GENERAL BUTLER ON A RAID.

His Speech in Brooklyn Last Evening.

INVECTIVE AGAINST THE PRESIDENT.

TIRADE OF CHARGES.

He Demands Impeachment for Drunkenness in Office, Indecent, Inflammatory and Dangerous Harangues and the Usurpation of Legislative Powers.

Corrupt Use of the Appointing Power and the Abuse of the Pardoning Power Among the Charges.

AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE.

&c. &c. &c.

General Butler last evening uncorked the phials of his long bottled up wrath in the Academy of Music, Brooklyn, in a lecture entitled, "The usurpations, wrongs and abuses of Executive power, and the constitutional remedies therefor." The General has long desired to deliver himself of this lecture, which has been for some time prepared; and it would, no doubt, have been given to the world before this had the boys in the City Hall Park, on a late occasion, been of the same ilk as the "Brooklyn fraternity," under whose auspices he made his *début* last evening.

The Academy was filled in every part, and, bottle or no bottle, the house, in theatrical parlance, was a bumper, the immense audience paying for *entré* fifty cents to all parts but the platform, for seats on which one dollar was the charge.

A rumor had got abroad that the General, though invited to deliver his lecture by the "Brooklyn fraternity," would not receive a very fraternal greeting, and Inspector Folk, with many of his official folks, were on hand, occupying seats in private citizen's clothes, in different parts of the house. The precaution was judicious, but unnecessary. The audience was one that might easily have been supposed to have been drawn from Plymouth church itself, so evenly divided were the two sexes, and so quietly and attentively was the lecturer listened to.

At a quarter past eight o'clock General Butler made his appearance on the stage, and was greeted with considerable cheering and applause.

REMARKS BY AARON M. POWELL.

Mr. AARON M. POWELL then stepped forward and introduced the lecturer in the following words:—As Chairman of the Fraternity Lecture Association, I have the pleasure of announcing that the next lecture of this series will be given on Monday evening, December 17, by Mr. Frederick Douglass, of Rochester. (Applause.) His subject will be "The Sources of Danger to the Republic." That lecture, on account of a prior engagement of the Academy for another purpose, will be given in Plymouth church. Other lectures, the dates of which will be duly announced, are to follow in the Academy, to be given by the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher—(great applause)—by Mr. Wendell Phillips—(applause)—by General Logan—(applause)—and others whose names we are not at present able to announce.

I have the honor of introducing to you this evening one who is justly distinguished for eminently practical statesmanship, and to whose great executive ability the national cause is very largely indebted—Major General Butler, of Massachusetts. (Prolonged applause.)

THE LECTURE.

General BUTLER then stepped forward, and the enthusiasm which welcomed him having subsided, he addressed the audience substantially as follows:—

FAIR LADIES, GENTLEMEN OF BROOKLYN:—All experiments of government, republican in form, have hitherto been failures. Whether conducted by the intellectual but polished Athenian; the rugged, austere Spartan; the warlike, enterprising, but luxurious Roman of ancient days; or in the present century by the mercurial but philosophical Frenchman, worshipping the Goddess of Reason and theorizing a Utopia; or by the crisp-haired semi-barbarous Haytien just emerging from the darkness of ages into the light of civilization—each and all have been merged in despotism or ended in anarchy tempered with autocracy. True, the free Switzer still sways his snow-crowned Alps by elected rulers, but his Government holds its power not in its strength, but in its insignificance, and rather serves as an illustration than a contravention of this great truth. History in all ages has repeated herself, when the conditions under which she exhibits the affairs of man are the same, as well in acts as situation. Startling as is this fact to the American patriot, when reasoning *a priori* upon the future of his country, the enemies of free institutions, denying the capacity of men for self-government, have never failed to press it upon him, whenever the safety, stability, or durability of dissent forms of government are the topic of discussion or prophecy. Sad indeed would be the forebodings of the American statesman for the future of his country—nay, of the very existence of liberty itself in the world—if he could find no vital distinctions by which to take our last and, so far, best experiment of free government from the inexorable destiny to which it seems fated in the light of philosophy teaching through example. It would also seem to be his highest duty, taking warning from the story of the past, so to shape the course and current of governmental action as to avoid the vortex in which all other free governments have been drawn and foundered. The "beginning of their end" has been as uniform as their destruction has been universal. The same harbinger has heralded the downfall of each, at once the precursor and cause of death.

