THE BLAINE SCANDAL.

Mr. Riddle in Defence of the Memory of His Son-in-Law.

WHAT MR. KNOWLTON SAW WHILE LIVING.

Impressions of Those to Whom He Communicated the Facts.

WAS MR. BLAINE IN MR. STEWART'S OFFICE?

Certain Kansas Pacific Bonds Traced Through Devious Windings.

KALEIDOSCOPIC CHANGES IN A NAME.

WASHINGTON, May 14, 1876.

Mr. A. G. Riddle has written a communication in answer to Mr. Blaine's last personal explanation, with the purpose, as he states, of clearing the memory of the late Mr. J. W. Knowlton, his (Mr. Riddle's), son-in-law, who, as it will be recollected, was charged by Mr Blaine, with being the author of the story concerning the Kansas Pacific bonds, and who was afterward, according to the same authority, swift to retract it, saying he had told the story as a jest, and that it was published without his knowledge or approbation, and, moreover, that he had done all he could to prevent its circulation. After quoting the letters which had passed between himself and Mr. Blaine, and which have already been published in the HERALD, Mr. Riddle continues:—

I ask attention to the following communications, strictly responsive to notes addressed by me to the writers, severally:—

STATEMENT OF GENERAL H. V. BOYNTON.

WASHINGTON, May 4, 1876.

MY DEAR MR. RIDDLE:—Your letter of yesterday has reached me. In it you call my attention to the personal explanation made by Mr. Blaine in the House of Representatives, on the 1st inst., and ask me to state to you the character of my acquaintance with James W. Knowlton, my estimate of him as a man of truth and honor, the nature of the statement he made to me in regard to Mr. Blaine, the circumstances under which he made it, whether he ever changed or varied this statement to my knowledge, how the incorrect allusions to it came to be printed, the course taken by Mr. Knowlton in reference to this publication, and what I know concerning his acquaintance with Mr. Blaine, and in what shape the bond question has been of late presented to Mr. Blaine.

Mr. Knowlton, as Washington correspondent of the Chicago *Tribune* was my business associate from the autumn of 1870 to the summer of 1872, and thereafter my intimate friend until his death in November, 1873. So far as my knowledge of him extended, he enjoyed a high reputation among his associates as a man of unblemished honor and a most careful and exact correspondent, and during my daily and close association with him nothing was ever brought to my attention at variance with this reputation.

The statement he made to me in regard to Mr. Blaine was first called out by the publications made in the summer and fall of 1872 concerning Credit Mobilier and a railroad scandal which had been afterward retracted, in which both Mr. Blaine and Mr. Joseph B. Stewart were made to figure, and the former to figure unjustly.

After speaking of these matters, Mr. Knowlton said that he was a law student in the office of Stewart & Riddle, in the Colonization buildings, in this city, at the time certain railroad transactions of Stewart's were in progress; that one night he was sitting in the general room of that office when Mr. Blaine called and asked to see Mr. Stewart, who was in his private room. He passed into that room and remained there with Stewart for about an hour, when Stewart came out of the room with what proved to be twenty-five $1,000 construction bonds of the Union Pacific Railroad, Eastern division, and asked Mr. Knowlton to sign them, as witness to a transfer. This Mr. Knowlton did, and Stewart took the bonds back into the room where Mr. Blaine was, and in a few moments the latter passed out. Mr. Knowlton did not claim to have seen these bonds delivered to Mr. Blaine, or to have any other knowledge of the transaction than that recited above. After this conversation we found that it had been heard in part by Mr. Gibson, of the *New York Sun*, then in the front office; and Mr. Knowlton said to me that he had charged him in the most emphatic manner not to use it; and that he did not at that time.

The matter next came up under the following circumstances:—Joseph B. Stewart, formerly a lawyer in this city, had testified before the Credit Mobilier Committee, No. 2, that he drew the tenth section of the amended Pacific Railroad act of 1864, by which section the government lien was made a second mortgage; that he had been engaged in working it through Congress, and that in some of his operations here he had handled several hundred of the $1,000 construction bonds of the Union Pacific Railroad, Eastern division; now this Kansas lawyer refusing to testify as to the disposition of these bonds he was arraigned at the bar of the House to answer for contempt. Instead of confining himself to a written statement, as is usual, he made what many denominated a stump speech to the House. This gave rise to much severe comment upon the then Speaker, Mr. Blaine, arising partly from the fact that Stewart was allowed such liberty, and partly from the fact that Mr. Blaine had cut out a resolution offered by Mr. Sargeant, which, could it have been acted upon, would probably have sent Stewart to the jail of the District, instead of the more comfortable quarters in the Capitol.

The next day after Stewart's arraignment in the House an incorrect version of his (Knowlton's) statement appeared in the New York *Sun* of February 1, 1873, which, after referring to reports in circulation concerning alleged relations between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Stewart, continued:—"A clerk in Stewart's office tells a circumstantial story about a visit a certain gentleman paid to Stewart's office late one night and how $24,000 in guaranteed bonds of the Kansas Pacific road passed from Stewart's hands to the certain gentleman aforesaid."

