washington life; whose retinue consists of lobbyists, Rebels, and adventurers; who has polluted the public service by making espionage honorable, and treachery the means of advancement; who has deceived the party that elected him, as well as the party that created him; who has made his own morbid and overweening vanity the only rule of his administration; who has sought to entrap illustrious servants of the people into ignominious evasion of the law, and who now claims to break that law with impunity—this most infamous Chief-Magistrate should be swept out of office. LET HIM BE IMPEACHED! And let the Republican party show that it not only has the power to preserve the country from rebellion under Jefferson Davis, but also from treachery under Andrew Johnson.

THE FORFEALURE OF CONGRESS.
Now that Andrew Johnson is about to be arraigned before the Senate for the crime of defying the laws, it may be profitable to look back at the action of Congress, especially upon the question of impeachment. We do this for the purpose of showing that the representatives of the people have acted with wisdom, prudence, and forbearance. Possibly they have forborne too long. We shall be told that we were all cowards for not impeaching the President before, and that if we had taken this step in the beginning there would be no trouble now.

Congress might, of course, have impeached Mr. Johnson at any time. The Republican party was in power. It had not only a majority, but enough votes to control a veto, and pass laws in spite of the Executive. It is difficult to imagine a greater power, or one more delicate to manage. The temptations of all great majorities is to tyrannize. Here was a party fresh from the great war, triumphant over rebellion, and eager to reap the fruits of victory by speedy reconstruction. Here was its President, so advanced in Radicalism that many prudent men were afraid he would execute all the Rebels within his reach. Surely, men said, this President has seen the South; he has been through the fiery furnace; he is seared with the flames of rebellion, and he will give us a reconstruction that will be just, humane, and prompt. Congress was disappointed. Mr. Johnson had made himself Vice-President by pretending to be an extreme Radical. That was in war times. There were eleven States to return. In all probability they would be Democratic. He would insist upon their admission. He would be their champion and friend. He would ally himself with the Democratic party of the North, and then be elected President. We believe this has been Mr. Johnson's purpose since the beginning of his Administration. We believe he has always intended to betray the Republican party, and with it to betray Congress. For this he has labored with a tenacity which has no parallel in history—with an energy worthy of a better cause. During all the time that the President was planning, intriguing, arranging, backing and filling, saying one thing to-day and another to-morrow, Congress treated him with courtesy and patience. Not one word was said of dissent—impeachment was never breathed.

For the New-Orleans riots Mr. Johnson is responsible. No fair man can read the evidence without seeing that his hands are stained with the blood of loyal men. He is responsible for the great deficiency in the revenue. He debased that service to gratify his ambition. When it was necessary to construct a Philadelphia Convention, postmasters were removed by the hundred, and the collection of the revenues was transferred to those of his creatures who would accept the degrading office. Their needs were mainly pecuniary, and the surest way of supplying them was to have the gathering of the taxes. The result is that, under Mr. Johnson, corruption in the revenue service has been reduced to a science. We have men making fraud a profession, organizing it into a "ring," and boasting that with their money they can control his Administration. We believe that if this whisky-tax alone were made a matter of inquiry, enough would be found to warrant the impeachment of the President. For the failure of reconstruction he is pre-eminently responsible. Beginning his Administration by loudly proclaiming his intention to hang the Rebels, he speedily took to giving them offices. Clamorously insisting that his "policy" was to bring the States back

to the Union, we find him directly interfering to keep Alabama out. Since he cannot make the South Democratic, he will produce anarchy. Everything must yield to his own selfish purpose. In nothing has the President been sincere and consistent except to secure his own reelection to the Presidency.
—With Impeachment always at hand—with causes for impeachment as thick as autumn leaves—with every political passion aroused, and a war of bitterness raging—Congress has remained patient. Read, for instance, Mr. Johnson's last annual message. The Tullors in the splendor of their almost oriental power, the Sturats in the days of their blindest arrogance, scarcely ventured to address such a message to an English Parliament. Our own feeling at that time was that Congress would be angered into impeaching the President who had put upon them such an insult. It seems almost as if Mr. Johnson has been trying to goad Congress to pass the resolutions which will most probably be adopted to-day. Possibly he may feel that this is his last chance of obtaining the nomination of the Democratic party, and has prepared a coup d'etat for the purpose of impressing Mr. Belmont and his friends with the vigor of which he has so often spoken. We do not care to dwell upon the President's motives, however. The main point is that Congress has acted with a wisdom and forbearance which deserves the highest praise. Subject to all the passions of a legislative body, it has shown in this impeachment business the serenity, the patience, and the dignity of a court of justice. Possibly His Excellency has presumed upon this, and supposed that because Congress was forbearing, it was cowardly, and would not dare to check him. He will find, we think, before many days are passed, how dreadfully he was mistaken.