USURPATION OF THE EXECUTIVE POWER

and the neglect of the people to resist the earlier encroachments upon their rights and liberties. How to meet these dangers to our republic, will not unprofitably employ an evening's thought. The strength of a democratic form of government had been tested triumphantly in the late rebellion, by our power to wage a long war, our ability to borrow money and to pay it, and by the fact that so far from repudiation being the necessary result of a representative government, the struggle had strengthened it by the very taxation which was predicted as its ruin. The National credit will never be impaired though it shall take the last dollar and the last loaf to redeem it. (Applause.) Another and greater danger to our free institutions was claimed when the war ended. Our victorious armies, greater than the fabled hosts of Xerxes, flushed with success, their soldiers, combined together and endeared to each other by the hardships of the bivouac and the perils of battle, enticed by the romance, the excitement and the allurements of camp and field—their officers in love with a profession at once chivalric and commanding, wherein laurels were to be won, distinction and high positions attained, both and each spurning the tame arts of peace, unwilling to return to the monotony of every day life, under the lead of some bold, bad man, but brilliant and unscrupulous soldier, would, like the Roman legions, seize upon the government, make their General supreme and govern by the sword. On the contrary, these armies have melted away "like the snow flake soft falling on the sod"—the soldier merging in the civilian, all the better citizen because he had been a good soldier, bringing home the discipline of the army as instruction to obedience of the law, honored by the people for his deeds of valor or endurance in the field, and, so far from being dreaded as dangerous to the liberties of the people, leaned upon as the right arm of support in peace, of those free institutions which he had preserved in war. (Applause.) Thus all these perils, so fatal either in detail or in the aggregate to so many republics, have not only been passed in safety, but the country has surmounted them with accumulated power and grandeur, purged from slavery, the last vestige of sin and wrong in her constitution, with liberty and equality of right to all men for her motto, and her escutcheon bright, spotless, stainless and pure as the glittering shield of Richard the Lionhearted when he dashed it in the face of the hosts of the Saracen.

THE SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY, RELIGION AND INTELLIGENCE.

What elements, then, has this our republic, which others had not, that she laughs to scorn hazards which were fatal to them?—The school house and the church, education and Christianity, never before given to a whole people under a republic. (Applause.) To a whole people, did I say? Ah! would it had been so. Therein lies the difficulty. "It was a grievous fault and grievously have we answered it." Over nearly one half of our territory heretofore swaying quite that proportion of political powers, there has never been established any system of education free and common to all, in which the people could be instructed in their duty to their fellowmen and their country, and the larger part of whose inhabitants are unable even to read the Book of Life. Far more miserable and wretched beside, to almost a majority of the people, the truths of the gospel were hidden or perverted, and marriage, the most holy of the sacraments of the church, the very foundation of society, even as a civil contract was denied. Is it a marvel then that eleven States, with people thus besotted by ignorance, with governments republican in form, cursed with an institution which, demoralizing the people of the Grecian and Roman republics, hastened their downfall; bound to the parent government by moral and political obligations only, should break away from all ties of loyalty and patriotism which hold man to country and government, to try the experiment of despotism and end in anarchy? Thought we not to be thankful to the Almighty Disposer of events that there was enough of intelligence, virtue, courage and Christian faith in the North to redeem the country as from the gulf of perdition, to the brink of which, ignorance, sin and slavery had brought it?

HOW CAN THE SOUTH BE BEST REGENERATED?

Now that organized resistance to the laws has ceased in that territory, how shall the people thereof, with safety to themselves and to the whole country, be brought to enjoy the blessings of free institutions, the saving equality of rights and justice to all? That problem, so vast, so momentous, so vital, can only be solved by the wisdom of experience learning from the events of the past. Political expedients adjusting balances of power; conventions framing constitutions of government; Presidents inventing plans of reconstruction; Congress passing acts of admission or rejection of reorganized or disorganized States, cannot compass it; each and all, all the devices of statecraft, will fail as they always, under like conditions, have failed. Even the new born, universal freedom, has not and will not accomplish it. Universal education, the common school and the church, are the only bases upon which the South can be safely and permanently reconstructed. Let the school house arise in her every hamlet and precinct, free to all, black and white alike; scattering its blessings upon all—upon the loyal and disloyal—bountiful and broadcast, like the dews of heaven on the just and unjust. The church will follow the school as a fostering mother, and the seeds of religion will not fall on stony ground, where learning has upturned the mind and heart by her benign influences. Let nothing hinder this method of reconstruction. All others are temporary expedients which will fail, and fortunate it will be for the country if they do not fail in anarchy and blood. This alone is safe and eternal. Let us not be told that there is no power given by the constitution to Congress to educate the people of these conquered territories. If the power is not in the organic law, put it there, and at once. But I deny the proposition. Adequate power is now in the constitution from necessity, because of the very instincts of self-preservation. Nay, it is there in words:—"Congress shall have power to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." (Cheers.) Let no traditions of government; let no mere forms of law; no circumlocutions of statecraft, or any of the clogs of the dead past prevent the education of the Southern people. Urged by the warnings of history, I plead as for my life for this, the only assurance of the success of this greatest, and if it fail this last experiment of freedom and happiness of the people, untrodden by despotism. With the wailing cry of him who sees the ark of safety forever disappearing in the whirling waste of waters, I pray that the intelligence and Christianity of our educated people may turn aside the wand of the Muse of History pointing downward the course of our country, to follow in the long ranks of buried republics, to guide us in a triumphal march, onward! upward, forever!

VIGILANCE AND INTEGRITY ALSO NECESSARY.