When this despatch returned Mr. Knowlton was exceedingly surprised and annoyed, and consulted me at length in regard to the matter. I advised him to print the very exact statement he had previously given me. He replied that under no circumstances could he do it, and that he must at all hazards avoid being called before the committee in regard to it, for in the first place he had a friendly regard for Mr. Blaine, and admired him greatly as a politician, and he would not appear against him. In the second place, his associations in Washington and those of his family, aside from his newspaper friends, were each chiefly with the Bar of the District, and that his approaching marriage into your own family would largely extend his associations in the same direction. As what he had done and seen in the office of Stewart & Riddle took place under the privileges and confidences which attach to a lawyer's office, he was, unwilling to subject his friends or himself to the criticisms which would follow in the circles where they moved, if it proved, as it did to them as one who had attacked a public man by violating the confidences of a law office. Our own conversation had been in the confidence of intimate friendship, with no intention on his part that it should lead to further circulation or printing, and strict injunctions that it should not. After examining the despatch in the *Sun* it was found that, strictly speaking, it contained several errors, and Mr. Knowlton then decided to go directly to Mr. Gibson and assure him of the incorrectness of his despatch, and say that, if called upon, he should be obliged to testify to that effect.

Subsequently he informed me that Mr. Blaine had sent for him, and that he called and made the same statement to him, and that Mr. Blaine had further sought to convince him that it was his cousin, General Thomas Ewing, Jr., who had legal relations with Stewart, who was in the office with Stewart on the night in question. Mr. Knowlton said to me in relation to this that, while he was absolutely certain that it was not a case of mistaken identity, and that there was a tacit understanding between himself and Mr. Blaine that it was not, yet in view of the great embarrassment that would certainly come both to himself and Mr. Blaine if he should testify before the committee without qualification, he would be glad, if possible, to let the matter pass there, if he was summoned, upon any declaration which Mr. Blaine should make that it was a mistake in identity.

Mr. Knowlton further took active means to stop the circulation of the story by assuring several other correspondents that Mr. Gibson's special was not correct and that he should be obliged to so testify if called before the committee. As a result of his efforts the story gained no circulation in the press. Mr. Knowlton, however, continued greatly disturbed over the matter, fearing that if summoned he might be too strictly questioned in regard to his real conviction regarding the matter of identity, and so long as there was any probability that the committee would take up the matter he kept close watch for all indications that they would do so, and had his baggage packed for quite a time in order that he might leave the city, and, if necessary, go to Canada to avoid testifying, because, as he declared, if put under oath and questioned closely he would be obliged to swear with positiveness that it was Mr. Blaine who visited Stewart's office under the circumstances already related.

In several subsequent conversations Mr. Knowlton went over this ground, always affirming the correctness of his statement regarding the night visit to Stewart, and never, under any circumstances, alluding to it as the transaction which was disguised and afterward retracted in the New York *Tribune* of September or October, 1872. The *Tribune's* charge was quite a different thing, being to the effect that Mr. Blaine held at one time in his own right $225,000, and for distribution $1,625,000 in the stocks and lands of the Leavenworth, Pawnee and Western railroad. A fac-simile from the records of that road was printed in the *Tribune* of October 2, 1872, to prove this, which fac-simile was afterward admitted to be erroneous and the charge founded upon it to be false.

In regard to the nature of Mr. Knowlton's acquaintance with Mr. Blaine at the time the *Sun* despatch was printed, I can only say that it was a matter of very great surprise to me to read that Mr. Knowlton had asked any one to introduce him to Mr. Blaine. As a matter of fact, Mr. Blaine himself informed me some weeks ago that it was quite another gentleman from the one whose letters he now quotes, who introduced Mr. Knowlton on the occasion referred to, and it is a fact within my knowledge that no introduction was needed at that time. Mr. Knowlton may have sought for company, but he could not have been correctly understood as seeking for some one to present him.

The case laid before Mr. Blaine for explanation by some of his friends a number of weeks since, and by yourself first of all, was not based upon Mr. Knowlton's statement, but upon certain sworn records in the courts.

I have thus answered your inquiries as briefly as a statement of the main features of the case would allow, and I shall be very glad if it proves of any value to you in the purpose expressed in your letter to me to vindicate the thoroughly honorable course pursued by Mr. Knowlton in all this matter. Very truly, your friend, H. V. BOYNTON.

Hon. A. G. RIDDLE, Washington, D. C.

GENERAL R. D. MUSSEY'S STATEMENT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 5, 1876.

