

Auditors Office

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Table with advertising rates: One column one year \$100.00, Half a column one year \$50.00, Quarter column one year \$25.00, Special Notices per line 20, Special Cards of not more than six lines for one year 4.00, Marriage and death notices free.

THE CONSERVATIVE.

VOL. II. M'CONNELLSVILLE, FEBRUARY 20, 1868. NO. 29.

The Conservative.

Office Southwest Corner Public Square. PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING. TERMS: For one year, payable in advance \$2.00; For six months, payable in advance \$1.25; For three months, payable in advance \$0.75. JOSEPH A. KRIVY, Editor.

POLITICAL.

ANDREW JACKSON.

Speech of Honorable Jeremiah S. Black or PENNSYLVANIA.

At the Democratic Celebration in Washington City, Jan. 8th.

There is no day in the year, except the Fourth of July, that ought to be kept as sacred as the 8th of January. [Applause.] And, except the Father of his Country, there is no name known among men that is entitled to higher reverence than that of Andrew Jackson. [Applause.] I put Washington first, because the place which he occupies in history, as the foremost man of all this world, has never been disputed. Competition gave way before the acknowledged greatness of his character, and rivalry itself, conceded the palm to his pre-eminent virtue. I know not how it may be with others, but his is a name which I never was able to pronounce without emotions of respect and reverence which I have no form of words to express.

But the reputation of Jackson has not been so fortunate. His life was one long battle with the enemies of constitutional freedom. [Applause.] They assailed him with every species of slander, and even at this day, the four birds that screamed around him in his lifetime, and others hatched in the same bad nest, light upon his tombstones whenever they can find it with their obscene droppings. [Loud applause.] One of the most injurious of these aspersions is that by which the Radical party have attempted to make him authority for their own attempts to trample upon liberty and law. If that be true, if he be authority for them; if he did set the example for their misconduct; if they are traveling upon a path that has one impress of his footsteps, he is then wholly and utterly unworthy of the honor which the American people, all through the country, are bestowing upon him at this moment. Then I give him up; he is their man; he is not ours. If General Jackson ever did anything in his life which can justify the murder, kidnapping, and robbery of innocent men and women; if he ever used military force for the purpose of enslaving any State, North or South, [applause], if he ever used one atom of his powerful influence for the purpose of subjugating his fellow-citizens or any portion of them to the domination of a negro government, [cries of "good" and applause]; if there be one single act of his whole life that can be cited as an example for the coarse, cruel, and corrupt despotism, which the Radicals have organized wherever, and whenever they could, then he don't belong to our communion. [Applause.] In that case he is only fit to be set up in the heathen pagoda, which despotism has established among us as one of the divinities to be worshipped beside such generals as Pope and Baker. [Loud applause.] and others of that class, where the worshippers lay it down as a part of their creed that the Constitution is "a league with hell and a covenant with death," where the high priests that minister at the altar have qualified themselves for holy orders by being hired betrayers and perjured witnesses, and where an act of the worship which they offer consists in false affidavits against the honor and rights of an innocent people.

I am not here to pronounce an eulogy, or to make any defence of General Jackson, but I do wish to refer to one passage in his life upon which the slander to which I have referred is based, if it be based upon anything. When General Jackson undertook the defense of the city of New Orleans, in the fall of 1814, he assumed a responsibility such as had rarely been taken by any body in the world, and such as very few men, except himself, would have taken, under such circumstances. The British army was 14,000 strong, composed of veterans ably commanded, thoroughly trained, and fresh from the victorious battle fields of the Spanish Peninsula. They had never known what it was to be defeated. No hostile army of equal strength had ever before landed in one body upon the American shores. To meet them General Jackson had half the number of raw levies, hastily collected from the plough and the workshop, not organized; all of them imperfectly equipped, and some of them—a considerable number—not armed at all. With these fearful odds against him, he was required to hold possession of an un-walled and unfortified town, situated upon an open plain, accessible upon every side, and with absolutely no defenses, natural or artificial, except what were to be erected upon the spur of the occasion, and he had not assistance of one experienced officer or engineer to aid him in putting up his field works or mounting his guns.