Will these so great safeguards be sufficient without that vigilance and integrity of the people which shall watch and resist the first so dangerous encroachments of Executive power? Nothing can be more fatal to liberty than the listless carelessness which passes over unheeded the first steps of usurpation. All history teaches that no despot has ever seized upon the liberties of a people until the people were familiarized by frequent allusions to its possibility.

THE GREAT CRIME OF SUGGESTING THAT A DICTATOR IS POSSIBLE IN THIS COUNTRY.

Whoever, then, shall suggest the possibility that the form of our government may be changed, and that a "king" or a "dictator" may seize the liberties of the people, commits a great crime and misdemeanor against free government. It is an insult to the intelligence and virtue of the people to suppose that thing possible. The Roman law is said not to have contained any penalty against a child killing his parent, because by making a provision against so horrid a crime the law would suppose parricide possible. So there is no express enactment in our constitution and laws to punish the declaration that any man by the use of the patronage of the government and the army and navy of the people may take away their liberties and make himself either king or dictator; but the crime of undermining the confidence and affection of the people to their institutions is not therefore less, and all the greater when it emanates from high official position. The hope, wish or thought of the possibility, publicly expressed by any officer of the government, civil or military, that he could become the tyrant of the people, under whatever name, is a heinous offence, for which the constitution has provided a sure and conservative remedy.

IMPEACHMENT ESTABLISHED AS A REMEDY FOR USURPATION AND MISBEHAVIOR IN OFFICE.

Our patriot heroes, founding a government, of itself born of a revolution springing from the oppressions of a king and an irresponsible ministry, availing themselves of every safeguard of British freedom declared in Magna Charta, added thereto frequency of election of the Chief Executive and the legislative branch of the State; but, mindful that the Roman Consuls, although annually elected even, contrived to usurp power until they became dictators, condemning the maxim that a king could do no wrong, and impressed with the fact, from sad experience, that princes and ministers of state were not angels of grace, carefully provided for usurpation of power and all misbehavior in office the great constitutional, conservative remedy of impeachment and removal. (Cheers.)

JUDGE HUMPHREYS IMPEACHED FOR ADVOCATING THE RIGHT OF SECESSION.

The last and most interesting case of impeachment at the present juncture was that of Judge Humphreys of Tennessee upon the complaint of Andrew Johnson, in in June, 1862. (Cheers.) One of the charges against Humphreys, of which he was unanimously found guilty by the Senate, was that at Nashville, on the 29th day of December, 1860, at a public meeting, he "did then and there publicly declare that it was the right of the people of said State by the ordinance of secession to absolve themselves from allegiance to the government of the United States, the constitution and laws thereof." Among the articles of impeachment against Humphreys was a charge that as Confederate Judge, after the secession of Tennessee, he had decreed the confiscation of the property of Andrew Johnson. Upon this charge he was acquitted.

This case is exceedingly instructive. It determines that a speech may be an impeachable offence. Every Senator, thirty-eight in number, democrats included, voted that a political speech by a United States officer in a public meeting before the war, advocating secession, was a high crime and misdemeanor. But Judge Humphreys only advanced publicly the right of secession which had been advocated in the South for thirty years by Calhoun and his disciples. How much would have been saved to the country if the first utterer of it had been impeached! What a lesson is taught us that the first utterances of officials dangerous to liberty and law should be promptly punished, however high the offender may be. Let justice be done though the heavens fall. (Cheers.)

ANDREW JOHNSON COMPLAINANT IS STOPPED TO DENY THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO IMPEACH HIM.

Andrew Johnson was a complainant in this case, so that he is concluded by it to deny, first, that an improper public speech of a high official is impeachable; second, that a House of Representatives from which eleven States are excluded is not a constitutional House, with the power of impeachment, and that a Senate from which twenty-two members are excluded are not a constitutional court to try and determine an impeachment. Humphreys, when summoned before the Senate, refused to appear, and was tried and convicted in his absence. So that Andrew Johnson, the complainant, and every democratic Senator of that day, and a majority of the republican senators of the present Senate are concluded by their votes and acts under their solemn oaths, upon every disputed question that would possibly arise upon an impeachment of the President of the United States, save one, which we will directly discuss. Let us repeat, the President, House and Senate have solemnly committed themselves to the proposition that a House from which the representatives of eleven States are excluded is a constitutional House for the purpose of an impeachment of a high officer of the United States.

ADVOCATING AN UNLAWFUL ACT A HIGH CRIME, WORTHY OF IMPEACHMENT.