Hon. A. G. RIDDLE, Present:—

DEAR SIR—In reply to yours of the 3d inst. I have to say:—

First—The late J. W. Knowlton and myself were students in your law office in this city in 1866-67. Our desks were in the main office, in which was also yours. Mr. Stewart had a private office, where he received his visitors. Subsequent to my admission to the Bar I retained my desk in your office for several months. It was Mr. Knowlton's habit and mine to spend many of our evenings at the office during such part of the summer of 1866 as I was here, and also during the winter and spring of 1866-67. My acquaintance with Mr. Knowlton, formed when we were students together, continued after he became a journalist resident here and I had been admitted to practice at the Bar of the District, and I frequently dropped into his office on Fourteenth street. Once on calling on him at his office he asked me if I remembered ever, while I was a student or had a desk in the office of Stewart & Riddle, to have seen Mr. Blaine (the then Speaker) in that office. I said I recollected seeing him there, but could not name any special occasion, and asked him why he made the inquiry. He then spoke of the interview between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Stewart, and said that Mr. Blaine had denied ever being in that office.

The interview referred to between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Stewart, as stated by Mr. Knowlton, was as follows:—Mr. Blaine came with Mr. Stewart one evening into the Colonization building while Knowlton was at his desk in the main office, and passed in together into Stewart's private office. After some time Stewart came out and asked Knowlton to "witness" some "transfer" or "assignment" of some railroad bonds, which he did. Stewart then went back into the private office, where Blaine had meantime remained.

Second—This statement he never changed or varied so far as I know, nor did he ever say that it had been made in jest.

Third—I say to you as I did to Knowlton, that my recollection is distinct that while I was a student, or having a desk in your office, I saw Mr. James G. Blaine there, and I remember his once asking me whether Joe Stewart had returned, or something to that effect, though this question, as I remember it, was put while I was on the avenue on the way to the Capitol.

Fourth—What I have stated above is the total of my knowledge on the subject.

Mr. Knowlton was, when we were students together, regarded as entirely veracious. Such, so far as I had any opportunity to observe, was his reputation when he was a journalist. He carried into the discharge of the duties of that profession the habits of exact, accurate and critical statement acquired in his legal studies. It does not comport at all with my personal knowledge of him or his general reputation that he should have done a dishonorable act or uttered an untruthful word. Very truly your friend,

R. D. MUSSEY.

H. L. BRIDGMAN'S STATEMENT.

NEW YORK, May 4, 1876.

DEAR SIR—In answer to your favor of the 3d inst. I would say that Knowlton's statement to me of his knowledge of the bond transaction between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Stewart was, as I recently thoroughly proved, precisely identical with his account of the same matter to General H. V. Boynton, and I presume to yourself also. Independ, I understood from Knowlton that to one other person only did he ever narrate the occurrence, though, of course, he may have done so since I left Washington. This being the case, I suppose it unnecessary for me to write in detail Mr. Knowlton's statement to me.

That it was a jest he never intimated, and the frequent and earnest discussions we held on the matter are all against that theory.

Of Knowlton's character for honor and truthfulness the high and responsible position which he so well filled, is the best demonstration. If my tribute could add to that it is given cordially and completely. Yours truly,

H. L. BRIDGMAN.

Hon. A. G. RIDDLE, Washington, D. C.

STATEMENT OF MR RIDDLE.

Mr. Bridgman was then Washington correspondent of the Boston *Advertiser*. To these I subjoin my own statement. The firm of Stewart & Riddle was formed, I think, in July, 1864. I was in Washington in the June preceding. Stewart was then engaged as attorney for the Union Pacific Railroad Company, Eastern division. The late J. W. Knowlton entered the office, as I think, the following winter, and remained in Washington till the spring of 1867. In the autumn of 1870 he became the correspondent for the Chicago *Tribune*. As I believe, I first heard of the statement of J. W. Knowlton in reference to Mr. Blaine, the subject of his explanation, on the night of February 1, 1873. In this connection, I may say that neither before nor since that time did I have any conversation with Mr. Knowlton on the subject of this statement, nor until I saw it in the letter of General Boynton, given above, did I know, except in a general way, what the statement was. Since that night I have talked with Boynton, Mussey and others about it, who took it for granted, I presume, that I knew what it was. I purposely avoided information on the subject.

On the night referred to a gentleman called at my house, from Mr. Blaine, who, as he said wished to see me at a later hour. At half-past eleven o'clock Mr. Blaine came in, with something unusual in his manner, and inquired if Mr. Knowlton was in the house, saying he was told that he might find him there. I answered that he was not. He expressed a wish to see him, and asked me to communicate this wish to Mr. Knowlton. He then produced the *Sun* of that date and read me Gibson's special, which had apparently moved him and astonished me. He said the "clerk in Stewart's office" was Knowlton. In the conversation which followed he emphatically denied the truth of the story; said that he did not know Knowlton at the time of the supposed transaction, declared that he had never been in the office referred to, and never had a business transaction with Stewart in his life. He said he could see how Knowlton may have supposed he had seen him at that office—he had mistaken his cousin, Tom Ewing, Jr., for him; that in their school or college days they greatly resembled each other and were often mistaken for each other; that Tom had business transactions with Stewart about the time referred to—an explanation which he has twice repeated to me since, and the last time within a month. At that interview Mr. Blaine asked me if I had any personal knowledge of any transaction like that detailed in the *Sun*. I answered, "Not the slightest." Had I ever seen him in my office? With his declaration just made that he was never in it, I answered I never had. He asked me if I would put this in writing, and with the *Sun* article before me I did so. The first sentence of my note refers to that article; the last was added at the request of Mr. Blaine.