This desperate game was to be played for a stake of the most stupendous magnitude. The possession of the

whole valley of the Mississippi depended upon it; and if the city had been taken by assault, we shudder, even at this distance of time, to think what must have been its fate. The very troops that were then marching to the attack had committed the most atrocious cruelties, only a few months before, at Badajos and St. Sebastian; and here again they were to be rewarded with booty and booty. The defense seemed like a forlorn hope, without a particle of confidence in its success—except what was inspired by the courage, genius, and energy of their great commander. But he was a host in himself. They wisely determined that they would throw the whole responsibility upon him; that they would put their fate entirely in his hands, and they did so. Members of the Legislature, officers of the City Corporation, and Judges of the Courts, came and laid their powers at his feet, and voluntarily agreed that they would surrender and suspend their official functions until the danger was over. The whole population, with one voice, besought him that he would make the city a part of his camp, and take the absolute command upon himself of every human being within its limits. He had a right to do it. It was proper that he should do it, for this simple and plain reason, that the city was in a state of actual siege. It was no fiction! His act bore no kind of resemblance to the wanton outrage of declaring martial law, which is no law at all,—for the mere purpose of trampling down the law of the land at a place where there are no military operations going on. [Great applause.]

When a controversy upon matters of fact reaches the point to which this has been brought, further assertion or denial should cease, especially when upon either side it loses the character of the respectful discussion which is required by the standing of the parties to each other and degenerates in tone and temper.

In such a case, if there is nothing to rely upon but the opposing statements, conclusions must be drawn from those statements alone, and from whatever intrinsic probabilities they afford in favor of or against either of the parties. I should not shrink from this controversy, but fortunately it is not left to this test alone. There were five Cabinet officers present at the conversation, the details of which, in my letter of the 28th ult., you will allow yourself to say contain many and gross misrepresentations. These gentlemen heard that conversation and have read my statement; they speak for themselves, and I leave the proof without a word of comment. I deem it proper before concluding this communication, to notice some of the statements contained in your letter. You say that a performance of the promises alleged to have been made by you to the President would have involved "a resistance to law and an inconsistency with the whole history of my connection with the suspension of Mr. Stanton." You then state that you had fears the President would, on the removal of Mr. Stanton, appoint some one in his place, who would embarrass the army in carrying out the Reconstruction acts, and add: "It was to prevent such an appointment that I accepted the office of Secretary of War ad interim, and not for the purpose of enabling you to get rid of Mr. Stanton by my withholding it from him in opposition to the law, or not doing so myself, surrendering it to one who would."

As the statements and assumptions in your communication plainly indicate was sought first of all, you here admit that from the very beginning of what you term the whole history of your connection with Mr. Stanton's suspension, you intended to circumvent the President. It was to carry out that intent that you accepted the appointment. This was in your mind at the time of your acceptance. It was not then in obedience to the order of your superior, as has heretofore been supposed, that you assumed the duties of the office.—You knew it was the President's purpose to prevent Mr. Stanton from resuming the office of Secretary of War, and you intended to defeat that purpose. You accepted the office, not in the interest of the President, but of Mr. Stanton. If this purpose so entertained by you had been confined to yourself—if, when accepting the office, you had done so with a mental reservation to frustrate the President—it would have been a deception in the ethics of some persons. Each course is allowable; but you cannot stand even upon that questionable ground.

The history of your connection with this transaction, as written by yourself, places you in a different predicament, and shows that you not only concealed your design from the President, but induced him to suppose that you would carry out his purpose to keep Mr. Stanton out of office by retaining it yourself after an attempted restoration, by the Senate, so as to require Mr. Stanton to establish his right by a judicial decision. I now give that part of this history as written by yourself in your letter of the 28th ult.:

form what you think your duty." [Applause.] The Judge fined him a thousand dollars, and then his friends flocked around him; but he declined all such offers. "No," said he, "I will not evade the decision of a lawful tribunal." [Applause.] "I will pay the fine myself. It becomes me to suffer whatever has been inflicted,—rightfully or wrongfully. And now," said he, "I am square with the law, even as Judge Hall expounded it."

Now, if Gen. Jackson had systematized robbery and murder by means of military commissions, [applause, and cries of "Good!"] if, instead of using his army to fight the common enemy, he had scattered his soldiers over the country, hundreds of miles away from his post to kidnaping his political opponents for expressing their honest convictions; if he had ordered an upright judge to be dragged from the bench by ruffians, beaten upon the head with butt ends of their pistols; and carried away to prison, because he had administered justice according to law; and if, finally, he had established a military despotism upon the ruins of a free Government; then, I admit that he would have been fair authority and they might have quoted him as an example of their misdeeds. But in truth and fact, Gen. Jackson was one of the ablest and best defenders of the Constitution and the laws that the United States ever had. There lived no man within the limits of this country who would go further to defend them, or more cheerfully shed his blood to save them from violation. [Applause.]