That the advocacy by a high officer of the United States of an unlawful proposition in a political speech is sufficient ground of impeachment. Therefore that mere words are sufficient, without any overt act. If the accused neglects or refuses to appear before the Senate when summoned, he may be tried, convicted and deposed from office in his absence. (Cheers.) The only remaining question not settled by this precedent is whether the Senate, when sitting as a high court of impeachment, can bring the offender before it and suspend or remove him from office during the trial? Now, it was familiar history that the Commons of England, when they impeached any person not a peer of the realm, took him into custody of their sergeant-at-arms, as soon as the impeachment was determined upon in that body, and delivered the prisoner over, still in custody, to the House of Lords, when the articles of impeachment were placed before the peers, as in Dr. Sacheverell's case, impeached for preaching a sermon, or held him to bail, as in Seymour's case. The accused persons being in prison were, of course, suspended from the exercise of their official functions. A question arose, however, whether when a peer of the realm was impeached he could before trial be suspended from his function in the House of Lords. This was denied by the Lords and asserted by the Commons, as it would seem to be manifestly improper for an officer to exercise the duties of his office while being tried for high crimes and misdemeanors. To provide against such controversy in the future, in our constitution it is declared that "The President, Vice President and all other civil officers may be removed from office upon impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors." If the officer could only be removed or suspended from the exercise of his office upon conviction, that being against the custom of Parliament, it would have been expressly so enacted in the constitution, but the exact contrary are the words of the constitution, the officer being removable "upon impeachment for and conviction of high crimes and misdemeanors." And the higher the officer the more need that he shall be removed from office lest he shall by influence corrupt both witnesses and judges, and that is possible.

HOW THE TRIAL OF AN IMPEACHMENT IS CONDUCTED.

It may not be uninteresting to observe that by the English law the incidents of a trial of an impeachment differ from trials in court. When the representative of the whole people vote to impeach an officer, the proceeding is of so solemn a nature that the particulars of the offence, as in the case of an indictment, are not required to be written out until the offender is charged before the Senate, sitting as a court. The proceeding in such case is this:—A message is sent to the Senate, informing that body that an impeachment has been found, and that articles will be preferred, and if the offences are grave, praying the offender may be held to answer, if not then in custody. Thereupon the accused is either by summons or arrest brought to the bar of the Senate and the accusation read to him, and his answer taken. From that hour his person is in custody of the court, and he has no farther official functions. Another peculiarity in a trial before the Senate is that it is no cause of challenge to a senator as it would be to a juror that he had formed or expressed an opinion on the merits of the case, or even that he is related to the accused; the brothers and sons of the prisoners at the bar of the House of Lords frequently voting on the question of their guilt or innocence. The reason of this is that there can be no talesmen to supply the place of a senator if he should be challenged by the accused. There is still another distinction from ordinary trials, in case of impeachment, which it is interesting to notice, and that is, that the representatives of the people may proceed against high officers upon common fame or common report of their misconduct; and the reason given for this apparent anomaly is that if it were not so great offenders would be the only ones safe in their crimes, because when in power and authority no private person would venture to prosecute or make known their wrongs, so that until they are impeached and deprived of power and official station witnesses would not dare to come forward and give evidence against them. Besides, impeachment is an act of government, and all governmental acts are based upon facts of which history and common fame are the only evidence. Another and amusing popular mistake upon the effect of impeachment—that the sentence may order the execution of the party convicted—would not deserve notice except that it has obtained favor with the President of the United States, who says in one of his speeches, "Would they take off my head, as they did the head of James II.?" The President is at fault. By the constitution only the official head of the officer is to be taken off, of which he himself has taken off so many. (Laughter.) Farther, James II.'s head was never taken off at all, except in this wise:—After having misgoverned his kingdom and disaffected his people he become alarmed for his safety, threw the great seal of England into the Thames and ran away to France, and took his head off with him, an example well and highly proper to be followed by any ruler in like case offending. (Laughter.)

THE IMPEACHMENT LIVES THOUGH CONGRESS DIES.

Another question has also been much mooted: whether a Parliament presenting an impeachment being prorogued or dissolved, the impeachment and trial might be carried on by a new Parliament; or, in other words, if a Congress end by its limitation a new Congress can prosecute an impeachment begun by a former Congress. In early times, when the favorites of the King were impeached the monarch, to save his creatures, used to dissolve the Parliament to put an end to the prosecution; but afterwards it was resolved, and finally determined in the case of Warren Hastings, that the impeachment did not die with the Parliament. We thus have carefully examined the constitutional remedy for usurpation and official misconduct. We have seen that it is aptly fitted to be, and ought to be, applied at the nearest approach of danger or wrong without waiting till they have ripened into outrage and disaster.

IS ANDREW JOHNSON GUILTY OF IMPEACHABLE OFFENCES?—THE CHARGES.

The only inquiry that remains to us is whether common fame or current history charges any officer of the government with declarations or acts dangerous to the permanency of our institutions and the liberties of the people, so that they are satisfied that for the "general welfare of the United States" this remedy ought to be applied, as well to meet the beginnings of wrong in high places as to punish the offender as a warning to all others daring thus to sin. Because if the judgment and conscience of the loyal people of the country are not satisfied of the guilt of the accused and the righteousness of his punishment, he becomes not a criminal but a martyr, whatever may be the official verdict against him. And indeed in this, as in all other governmental action, the representatives of the people should only echo their thought and do their behest. What, then, is the judgment of the people upon the official conduct of the "Vice President of the United States discharging the powers and duties devolved upon him by the death" by assassination of the President, such being the exact constitutional definition of his present office? In this inquiry let us proceed upon the "evidence" by which he might be impeached, well grounded common fame. As one of the people, then, I charge that Andrew Johnson has committed high crimes and misdemeanors in office in many particulars, but which may be grouped under these general charges:—

DRUNKENNESS IN OFFICE.