I knew from personal observation for several days following the interview that Knowlton was very much distressed, though I made no inquiries of him. I afterward heard from those nearest him, whom I do not care to name, that he said, two or three days later, that it was understood between Mr. Blaine and himself, as to Blaine's being at the office—it was to be regarded as a case of mistaken identity on his part; but so apprehensive was he of being compelled to testify, and so determined to avoid it, that he was prepared to go away until the matter should subside, saying that if questioned on oath he would be obliged to say that he did see him there. The mixing of the name of

JOHN EWING BLAINE

with this bond story compels me to refer reluctantly to another matter. Differences arose between Stewart and the Union Pacific Railroad Company, Eastern division, concerning the ownership of 140 or 150 of the 250 bonds of the company, placed by it in his hands. In August, 1868, Stewart commenced a suit in the United States District Court for Kansas against the company and others to enforce his claim to the bonds.

Some time late in 1874, or early in 1875, Stewart sent me a printed transcript of over 200 pages of the evidence in the case, which I laid by for months without examination. Afterward I found in it a letter from J. B. Stewart to John D. Perry, president of the company, wherein Stewart stated that "James Blaine" was an owner of fifteen of these bonds. (See letter of April 28, 1868, hereafter quoted.) This was a surprise, as I found no explanation or statement that there was a mistake in the name. I showed it to Francis Miller, Esq., my office associate, and later in the autumn, when Mr. Blaine was coming into prominence as a national candidate, we discussed the duty and propriety of bringing it to his notice. The case had been appealed to the Supreme Court, the record would be printed, and probably tried at the ensuing term. We were both very friendly to him, but I hesitated. He might know of it. It might look like the zeal of one who wished to lay the apparently coming man under obligation. In my anxiety I applied to General Boynton, whose friendship I had long enjoyed, and whom I knew to be personally friendly to Mr. Blaine, and on whose discretion and judgment I could rely. I told him what I had done, what I felt to be my duty, and my reluctance to perform it, and I asked him to call, see the evidence and advise me. I spoke to him two or three times, and he called in the early part of December. He examined the letter of Stewart referred to, and said unhesitatingly that it was only the fair and manly thing for any body who was in possession of the evidence to place it in the hands of Mr. Blaine; that my relation to him was such that it was my duty. Shortly after I called upon General Garfield, who had the same view, and he was present at my interview with Mr. Blaine. I gave him the pamphlet. He apparently was unaware of the existence of the Stewart letter, but accounted for it by saying that it was the same old matter published on him by the New York *Tribune* in the fall of 1872. At his request I made a slight examination of the actual record of the case in the Supreme Court, a book of near 1,200 printed pages, and subsequently reported that I found the name of John E. Blaine in connection with bonds, and seemingly in a way to show that John E. and James were the same, but as it was a paper in court it might be claimed that if there was this mistake it would have been corrected by the writer of the letter or the other party. He assured me that there was a mistake so far as he was concerned, and on this assurance I rested. The last time this matter was referred to between Mr. Blaine and myself was at my house a month ago. At this interview Mr. Blaine requested that I should rewrite the note of February 1, 1873, with verbal changes only, which he suggested. As he had on the former occasion asked me for my personal knowledge and not for my information, and as I was ready to do anything for him that an honorable man might do, although surprised at the request, after having my attention again called to it by him, I wrote the note, and it is now in his hands for any use he may care to make of it. It was either less satisfactory than the note of February, 1873, or wanted for another purpose. At this last interview I said to Mr. Blaine that in anything which might happen the friends of Mr. Knowlton would protect his memory.

REMARKS.

It will be seen that in my note of May 2 I charge Mr. Blaine with preparing the occasion; meaning that he caused the insertion of the article in the HERALD for the purpose of making his denial and offering his evidence in the House, and he did not deny it. Mr. Blaine failed to prove that Knowlton told the story or anything which warranted the story told by the *Sun*. He proved that Knowlton repudiated that tale, and I show that he denied it, and this can be proved by many other gentlemen. What he did say was, not that he saw Stewart deliver $24,000 guaranteed bonds to Blaine, but that these two gentlemen had an interview in Stewart's room; that Stewart brought to him twenty-five construction bonds of the Union Pacific, Eastern division, and asked him to write his name on them as a witness to a transfer; that Stewart took them to his room, and soon after Blaine went away. He did not say that they were transferred to Blaine; that they were delivered to Blaine, nor that he carried them away. He did not say there were no other persons in Stewart's room at the time, or a word beyond the above. This statement he never denied, varied or changed to those who had his confidence. To others he gave vague and general statements, made to destroy the currency of any story authorized by him. It is true, Stewart says, that Knowlton said to him that he told the story in jest. We know this was a mistake. They were talking of the *Sun* story, which Knowlton certainly did not tell and always denied.