MORAL CAUSES FOR IMPEACHMENT.
Although impeachment comes before the House to-day, because the President has violated a specific law of Congress—and there is little doubt that his trial will be confined to one specific point, namely, his refusal to obey the Tenure-of-Office law—yet there are moral causes for impeachment which the country will not fail to consider. The decision of the House to-day will form one of the most important pages in American History, and generations will discuss its wisdom.

The country cannot fail to see that Mr. Johnson is a man who cannot be measured by the ordinary moral tests. We do not honor a man for being a gentleman any more than we honor a lady for being virtuous. It is the duty of every man and woman so to live that their lives may be pure and their names unspotted. It is the duty of every public man to leave a name in history that future generations may regard as an example. It will be in the mind of every Christian to-day that there are a hundred reasons for impeachment in the case of President Johnson which will hold good in general esteem, if not in law. We all remember the scenes of his inauguration as Vice-President. He was elected to a high office. It was the triumph of an idea which was dear to the heart of every laboring man. He was the representative of a despised class. He had labored with his hands at one of the most unpretending of employments. He had no advantages of wealth, education, or social culture. At a time when most young men are about to leave college, full of the classics and mathematics, he was beginning to read. Surmounting these difficulties, he had risen from place to place until he was the second officer of the country. Every laboring man felt ennobled in the elevation, for it showed that in free America the highest stations were open to the humblest.

We do not repeat the history of that shameful day when Mr. Johnson not only insulted his audience, but the class from which he sprung, and gave the enemies of labor the opportunity of saying: "Look at your representative workingman, your exalted plebeian, your 'Senatorial tailor.' This is what comes of your 'Democratic institutions!' A boor is always a boor. The quality of governing exists only in the blue veins of gentlemen like us, who come from the loins of kings. This is what Democracy brings you." We condoned that offense. But men buried it deep in their hearts, and Americans, proud of their country, and, above all, proud of the name of an American gentleman, blushed when they remembered that a drunken Vice-President had shaken his fist in the faces of the ambassadors of foreign countries, and taunted them with their noble birth. They thought of it even more keenly when Mr. Johnson went "swinging around the circle." The story of that dreadful journey has never been fully told. The name of a dead statesman was degraded. We have heard, in ruder civilizations, of a people revealing around a coffin, and boisterously carousing over the dead body of a departed friend. But it remained for a President of the United States to dig from the grave, as it were, the body of the dead Douglas, and go junketing with it through the country. There may have been a hope that the memory of the great leader would bring followers to his cause; but, be that as it may, the dishonor put upon his memory, and upon the country, was humiliating. We saw the President bandying words with a mob in Cleveland, defending riot and murder in St. Louis, and making wild, incoherent speeches at every station. Men have told us that they read accounts of this journey, in foreign lands, with crimsoned cheeks, and tearful eyes, and hearts heavy with shame, and that they almost blushed at the name of an American citizen. Andrew Johnson is the first Chief Magistrate of the country that ever disgraced his office by conduct unbecoming a gentleman.

Men will not fail to remember these things when the events of to-day are written in history. There are moral reasons for the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. Children will ask their parents what became of the man who thus dishonored his country, and the reply will be, he was driven from his office to obscurity, and was never afterward heard of beyond the tap-rooms of Greenville, where he lived to a green old age, making endless speeches about the Constitution and the Radicals, and what he would do when he was re-elected President of the United States. We owe something to the spirit of Christianity, to the moral law which every gentleman tries to obey, and to teach to his children. The impeachment of Andrew Johnson will not merely be commended because he tried to evade the law, but because he degraded his high office, and brought his country to shame, and made it a scandal among the nations. Therefore, the moral sense of the country demands this impeachment. Congress should feel that every gentleman, that every Christian mother who has sons that she would see honored, that every American who is proud of his country, will stand by it in this solemn but unavoidable duty. There are moral laws as well as civil laws. While the tribunal of one is the present and palpable machinery of justice, the tribunal