Therefore I charge Andrew Johnson, as well while Vice President as while discharging the powers and duties of President of the United States, with degrading and debasing, even while taking the oath of office, the station and dignity of the office of Vice President and that of President, by indecently exhibiting and exposing himself upon official and public occasions in a state of drunkenness, by the voluntary use of intoxicating liquors, to the great scandal and disgrace of the whole people of the United States and the government thereof. (Applause.) As to the specification and evidence of the first charge of public drunkenness, if common uncontradicted fame speaks truly, and that it does in this instance, the blush of shame which mantles the cheek of every true American when the occurrence is mentioned, is the highest guarantee—then every Senator who witnessed the disgraceful stammering tongue of the Vice President as he mumbled his oath of office, and slobbered the Holy Book with a drunken kiss, will be at once the witness and judge—(applause)—and to other like public and disgraceful exhibitions almost every depot and station master between Washington and St. Louis can give evidence. (Laughter and cheers.) Indeed, it were Christian, kindly charity to believe that the speeches made on those occasions had that excuse, because then they would be errors of the head, wherein an "enemy had been put to steal away the brain," and might be reformed; but a heart that could send forth such utterances, specially that made by Andrew Johnson at Niagara, wherein he said he was glad that by the constitution he was made President, can never be made better save by the omnipotence of Divine Grace. That I may do Mr. Johnson no wrong I will give his words as reported on that occasion:—"The victory was obtained and I was made Vice President of the United States. Can't you see the gradation comes along regularly? And then by the constitution of the country I was made President. I am glad of it." (Laughter.) Is Andrew Johnson guilty or not guilty of this charge and specification? How say you, fellow citizens, was he drunk or sober? (Applause and laughter.)

INDECENT, INFLAMMATORY AND DANGEROUS HARANGUES.

I charge Andrew Johnson, Vice-President, discharging the powers and duties of the President of the United States, and sworn faithfully to execute the same, with officially and publicly making declarations and inflammatory harangues, indecent and unbecoming and in derogation of his high office, dangerous to the permanency of our republican form of government, and with intent and design to excite the ridicule, fear, hatred and contempt of the people against the legislative and judicial departments thereof. The second charge of making indecent and inflammatory harangues, degrading the position as the Executive head of the most civilized and intellectual nation in the world, has many specifications, and is sustained by much evidence. The obnoxious declarations of Mr. Johnson are all of them public speeches, made either to committees or from the rostrum, in defence of his policy, or attacks upon individuals or other branches of the government. They may be divided into two classes, the indecent and the dangerous and inflammatory. Can there be anything more indecent and degrading to the office of President of the United States than the exhibition made by Andrew Johnson on the 22d of February last in that speech, for which there is, unfortunately for the honor of the country, not the apology that he was drunk? His characterization of the editor of a leading journal, who certainly up to that time had dealt with him in courteous language, as a "dead duck," (laughter); the tone, the manner, the occasion are all criminally beneath the dignity of the office he occupies. Again, on that most unhappy funeral journey, his vituperative denunciations by name of some of the best and purest of the land, calling a Senator, a Representative and a gifted orator, each and all of them true and tried patriots beyond doubt or cavil of any sound mind, "traitors" and threatening them with death, to raise a vulgar laugh. His threats at St. Louis to "kick out" of office whoever should oppose his policy; his vulgar attack, at the same place, upon a law which he himself had signed, appealing to prejudice against the blacks by arguing that Congress had given the negro soldier ($100) one hundred dollars bounty, and to the white soldier only fifty dollars. His perversion of the holy Scriptures and blasphemy at Philadelphia, by enunciating from the balcony of the hotel to a deputation of tailors, that the "Great Father of us all was the first tailor," accompanied by the announcement that "he did not want to be thought facetious in so asserting." (Laughter.) Outraging the religious sense of the whole community by comparing the radical to the Saviour, using his holiest name, never to be breathed by a Christian public man save with veneration, as the drunken catchword of a blackguard harangue, and so on and on *ad nauseam*. Has a shocked, outraged, humbled, shamed and indignant people no remedy for such disgusting humiliation of their pride of country and national self-respect? Must they endure it two years and more longer? A like record made against any other high officer of the United States to any former President, would he not have removed him for cause? Shall the spectacle remain forever unrebuked of the President debasing himself so as justly to draw from the crowd witnessing the exhibition such expressions as "Go it, Andy!" "Keep your temper, Andy!" "Don't get mad, Andy!" And for the President to reply, "I left my dignity at Washington!" (Laughter.) May not the people say you have quit the dignity of your office once—you shall never again resume it? Are the decent, respectable and intelligent people of the country always to have their cheeks burn with shame whenever such conduct of their Chief is discussed, because the remedy has never been applied or an example made? Is the highest office in the land, the Presidency, to which it is our proudest boast the humblest American boy may aspire, to be so degraded that to any well bred boy it will not seem worth the aspiration, and yet to be neither remedied nor punished? No; so long as the conservative remedy of impeachment exists, the American people will preserve the Presidential office honored by Washington by punishing this its degradation as the highest of all misdemeanors. What motive for this course, you may ask, could Mr. Johnson have? He everywhere declared that he had filled all the offices under the constitution that man could fill. The outcroppings of his mind peep from his mouth. "Why," he says, "with the Freedmen's Bureau, with agents and satraps in every town and school district, with fifty millions of dollars in my pocket, and the army at my back, I could proclaim myself Dictator." This was at Cincinnati; but at Niagara Mr. Seward, subtle and wily, had foreshadowed the same proposition in these words:—"The President has struck the key note of the political argument to-day. 'The Union must not, shall not be divided.' The question is between the President and the Congressmen." More boldly at Battle Creek, Michigan, Mr. Seward says:—"Those that want thirty-six States say so." (Voices respond—"Ay!" "Ay!") "Do you want Andrew Johnson President or King?" Mr. Seward never says anything without a purpose. What was that purpose? That the loyal people of Michigan who heard it understood what he means was evident, for they refused to hear him any further. (Applause.)