There are some persons here, I think, who not only knew the character of General Jackson, but who have been intimately acquainted with him. I ask of such what they suppose Gen. Jackson would have thought of our "Bureau of Military Justice," if such a bloody machine as that had been set up in his time. [Great applause and laughter.] I do not know; I only can conjecture; I think he would have shattered it into a thousand atoms with one blow of his ponderous hand, [applause], and the first impulse of his noble and generous nature would have been to take that lawless crew by the throat and pitch them into the Potomac, [applause.] I do not say that he would have done it any more than our honored Chief Magistrate would. [Tremendous applause.] "Three cheers for the President!" Let me tell you for the reason why I think he would not have done it. He was a perfectly law-abiding man. He would have curbed his fiery temper; he would have chastened down, (as he did,) in a proper way, his impetuous passions. But sooner or later he would have done what will be done yet. [Great applause.] He would have made those miscreants feel the majesty of legal justice.

The Spaniards have a proverb, that the mill of God grinds slowly, but it grinds dreadfully fine. [Laughter.] And now, don't you think the people of this country are about to let the water out? [Great laughter.] I said that I had no eulogy or defense to make of Gen. Jackson, but I do say now, in conclusion, that if the people of this country will appreciate his character truly, and remember well the lessons that his acts and his precepts have furnished them, they will have such a Government as that which he described in his protest to the Senate—not a despotism surrounded by pride, pomp, and circumstance of military show, but a quiet Government, which will protect their liberties and their rights—a Government distributing its blessings like the dews of Heaven, unseen and unfeeling, save in the beauty and freshness they contribute to produce. As long as we keep our eyes upon his history, as the pole star by which we are to be guided, we will be wise; and whenever we quit it, we will be otherwise. [Great applause.]

The Johnson-Grant Correspondence.

On the 4th instant there was laid before the Federal House of Representatives by the Speaker thereof, a correspondence that had transpired between President Johnson and General Grant in relation to the reinstatement of Secretary Stanton. In that correspondence, President Johnson claimed that there was between him and General Grant a distinct, unequivocal understanding, when General Grant consented to discharge the duties of the War office ad interim, that in the event the Senate should under take to reinstate Secretary Stanton he (General Grant) was to hold on to the War office until the Judiciary should have passed on the question, or if he felt disinclined to do so, then he was to give the President sufficient notice to enable him to appoint a man who would hold on to the office until the question had thus been tested. General Grant denied that this was the understanding on his part. To this letter the President replied under date the 10th inst., accompanying his reply, which we subjoin, with letters from Secretaries Welles, McCulloch, Randall, Browning and Seward, concurring in the statement that General Grant in Cabinet meeting did admit that there was between him and the President the understanding that

President claimed. This answer of the President was communicated to the Federal House of Representatives on the 11th, in pursuance of a resolution adopted the preceding day calling for the same, and it is most terrible on General Grant. It shows him to have been untruthful and treacherous in his dealings with the President—with having taken the War office for the purpose of defeating the President in his effort to get rid of Stanton, and to defeat him in testing the constitutionality of the Civil Tenure bill.

THE PRESIDENT TO GENERAL GRANT. EXECUTIVE MANSION, Feb. 10, 1868.

GENERAL: The extraordinary character of your letter of the 3d instant, would seem to preclude any reply on my part, but the manner in which publicity has been given to the correspondence, of which that letter forms a part, and the grave questions which are involved, induce me to take this mode of giving, as a proper sequel to the communications which have passed between us, the statements of the five members of the Cabinet who were present on the occasion of our conversation on the 14th ult. Copies of letters which they have addressed to me upon the subject, are accordingly herewith enclosed.

You speak of my letter of the 1st ultimo, as a reiterative of the many and gross misrepresentations contained in certain newspaper articles, and reassert the correctness of the statements contained in your communication of the 28th ultimo, adding—and here I give your own words—"Anything of yours in reply to it to the contrary notwithstanding."

When a controversy upon matters of fact reaches the point to which this has been brought, further assertion or denial should cease, especially when upon either side it loses the character of the respectful discussion which is required by the standing of the parties to each other and degenerates in tone and temper.

In such a case, if there is nothing to rely upon but the opposing statements, conclusions must be drawn from those statements alone, and from whatever intrinsic probabilities they afford in favor of or against either of the parties. I should not shrink from this controversy, but fortunately it is not left to this test alone. There were five Cabinet officers present at the conversation, the details of which, in my letter of the 28th ult., you will allow yourself to say contain many and gross misrepresentations. These gentlemen heard that conversation and have read my statement; they speak for themselves, and I leave the proof without a word of comment. I deem it proper before concluding this communication, to notice some of the statements contained in your letter. You say that a performance of the promises alleged to have been made by you to the President would have involved "a resistance to law and an inconsistency with the whole history of my connection with the suspension of Mr. Stanton." You then state that you had fears the President would, on the removal of Mr. Stanton, appoint some one in his place, who would embarrass the army in carrying out the Reconstruction acts, and add: "It was to prevent such an appointment that I accepted the office of Secretary of War ad interim, and not for the purpose of enabling you to get rid of Mr. Stanton by my withholding it from him in opposition to the law, or not doing so myself, surrendering it to one who would."