of the other is in the conscience and heart of all. Now that Andrew Johnson is about to appear before the civil law to answer for his misdemeanors, it is well to remember that, morally, he was long since tried by the common-sense of his countrymen, and condemned to the execration of the party which he betrayed, and to the contempt of that other party upon which he is now fawning.
IS IMPEACHMENT REVOLUTIONARY?
Impeachment has been uniformly denounced by Mr. Johnson's friends as "revolutionary." As it is a remedy expressly provided by the Constitution, for as wise and patriotic reasons as those which inspired any other portion of that document, it certainly cannot tend to revolutionize the Constitution itself. Of what, then, is it revolutionary? History furnishes us with some precedents on this point. The impeachment of Charles I. revolutionized the conduct of English monarchs from that day to the present, substituting the will of Parliament for the caprice of the King. The impeachment of the Earl of Strafford, and other British ministers, revolutionized the conduct of the official advisers of the British Crown, and caused them to recognize their responsibility to Parliament as well as to the King. The impeachment of Warren Hastings revolutionized the administration of the government of British India, and purged it in some degree of its grosser corruptions and oppressions. The impeachment of Judge Samuel Chase of our United States Supreme Court, and other of our Federal Judges, revolutionized the conduct of those Judges toward those who had occasion to transact business in their courts, and caused their action to be characterized by dignity, fairness, and sobriety, instead of by drunkenness, partiality, and corruption.

When the Constitution provided for the impeachment of a President of the United States, it did not designate the features of the first President to whom the process would justly apply. But if the authors of the Constitution expected us to be afflicted with any worse President than Mr. Johnson, they must have indulged in more gloomy forebodings of our destiny than were ever made public.
We believe the impeachment, conviction, and removal of Andrew Johnson would work an important revolution in the future conduct of Presidents who might be disposed to usurp the powers of Congress; to violate laws; to join hands with traitors in the oppression of the weak; to sell their appointments and pardons to the most worthless and abandoned characters; and to seek systematically either to coerce Congress into doing their will or to defeat the execution of the laws when passed. The impeachment and removal of Andrew Johnson would not only remove all obstacles to the execution of the laws, but would operate as an example to secure the country to all future time against Presidential despotism.

Press prosecutions are odious under almost any circumstances, but to prosecute a publisher for printing seditious wood-cuts is in nearly equal measure odious and grotesque. This is what the British Government has done to Mr. Sullivan of the Dublin Nation and Weekly News. Of course it is quite possible to convey treason or libel by the pencil as well as by the pen; but it seems to us that an attempt to punish a man for putting pictures into his newspaper can only cover the Crown with ridicule. The punishment may be logical enough in theory, but its effect in practice will be unfortunate to the Government.

The Mexican Government has given to Gen. Diaz an unlimited leave of absence; in other words, has accepted his resignation. As one of our recent Mexican letters explained, three of the four district-commanders of the Mexican Republic, Diaz, Escobedo and Regules, had asked for leave of absence, as they are dissatisfied with the policy of the Government. The Government naturally hesitates to comply with these requests, but has now granted that of Gen. Diaz in consequence of the accident which occurred to him at Oaxaca.

It looks as if the President were trying to hedge himself, and if possible escape from his dilemma. He announces that he will apply to the courts for legal proceedings against Mr. Stanton, and that he has appointed the Hon. Thomas Ewing, ar. of Ohio, Secretary of War. Too late, Mr. President! The question before the country now is the violation of an express law by the appointment of Gen. Thomas. That settled, we shall have time to consider Mr. Ewing.

We have a distinct recollection that when Mr. James Brooks made his celebrated speech on Shin Bones he promised that he "would never again address a white audience in the 'House of Representatives,' yet on Saturday he had another attack of solemnity, and uttered as usual a dismal and apparently hopeless protest against "these unholy proceedings." It is mortifying to learn that his impressive remarks were received "with derisive laughter."

The Legislative Body of France has rejected, by a vote of 155 to 67, a "Liberal" amendment to the press law, providing for the publication of a full report of the proceedings of that body. As the combined opposition numbers only 35 votes, it follows that at least some 30 Bonapartists have refused to adhere to the Government policy in a cause so gloriously illiberal.