THE JUDICIARY ATTACKED.

Nor is Congress the only branch of the government attacked by the President. The judiciary also was to be "made odious." Therefore, when the loyal people of Cleveland put the very pertinent question to Mr. Johnson, "Why don't you hang Jeff Davis?" what true man was not shocked at the answer, "Have you not got the Attorney General? Why is your Chief Justice who has refused to sit on the trial?" If it is true that the Chief Justice has refused to sit on the trial of a criminal, however great, when it was his duty so to do, he ought to be impeached—(applause)—and if the public charge of Mr. Johnson against the judiciary is false, then it is malicious, and he ought to be removed from an office which gives him position falsely to malign the judiciary of the United States by accusing its Chief Justice of dereliction of duty. ("Hear, hear," and applause.)

SHALL JOHNSON BE KING?

No, fellow-citizens; let us proceed to meet the beginnings of mischief by the legal, conservative, radical and constitutional method of impeachment. Let the people teach the incumbent of the office of President that he is not such stuff as dictators are made of—(laughter)—and if we are to have a king, he will not be King Andrew the Indecent. (Laughter and applause.) For his blasphemous exhibitions, his debasement of his high office, his revolutionary, inflammatory and unbecoming attacks upon the Congress of the people; his false accusations against the judiciary; his insult to the virtue and intelligence of the people, in daring to breathe the thought that they would submit their liberties to any dictator or tyrant, and least of all to him; of such high crimes against the people and misdemeanors against the country. How say you, fellow citizens, is Andrew Johnson guilty or not guilty? (Slight applause.)

USURPATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS.

I charge Andrew Johnson with wickedly, tyrannically and unconstitutionally, as chief executive officer, usurping the legislative rights and powers of the Congress of the United States. When the last rebel soldier had surrendered to our victorious armies and armed resistance had ceased, what was the exact state of things in the revolted States? An insurrection had ripened into a public territorial war, recognized by the executive, legislative and judicial departments, between the United States and the forces of the revolted States. All the citizens, then, in those States had become, by their own and the acts of their communities, and the effect of domestic violence and war, armed public enemies; and, in the language of Andrew Johnson's proclamation, "Rebellion in its revolutionary progress had deprived these States of all civil government." Armed hostilities had ceased. Their people had become disarmed public enemies, surrendered as paroled prisoners of war. If we look at them as belligerents we had captured them and all their rights. (Applause.) If we look at them as rebellious subjects, they had forfeited their lives, their property and all their rights by treason and rebellion. Whichever way you take it, they had lost all, we had gained all, by capture in war and from forfeiture by crime. By whom then was peace to be concluded, hostilities ceasing? By the President alone? Certainly not. A peace in a foreign war cannot be made by the President without two-thirds of the Senate, much less in a civil war, where the duties of rebellious citizens and the rights which ought to be restored to them must be settled by law. Who could enact any plan, policy or method of reorganizing these conquered territories "deprived of all civil government?" Congress alone. Andrew Johnson attempted it. He appointed rebel Governors for seven of them. By what right? He directed those Governors to "prescribe rules and regulations for convening a convention," composed of delegates to be chosen by that portion of the people of said State who are loyal to the United States, and no others, for the purpose of altering and amending the constitution thereof. Strictly and grammatically construed he thus ordered a convention to alter the constitution of the United States; but we must not expect too much of a head of the nation who did not know that James the Second did not lose his head. Taking it, however, as meant, by what law, constitutional or other, was all this pretended to be done? I venture to say, as a lawyer, that no single provision of law or constitution can be found that will give color of justification to this unheard of procedure. Looking at Mr. Johnson's proclamation for reorganizing North Carolina I find his claim of power to do it in these words:—"Rebellion has in its revolutionary progress deprived the people of the State of North Carolina of all civil government, and whereas it becomes necessary and proper to carry out and enforce the obligations of the United States to the people of North Carolina in securing to them the enjoyment of a republican form of government," I, Andrew Johnson, do, &c., &c. But did Andrew Johnson give to the people government republican in form? What is a republican government? It is that under which a majority of the people can take part in electing their own rulers and enacting their own laws. Excluding the negroes, as the proclamation does, will anybody pretend that a majority of the white people even of North Carolina were loyal May 29, 1865, when the rebel soldiers had not got home? The whole action of the Executive in this behalf was a most palpable and flagrant usurpation of the power of Congress; acts which even the judges of the Southern States have declared unconstitutional, although done in their behalf. The wicked object and intent of this usurpation is seen in the fact that Andrew Johnson has ever since fought and denounced Congress for not permitting its consummation, although by its fruits undoing almost all that was done by the war in bringing the South to such a proper spirit of subjugation as to make a truly loyal man safe there in his home.