It is also true that Gibson and MacFarland say, as perhaps others will, that Knowlton, in denying the *Sun* story, used language that would deny Boynton's, Mussey's and Bridgman's statements of what he did say; but, if Gibson listened with the same ears with which he heard Knowlton's statement to Boynton, in the first instance, allowance must be made for the inaccuracy of his hearing or memory. If he made such a statement to Blaine as MacFarland says he heard, why did not Blaine take it in writing with Knowlton's signature? Blaine took my statement on the night of the day when the *Sun* appeared. He spared no time in securing Stewart's and others. Knowlton was willing to say and do anything in honor, and would have signed any statement which he orally made. He made no such statement. If he did, why should he hesitate to repeat it on oath to a committee of the House? The truth is, he felt and knew that if sworn he would be compelled to affirm the statement made to Bridgman, Mussey and Boynton, rather than do which he preferred flight. Mr. Blaine would have it believed that he was never in Stewart's office. Why he is so anxious on this point always surprised me. General Mussey says he saw him there, and that Blaine once asked him if Stewart had returned, while on the way towards the office. If asked, General Mussey may be able to say why he distinctly remembers this. So far as McFarland is concerned, Mr. Blaine told General Boynton that another gentleman, whose name I can give, came to introduce Knowlton on that occasion, who was well known to Blaine and had been for years. The man who would flee rather than repeat a story he had told, to save not himself but the other party from the consequences of the repetition, was unequal to the invention of the story. Had the disposition existed, his unaided imagination would have failed to furnish the incidents. He related what he saw. Those who heard it from him believed it. Though true, it does not follow that the bonds were transferred to Blaine or that Stewart delivered them to him. Stewart says he did not, and I do not intimate that his is the position of a man who has received a woman's favors, and feels bound to protect her name by a denial of her frailty, nor do I comment upon the conclusive nature and value of such evidence. As to

JOHN E. BLAINE'S CONNECTION

with the Knowlton story, I must turn to the record of the case of Stewart vs. The Union Pacific Railroad Company, Eastern Division, a work of 1,178 pages. Stewart says in his bill that in December, 1864, he received from the company $251,000 construction bonds, the subject of said suit. On page 132 and following, in his deposition, he says that about ninety-six bonds were used to further the interests of the company, and he names Charles Sherman, a private citizen, as one who received twenty. As to the rest, T. C. Durant delivered some and A. Hay the rest, all of which were subsequently returned to him in trust for the holders. As neither he nor the company had a wish to disclose their names they were not called for. I call attention to the following, quoted from the ninety-seventh page of said record:—

It is agreed in this case that John E. Blaine was the holder of fifteen of the bonds described in the pleadings in this cause, as the construction bonds of the defendant, series B and that he received said bonds of the plaintiff, and which were returned to him by said Blaine; that afterwards, at the instance and request of the plaintiff, the defendant delivered to said Blaine twelve land grant bonds of $1,000 each, in full satisfaction of the fifteen bonds in the hands of the plaintiff, which have not been delivered to the defendant; that the delivery of the twelve bonds was made since the commencement of this suit, but said Blaine was the holder of the construction bonds aforesaid in the year 1864.

This statement is made to be read in evidence in the cause by the plaintiff, July 10, 1870.

* * * * * * *

J. P. USHER, Solicitor for Defendants.
JOS. B. STEWART, Complainant in person.

This was made in 1870, to be used as evidence by Stewart. Why? Stewart was obliged to prove up as to other, why exempt this? Would its actual proof compromise anybody, or was there no proof? Why prove what the other side does not deny? I would not insinuate that this name was interpolated into the case for any purpose. John E. Blaine is said to have received these bonds in 1864, which is a little funny when it is remembered that Stewart only received them during the last month of that year. In Stewart's letter produced on May 1 he says that he became John E. Blaine's attorney to settle his claim which grew out of certain stock which he held of the L., P. and W. R. R. Co., a predecessor of the Kansas Pacific, in 1863, in confirmation of which I cite from page 170, the power of attorney dated May 19, 1863. Stewart further says that by various expedients this claim was finally settled by compromise, and John E Blaine received $15,000 of the Union Pacific construction bonds. In 1872, as will be remembered, the New York Tribune published a statement that James G. Blaine had a large interest in this L., P. and W. R. R. Company, (more fully referred to in General Boynton's statement), which General Ewing so effectually demolished by a letter in the same print of October 11, 1872; that nobody has renewed it since, till James G. Blaine again brought it forward, and although it has nothing to do with the alleged Knowlton story, Mr. Blaine insists it has. I recur to that first note of Mr. Ewing. He said in it that John E. Blaine was the owner of $10,000 of the stock of that company, the extent of his interest, and that this was the only interest that any member of the Blaine family ever held. This stock, probably, never reached ten in any known market. For this we are told that he received $15,000 of these bonds of well known appreciable value. The paper $10,000 was increased by its half, and changed for a security fivefold its superior, and this Joe Stewart calls a compromise. He ought to know, for he was attorney for both parties, as he says. One other curious thing—Stewart's power of attorney was made in 1863. It was executed by him in 1864 by the delivery to J. E. Blaine of these bonds, as we are told, but on the 8th of December, 1865, by solemn writing, Stewart substituted this same T. Ewing for himself to execute this same already executed power of attorney. (See Record, pp. 170, 171.) Is it indeed true that the stipulation of Stewart and Usher at page 97 was made for a sinister purpose? But I am making no case against J. E. Blaine or J. G. Blaine. I am only to see that they make no case on Mr. Knowlton.