The Democratic State Convention of Wisconsin did not construct a platform. They adopted only one resolution, and that a request that the delegation in the National Convention should vote as a unit. The Pendleton organs, however, claim that he is the choice of Wisconsin; but it is probable that Andrew Johnson would get the first vote of the delegation.

The Missouri Republican Convention on Saturday named Gen. Grant as their choice for President. They also sent a dispatch to Congress, and to Mr. Stanton and Gen. Grant, urging them to stand firmly by the laws, with the assurance that the people of Missouri would sustain them.

The Democrats after tempting Mr. Johnson into his present unfortunate and deplorable position, now denounce him, declaring that they are not responsible for his acts, and will give him no support. Mr. Johnson might have known this. The party that tried to betray the country would little hesitate to betray him.

Sherman won't have it. George H. Thomas won't have it. Suppose Mr. Johnson tries Col. Thomas B. Florence of the Pennsylvania militia? We can assure A. J. that Col. Tom will accept every brevet conferred upon him.
The army seems to be unanimous in repelling Mr. Johnson's advances. Can't Mr. Welles be breveted?

THE PRESIDENT AS AN APOSTATE.
From an Occasional Correspondent.
WASHINGTON, Saturday, Feb. 23, 1868.
It is becoming to speak of the Head of the Government with respect; but it is a trial to do so when he is deserving of none. A party or an individual can pardon much to a consistent and manly opponent, to one who openly and persistently confronts your theories, your measures, and your principles. A party or an administration which is harmonious in its purposes, distinct in its objects and its declarations, headed by leaders who faithfully represent their own and its convictions, may be determinedly opposed and resolutely resisted at every step, and yet never inspire, among right-minded people, either passion or contempt.

But it is otherwise when men have to confront the opposition of apostasy and treason. Hostility to a leader and his followers who have deserted to the enemy and carried with them their strong lines and central position, cannot be governed by ordinary rules. Such conduct in war is treason, and the traitor, if captured, meets a traitor's fate. He is considered guilty by the common sentiment of all mankind, in all ages, of despicable conduct, and deserving of an ignominious death. His dishonor is damning, not to himself alone; it attaches to his name, his kindred, and his posterity.

It is the same in politics as it is in war. There cannot be two different characterizations for two essential things. The apostate in peace is the traitor in war, in every fundamental particular. He is chosen to dole out a set of views, and he abandons them and espouses the opposite cause. He is entrusted with a high command, to support the principles and the policy of those who elected him. He declares, and avails himself of his position to carry on effective hostilities against them. In doing this he is as much a traitor to those to whom he is indebted for the means of his warfare as the man is a traitor who points his guns against those who gave him the charge of them. The same defects of character, the same moral attributes, are involved in the one case as in the other. There are a lack of conscience, a destitution of honorable sentiment, a groveling spirit, and a treacherous nature. In the traitor and the apostate these characteristics alike predominate. And where they are recognized what room is there for respect and reserve?

The President has deserted those who elected him. He has gone over to the enemy, and turns all his guns upon those who gave him command of their artillery. The facts admit of no dispute, whatever may be the pretenses offered in excuse. With or without apology, he thus stands before the world an apostate and a traitor in every essential feature of his conduct. What can a man so circumstanced expect, in the present or the future, but to be execrated accordingly?