CORRUPT USE OF THE APPOINTING POWER.

I charge Andrew Johnson with wickedly and corruptly using and abusing the constitutional power of the President of nominating to office and filling vacancies in office during the recess of the Senate, and removing from office with intent and design to undermine, overthrow and evade the power of advising and consenting to appointments to office vested in the Senate by the constitution, and for the further corrupt purpose of controlling the freedom of the election by the people, of members of the House, in order to put the House of Representatives in the hands of men lately in rebellion against or evilly disposed towards the government. Fellow citizens, is it not time that these removals from office without cause, and to pamper the ambition or gratify the passions of any man, be stopped? It will never be done if we let Mr. Johnson's precedent go unpunished.

ABUSE OF PARDONING POWER.

I charge Andrew Johnson with improperly, wickedly and corruptly using and abusing the constitutional power of pardons for offences against the United States, and in order to bring traitors and rebels into places of honor, trust and profit under the government of the United States, and to screen whole classes of criminals from the penalties of their crimes against the laws thereof. As to the fifth charge—the abuse of the power of pardons. While the fact is admitted that thousands of rebels have been pardoned for their crimes without investigation, and solely upon the recommendation of other rebels, yet it is said, as the constitution gives the President the unlimited power to pardon, why may he not pardon as many as he pleases without doing any legal wrong? The answer is obvious. There are many powers in government right if properly used, criminal if used wrongfully or with a wrong motive. Let me illustrate. Almost every Governor of a State has the unlimited power of pardon. Suppose a Governor in mere wantonness should pardon and set free at once all the convicts in the Penitentiary; would any man doubt that that would be a great crime for which he might be impeached? Yet there is no statute law against it. Suppose he should pardon one murderer that he might revenge himself upon his enemy. Would any one doubt that such pardon was a crime because of the motive, although the Governor had the power to do it? Now what has been the motive of Andrew Johnson for his indiscriminate pardons? It was to restore property to rebels which by the confiscation laws belonged to the United States, or to enable rebels to hold office and thus to conciliate them to himself. No better illustration of the design of this exercise of the pardoning power can be given than the pardon of John T. Monroe that he might be Mayor of New Orleans. It bore its appropriate fruit—riot, bloodshed and murder.

APPOINTING REBELS TO POWER AGAINST LAW.

I charge Andrew Johnson with knowingly and wilfully violating the constitutionally enacted laws of the United States by appointing disloyal men to office, and, illegally and without right, giving to them the emoluments of such office from the treasury, well knowing the appointees to be ineligible to office. Hundreds of offices were filled at the South, in the several departments, by men who were known rebels. When Congress inquired into these acts what do you suppose was the answer? Why, that there were no loyal men in the districts to fill the office. What an excuse! If there were no loyal men what the need of the office at all for disloyal men? Must the office be filled against law? Were there not hundreds of maimed and wounded soldiers, black and white, who could have been sent South, who would have filled those offices a precious sight better than Andrew Johnson does the one he has dropped into? (Loud cheers.)

REFUSING TO EXECUTE THE LAWS.