By reference again to the above stipulation we see that it purports that the fifteen bonds were again returned to Stewart, and that afterward, at his instance, the railroad company gave J. E. Blaine $12,000 in land grant bonds for them, but the company had not at that time received the fifteen construction bonds. It will be seen how this was seemingly made to fit another paper, given hereafter from page 785. It appears by an arrangement between Stewart and other parties, made January 6, 1866, that the holders of the 250 bonds delivered to Stewart to start with suffered a loss of nearly twenty per cent on them.

I ask attention to the following. [See Rec., p. 1,130]:—

J. D. PERRY, Esq., President Union Pacific Railroad Company, E. D.:—

Please deliver to Thomas Ewing, Jr., or order, eight of the land grants bonds of your said company, held by exchange for the construction bonds claimed to have been made by the company and by you placed in the hands of J. C. Kennedy and now owned by me. And this shall be my receipt to the company for eight of the said land grant bonds when said construction bonds shall be presented for exchange. I have heretofore given to said Ewing an order on the company for the equivalent in land grant bonds of twenty-five of said construction bonds. This order now being given, the holder of the former order, on presenting it, will be entitled to the equivalent in land grant bonds of fifteen of said construction bonds, instead of twenty-five.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 29, 1868. JOS. B. STEWART.

Thomas Ewing, in his testimony at page 1,133 says that he was to receive ten of the construction bonds from Stewart for services. This arrangement was made in 1866, for which he took the above order. That, in fact, he never got any bonds of any kind. I return to the two last sentences of the above order:—"I have heretofore given to said Ewing an order for the equivalent in land grant bonds of twenty-five of said construction bonds. This order now being given, the holder of the former order on presenting it will be entitled to the equivalent in land grant bonds of fifteen of said construction bonds instead of twenty-five." This apparently means that before that time, October 29, 1866, Stewart had delivered to some man, whom he does not care to name, twenty-five of the construction bonds. That thereafter he delivered to said Ewing for that man an order on the company for land grant bonds, which order that man still held, and is referred to as "the holder of the former order." Whoever he was, Stewart took the liberty of setting off ten of his construction bonds to Thomas Ewing, which "said holder" would not submit to, and Ewing got none. The following is so much of the letter of Stewart to the President of the road as seems to bear on this matter, quoted from page 785 of the record, already referred to:—

NEW YORK, April 22, 1868.

JOHN D. PERRY,' President of the Union Pacific Railroad Company:—

DEAR SIR—In compliance with your request I will state that the total claims on me for any portion of the Union Pacific Railroad, E. D. construction bonds, are as follows:—

Thomas Ewing, Jr.	10	H. G. Fant	4
James Blaine	15	J. P. Usher	5
C. T. Sherman	20	W. J. Keeler	5
			—
Total			59

I have settled with all the other parties. The three last named, that is—

H. G. Fant	4	W. J. Keeler	5
J. P. Usher	5		
			14

bonds, are to be paid in full, as per orders.

These were stipulated to be paid since the agreement of the 6th of January, 1866, and are for distinct and specific considerations—Fant's for money, Usher's for some railroad stock I purchased for him, and Keeler's for a private contract between him and myself. But the Ewing 10, Blaine 15 and Sherman 20 are all subject to the amount of deduction (about twenty per cent) agreed on between Mr. Durant and myself before and at the time he ratified the settlement of the 6th of January, 1866, which deduction, applying to the whole 174 bonds then outstanding, makes the difference between the whole amount (174) series B construction bonds outstanding and the lesser amount in your hands to be exchanged.

I was compelled to accede to the reduction in favor of Durant in order to induce him to agree to the settlement and compromise of the 6th of January, 1866, and he was as careful to draw the deduction as well on the 174 that were not returned at the time of the general exchange, as well as those that were exchanged, just leaving the exact amount in hand that were to be exchanged for the whole 174.

* * * * * * *

JOS. B. STEWART.