It is idle to say that the President is removed, by virtue of his high position, from responsibility to his original political supporters, and that, under the guise of some vain pretense, he is at liberty to go over to his political enemies. In every free country there are two great parties, and there is no vague "country" to be represented, of which, under circumstances of apostasy, we often hear so much, standing between them. The "country" is represented by its political parties, naturally and necessarily. Sometimes by one, sometimes by another in the administration. The law, or rule, of the sway of each is found in the written or unwritten Constitution, and when one fails to reflect the opinion of the majority, it is, in the natural course of things, supplanted by its opponent. The ruling public opinion, in any given case, is the voice, simply, of one party or another. Under our Constitution popular elections decide for specific periods, and when a party is intrusted with power, it is its right to administer the Government upon its own theories and principles during the term for which it has been chosen. If, in selecting its agents, it mistakes the opinion of a man, and chooses one to important station who is hostile to its views and measures, the clear and manifest duty of the representative so chosen, if he cannot reflect the will of those who elected him, is to resign his place. No representative has any right to set himself up against his constituents. He is chosen by them for their benefit and to do their bidding in every case where they do not choose to leave his action to his own judgment; and every just man, and every high-toned man, will obey their will or surrender his trust, for he is nothing but a trustee empowered to act for his principals. The President of the United States is no exception to the rule. Especially is this the case with an accidental President, stepping into the place through constitutional provisions providing for an accidental vacancy, and not by the voluntary choice of the people. It is doubly the duty of such a man to consult the wishes of those by whom he has been elevated to his place. Such a man exercises no authority but representative authority. And when he uses the functions of his office for any purpose outside of its purely representative character he is guilty of moral usurpation. The place he fills belongs to those whose votes filled it. The individual is but their agent and spokesman, whose duty it is to carry out their will. They are, for the time, the nation, and their voice is the nation's voice. The assumption of the individual to disregard and oppose it, and to act in behalf of a pretentious individuality, is a gross and offensive claim to rulership. It is born of that slavery to forms and to despotic ideas which, in other times and under other systems, has so long held mankind in bondage. Popular government is one thing; despotic sentiments another. They have nothing in common. But, in cases of treason to the constituency, it is convenient for its supporters to assert a conservative sentimentalism, which sees in individual defection a prudent element in the system which admits of it that deserves commendation. It is complacently held to be a beneficent agent to preserve the people from themselves. This, however, is but to add insult to injury. The ideas of popular government have happily attained that development which discards this weakness, and holds that there is nothing in such an idea but defiance to a pretentious selfishness, and an interested support of a guilty apostasy.

These observations, it will be noticed, have nothing whatever to do with that constitutional phase of the President's conduct which exposes him to the charges of unfaithfulness or usurpation in the exercise of his official functions. Whether or not he is legally amenable to the Appropriation act, having effect from Dec. 31, 1867, and against him of "high crimes and misdemeanors," is a question quite outside of the line of these remarks. Our aim has been to present the moral and intellectual aspect of his case, removed from all considerations of the technicalities of Presidential authority, or of the political complications in which it is just now entangled.

J. S. F.
GEN. HANCOCK'S ORDER FOR THE RELIEF OF LOUISIANA.
NEW-ORLEANS, Feb. 23.—Gen. Hancock promulgated an important order yesterday, regarding the State finances. The order says that the Auditor and Treasurer having represented officially the indebtedness of the State to be such that, under the present Revenue laws, the debt cannot be paid, and the Governor, in an official communication to the Commanding General, having declared the State Treasury totally bankrupt, so that the United States officers cannot be paid, and the United States Government must stop the collection of arrears and taxes for four years being suspended by the Legislature until the year 1870, and the Appropriation act being expired Dec. 31, 1867, and the emergency being so pressing that prompt action is indispensable to prevent anarchy, confusion, and the loss of all semblance of civil authority, the General, therefore, orders that the State Treasury and after this date all the licenses on trades, professions, and occupations, and the revenues, dues, and taxes of the State, be collected, to each payment, and collected in the United States legal-tender notes. It is made the duty of the State Treasurer, and all other persons charged with the collection of such payments, to apply the said Appropriation Act, Executive, and civil officers of the State, and other purposes specified in the said Appropriation act, from the year 1867, so far as applicable to specified expenditures for the year 1867, and to be adopted by the Auditor and Treasurer, and to be performed as required to perform their duties under the existing laws.

TRAGEDY IN THE MAINE LUNATIC ASYLUM.
AGUSTA, Feb. 23.—At about 11 o'clock this morning, Miss Catharine Hurley and Mrs. Mary A. Pease were left alone in the third hall of the Insane Asylum. Shortly afterward one of the attendants called, the hall and found Mrs. Pease lying on the floor. Miss Hurley's hands were in Mrs. Pease's hair, and she was seated on the floor. Miss Hurley was very much excited, and she said she had been in a struggle with Mrs. Pease's face, and she had struck her in the face with her hands. Mrs. Pease's face had been strikingly mangled. She was from Westford, and had been in the Asylum only a short time. Miss Hurley is a native of Ireland, and had been in the Asylum only six weeks.