I charge Andrew Johnson with knowingly and wilfully neglecting and refusing to execute and carry out the constitutional laws of Congress in the insurrectionary States in order to favor and encourage men lately in rebellion and in arms against the United States, to the oppression and injury of the loyal and true citizens of such States. The charge that he has refused to execute the laws is too notoriously and sadly true to be controverted. I will detain you by noticing an instance or two only. Congress passed a law that all property used in aid of the rebellion should, when captured, be prize of war, and thereby the property of the United States. That law, so just and proper, is still unrepealed. We all remember what tremendous aid was given to the armies of the rebellion by the energetic use of the Southern railroads in transporting troops, most of them being run by the companies that owned them. Those roads were all captured, but every one of them has been given back to their rebel owners, although the interests of the Northern stockholders in them had been confiscated by the rebels. (Applause.) Again, Congress passed a law that the property of certain leaders of the rebellion, whenever it came into our possession, should be confiscated for the use of the armies of the United States. That law is unrepealed. Yet Andrew Johnson, sworn to execute the laws which made it his duty to confiscate this property, in the words following, "It shall be the duty of the President to seize and use the property aforesaid for the purposes aforesaid," has stopped all process of confiscation or seizure, although in his proclamation of restoration he orders the Attorney General to have the confiscation laws executed. Thus showing that he knew the law, but, according to what he calls "his policy," wilfully defies it. Again, Congress ordered a direct tax of twenty millions. We of the loyal North paid our portion of it in addition to our other burdens. The Southern portion was made a lien upon their property and land, and in many States the tax commissioners were proceeding to collect the tax according to law, when they were stopped by Executive order, and the taxes remain uncollected to this day. If these laws ought not to be executed, let them be repealed; but while in force let them be executed, or the officer failing in his duty be punished for it. I have yet, however, to see the message of Andrew Johnson to Congress urging the repeal of either of these laws. Once more: The Civil Rights bill was passed by Congress over the veto of Andrew Johnson. (Loud cheers.) Do we not hear daily of wrong and outrage and murder done upon the freedmen and Union men in every rebellious State? Have we not heard from official reports that in Texas a dozen murders daily of negroes are taking place without check, and that five hundred indictments for murders are still untried in that State alone? Have there not been a score of convictions by competent courts for felony and murder sent up to the Executive, and been before him for months, and are yet unexecuted or pardoned? and for the murder of no colored man has a white man, although convicted, been allowed to be executed by Andrew Johnson. Military orders protecting loyal men have been deemed inoperative because of the Civil Rights bill, and that is made a dead letter by the clogs of the Executive, until Sheridan—(cheers)—asserts that United States troops "are unsafe in reconstructed Johnsonian Texas outside of their own camps." And yet, with all this outrage, crime, anarchy and murder unchecked, men doubt whether the cause and occasion of it all in the Presidential chair ought to be impeached!

COMPLICITY IN THE NEW ORLEANS MASSACRE.

I charge Andrew Johnson with unlawfully, corruptly and wickedly confederating and conspiring with one John T. Monroe, late a rebel against the government of the United States, pardoned by himself that he might hold office, and other evil disposed persons, traitors and rebels, as well pardoned as unpardoned, to prevent, hinder and disperse a lawful, peaceful and rightful meeting and convention of loyal citizens of the United States, then assembled in New Orleans to consider their constitutional rights and privileges, and to submit to the judgment of the people of the State of Louisiana certain propositions of amendment to the constitution of that State for their discussion and action as such convention might rightfully do. And in pursuance of such unlawful, corrupt and wicked conspiracy, Andrew Johnson did incite, move and permit John T. Monroe and his rebellious and wicked associates to disperse and break up such lawful convention and the members thereof to kill, assassinate and murder. Fellow citizens, how say you? Ought not the New Orleans massacre, the murder of Doctie, the assassination of Horton, to be investigated before the highest court in the land with the highest criminal at the bar? (Loud applause.)

OBJECTIONS TO IMPEACHMENT NOW.

What is to be urged why these grave charges shall not be tried and punished if found true? We are told, because Andrew Johnson will now, after the rebuke of the elections, make concessions to Congress, and will make no more removals from office. Will that take away from us the disgrace of his public speeches and acts? Will that atone for the insult to the American people of threatening to make himself Dictator, and with civil internecine war? Will that put back into the Treasury the millions taken from it against law? Will that restore the Southern States to that fit condition for reorganization in which Andrew Johnson found them, and which, too, he has destroyed? Will that restore to life the unavenged, murdered freedmen and Union men in the South? Will that give back to his widowed wife the assassinated Doctie, or put again in the pulpit to preach the holy word the murdered Horton?

LET US NOT BE DECEIVED AGAIN.

It is said Mr. Johnson will, to get universal amnesty, now be willing to advocate universal suffrage. Most offenders against the law would be, but does that purge his offences against free institutions and free government? As soon as the great victory was won over the rebellion, scheming politicians plotted to give up all that we had gained by arms, and the spirit of rebellion grew rampant. Now that the people have won a great triumph by the ballot, let not the fruits of victory be lost by a new set of political manœuvres, and the reins of power again given to those who have betrayed us. It was then said we must give up all we had won because we had extorted by arms universal freedom; now it is claimed that we must yield all that justice demands because by the ballot we have forced universal suffrage. Must this government ever be carried on upon a wretched system of swappings and compromises? May it never be administered upon the great principles of truth and justice, to the "end that it may be a government of laws and not men."

THERE IS NO DANGER FROM THE ARMY.

But it is said if an impeachment is attempted the executive will resist by the aid of the army and navy. Then he will add tre