Indorsed—Statement of Jos. B. Stewart, April 23, 1868, filed February 3, 1874. Ross Burns, special master.

Who is this James Blaine? In the absence of anything I have yet seen, I think he was the man who received the twenty-five construction bonds, and the holder of Stewart's order for their equivalents in land grant bonds, mentioned in Stewart's order to Ewing, and this in the face of the stipulation in reference to J. E. Blaine's fifteen bonds, given above from p. 97.

First—Because Stewart in his letter above says that the parties named there have claims on him for construction bonds, and although by the stipulation these bonds had been returned by J. E. Blaine to Stewart, yet Stewart swears that he afterwards returned them to J. E. Blaine (Rec., pp. 676-77), so that at that time J. E. Blaine had no claim on him for any bonds.

Second—J. E. Blaine received fifteen bonds, and only fifteen, in 1864. He did not receive twenty-five, holding ten for somebody else, and Ewing had no bargain for bonds till 1866, and it is apparent, from the position of the names in the above letter (produced by John D. Perry on the order of the Court), that the two first represent the twenty-five bonds mentioned in Stewart's order of October, 1868.

Third—We know that John E. Blaine is not the man referred to in this letter, because J. B. Stewart, the man who wrote it and knew best therein, says that it was James Blaine. Had there occurred the blunder now claimed, Stewart and all the rest would have made swiftest haste to correct it. He must have been appalled when he saw that he had ventured to write simple "James," but he was mute, as have been all others, so far as explanation was concerned.

There is much more than this, and more inexplicable. The necessities of Stewart's case compelled him to put into it a copy of this same letter months before the compulsory production of the original. In this copy, while he gave the full name of all the other men named in the original letter, he dropped the "James," and merely wrote "Blaine."

This copy I quote from page 588, as follows:—

NEW YORK, April 23, 1868.

John D. Perry, Esq., President Union Pacific Railroad Company:—

DEAR SIR:—In compliance with your request, I will state that the total claims on me for any portion of the Union Pacific Railroad, eastern division construction bonds, are as follows:—

Thomas Ewing, Jr.	10	J. P. Usher	5
—— Blaine	15	W. J. Keeler	5
C. T. Sherman	20		—
H. G. Fant	4	Total	59

I have settled with all the other parties. The three last named, that is:—

H. G. Fant	4	W. J. Keeler	5
J. P. Usher	5		—
		Total	14

bonds." * * * * * * * *

Why did he do this? That it was by accident—another mistake in the same name—no man will believe. Had "James" been originally written by inadvertency, why not now give the true name and explain, by proof if necessary, how the mistake arose? This omission was by design—purposely made, without a word of explanation then, and none now, with all the intervening time in which to invent one. It was to serve some purpose, shield some person, gain some point desired by both parties to the suit.

I quote from a carefully prepared copy of Stewart's deposition in an abstract used on the trial of said case in 1872, at Topeka, in the presence of the original, in answer to cross-interrogatory 178 he said:—

"I further state, as in direct examination, that the president of the defendant, Mr. John D. Perry, and its counsel, Hon. John P. Usher, have both repeatedly stated to me, and, I believe, to others, that I was entitled to my bonds and ought to receive them whenever I should be able to produce the said series B bonds. Among others, I am informed and believe that Mr. Usher made that statement to Mr. Alexander Hay and Hon. James Blaine in Washington."

On turning to the record, copied from the same paper three years later, I find the Hon. James Blaine changed to the Hon. James Lane—not James H. Lane. There seems no end to the so-called mistakes in this name. No man would write Blaine for Lane in 1872. There may be a reason for writing Lane for Blaine in 1873. This same Blaine lost his James in 1873, and has lost his "B" and "l" now.

If I am misled in the construction of Stewart's order to Ewing, his letter to Perry, his copy of it, in the light of other parts of the record, it is quite within the power of Mr. Ewing, Mr. Stewart and others to set me right at once, and I hope this may be done. Thus far Mr. Ewing contents himself with calling attention to the similarity in the sounds of J. E. Blaine and J. G. Blaine as leading to this charge against James G., while Stewart is still silent. Most singular of all is it that while Mr. Blaine undertook to gather into a single garland all the remaining slanders against him and wither them with a scornful flash, he failed to say one word of, or in any way to notice this Stewart letter and its copy, though placed in his hands four months ago, that he might meet them. Among all the letters and statements taken by Mr. Blaine to disprove his connection with this bond story, of all living men, why has he not produced a statement of this John E. Blaine? He knows how many bonds he received, and when, and whether he is the James Blaine of Stewart's letter.

Do I undertake to say that the "James Blaine" of the original letter and the "Blaine" of the copy stand for the Hon. James G. Blaine? Not a word of it. I have nothing to urge against him. With my present hastily collected information I think they do not stand for John E Blaine, nor will the difficulty disappear by showing that there is no connection between Stewart's order to Ewing and his letter to Perry, as both will need the same explanation as now.

It is not supposable that the construction bonds, though taken up, were destroyed. Let series B be produced, and if the name of J. W. Knowlton is not on some of them he or those who report him are mistaken.

In a secluded part of beautiful Oak Hill is the solitary grave of James W. Knowlton. In late April a slender form, robed in black, aided by his trusted servant, was seen tenderly removing the foreign and foul drift of the winter and early spring from it and restoring it to comeliness.

Like her, I have only attempted to relieve his memory of the unseemly drift of scandal cast upon it.

A. G. RIDDLE.

MAY 8, 1876.

NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

AFFAIRS AT THE NORFOLK NAVY YARD—DEPARTURE OF COMMODORE CLITZ FOR PORT ROYAL—THE SLOOP-OF-WAR BROOKLYN.

NORFOLK, VA., May 13, 1876.

The United States ship of the line New Hampshire, Commodore J. M. B. Clitz commanding, sailed on Wednesday morning for Port Royal, S. C., in tow of the steam frigate Powhatan, Captain T. Scott Fillebrown. As a fine type of the old 74s, and a familiar object to the residents of Norfolk and Portsmouth, who had begun to consider her just as much a part of the navy yard as the dry dock, her departure drew to the wharves and shores of the river a vast concourse of people, who greeted the departure of the New Hampshire with affectionate and generous evidences of good will. On passing the Worcester, receiving ship of the station, which flies the pennant of Commodore Thomas H. Stevens, commandant of the yard, the New Hampshire fired a salute of eleven guns, which were replied to by the former vessel. All her officers and men were on deck waving their farewells to the noble old craft as she moved majestically by. All honors were paid to the New Hampshire as she passed the sloop-of-war Brooklyn, Captain J. H. Upshur, recently returned from the Brazil squadron. On her arrival at Port Royal the New Hampshire becomes the

FLAG SHIP OF THE SQUADRON,

in the absence of Rear Admiral Le Roy, as Commodore Clitz has been designated by the Secretary of the Navy as permanent senior naval officer at Port Royal. At he is to have an important and imposing command is is expected that he will conduct the drills and exercises of the squadron when it has assembled in that port. If no bad weather is encountered by the ships it is probable that the New Hampshire and Powhatan will reach Port Royal next Sunday.

The Powhatan, after safely towing the New Hampshire to her anchorage, will proceed at once to New York direct, and Captain Fillebrown is ordered to report to Assistant Quartermaster General Rufus Ingalls, United States Army, for special service, in connection with the transportation of the corps of cadets at West Point to Philadelphia in June. It is understood that the naval cadets will

VISIT THE CENTENNIAL

in the practice ship Constellation and will take part in the public military display to take place in Philadelphia on the Fourth of July.

Orders have been received from the department for the Nantucket (monitor), to proceed, as soon as she can be made ready, to Annapolis as a schoolship of her type for naval engineer cadets. She will leave the yard on or about the 20th, and on her arrival at Annapolis nearly, if not all, her officers will be detached. Many of them are to be ordered to the corvette Adams, Commander Merriman, now fitting out at Boston for special service as a practice ship for cadet engineers. The following is a list of the

OFFICERS OF THE NANTUCKET.

Commander O. F. Stanton, commanding; Lieutenant Edward Woodman, Executive Officer; Master Clayton S. Reichman, Navigator; Master, A. C. Dillingham; Ensign, Henry Morrell; Past Assistant Engineer, C. J. Habighurst; Cadet Engineer, Charles Kleckner; Assistant Surgeon, P. A. Lovering; Assistant Paymaster, Z. T. Brown.

THE MONITORS.

It appears to be quite probable that the other monitors now at the yard, consisting of the Wyandotte, Passaic and Montauk, will be put out of commission, although it is possible they may go to Port Royal to join the large fleet there.

It is reported that a large proportion of the crew of the sloop-of-war Brooklyn will be sent to the sailing sloop Constellation, at Annapolis, where the latter vessel is fitting out for the regular

SUMMER PRACTICE CRUISE

of the midshipmen at the Academy. It is possible that the Brooklyn, which has been on a long cruise on the Brazil station, and in the North Atlantic squadron, will be put off commission at an early date. She returns in a fine condition, and appears, externally at least, to be good for another cruise. The following is a full list of

THE BROOKLYN'S OFFICERS.

Captain John H. Upshur, commanding; Lieutenant Commander, Charles H. Pendleton, Executive Officer; Lieutenant William Watts, Navigator; Lieutenants, Thomas C. Terrell, A. B. H. Lillie, Frank W. Nichols, James W. Corbin; Ensign, J. C. Freeman; Midshipmen, H. F. Rich, David Peacock and C. A. Corbin; Surgeon, N. L. Bates; Paymaster, Rufus Perks; Chief Engineer, S. L. Ayres, Past Assistant Engineers, L. R. Harry and Robert W. Milligan; Captain Joseph F. Baker, United States