As the statements and assumptions in your communication plainly indicate was sought first of all, you here admit that from the very beginning of what you term the whole history of your connection with Mr. Stanton's suspension, you intended to circumvent the President. It was to carry out that intent that you accepted the appointment. This was in your mind at the time of your acceptance. It was not then in obedience to the order of your superior, as has heretofore been supposed, that you assumed the duties of the office.—You knew it was the President's purpose to prevent Mr. Stanton from resuming the office of Secretary of War, and you intended to defeat that purpose. You accepted the office, not in the interest of the President, but of Mr. Stanton. If this purpose so entertained by you had been confined to yourself—if, when accepting the office, you had done so with a mental reservation to frustrate the President—it would have been a deception in the ethics of some persons. Each course is allowable; but you cannot stand even upon that questionable ground.

The history of your connection with this transaction, as written by yourself, places you in a different predicament, and shows that you not only concealed your design from the President, but induced him to suppose that you would carry out his purpose to keep Mr. Stanton out of office by retaining it yourself after an attempted restoration, by the Senate, so as to require Mr. Stanton to establish his right by a judicial decision. I now give that part of this history as written by yourself in your letter of the 28th ult.:

Some time after I assumed the duties

of Secretary of War ad interim, the President asked my views as to the course Mr. Stanton would have to pursue in case the Senate should not concur in his suspension, to obtain possession of the office. My reply was in substance that Mr. Stanton would have to appeal to the Courts to reinstate him, illustrating my position by citing the ground I had taken in the case of the Baltimore Police Commissioners.

Now, at that time, as you admit in your letter of the 3d inst., you held the office for the very object of defeating an appeal to the courts. In that letter you say that, if accepting the office, one motive was to prevent the President from appointing some other person who would retain possession, and thus make judicial proceedings necessary. You knew the President was unwilling to trust the office with any one who could not, by holding it, compel Mr. Stanton to resort to the Court; you perfectly understood that in the interview some time after you accepted the office, the President, not content with your silence, desired an expression of your views, and you answered him that Mr. Stanton would have to appeal to the courts. If the President had reposed confidence before he knew your views, and that confidence had been violated, it might have been said he made a mistake; but that conversation, was no mistake of his or yours.

It is the fact only that needs to be stated that, at the date of this conversation, you did not intend to hold the office with the purpose of forcing Mr. Stanton into court, but did hold it then, and had accepted it, to prevent that course from being carried out. In other words, you said to the President, "That is the proper course;" and you said to yourself, "I have accepted this office, and now hold it to defeat that course."

The excuse you make in a subsequent paragraph of that letter, of the 28th ultimo, that afterward you changed your views as to what would be proper course, has nothing to do with the point now under consideration. The point is that before you had changed your views, you had secretly determined to do the very thing which you at last did, to surrender the office to Mr. Stanton. You may have changed your views as to the law, but you certainly did not change your views as to the course you had marked out for yourself from the beginning.

I will only notice one more statement in your letter of the 3d instant, that the making of the promises, which it is alleged were made by you, which involved you in the resistance of law, I know of no statute that would have been violated had you carried out your promises in good faith, and tendered your resignation when you concluded not to be made a party in any legal proceedings. You add: "I am confirmed in this conclusion by your recent order directing me to disobey orders from the Secretary of War, my superior and your subordinate, without having countermanded his authority to issue orders I am to disobey."

On the 24th ult., you addressed a note to the President, requesting in writing, an order given to you verbally five days before, to disregard orders from Mr. Stanton, as Secretary of War, until you knew, from the President himself, what were his orders.

On the 29th, in compliance with your request, I did give you instructions in writing not to obey any order from the War Department, to be issued by the direction of the President unless such order is known by the General commanding the armies of the United States, to have been authorized by the Executive.

There are some orders which a Secretary of War may issue without the authority of the President; there are others which he issues simply as the agent of the President, and which purport to be by direction of the President. For such orders the President is responsible, and he should therefore know and understand what they are before giving such direction. Mr. Stanton, in his letter of the 4th inst., which accompanies the published correspondence with the President since the 12th of August last, further says, that since he resumed the duties of the office he has continued to discharge them without any personal or written communication with the President, and he adds: "No orders have been issued from this Department in the name of the President with my knowledge, and I have received no orders from him."

ing to the practice of the Department, and state that "while this authority to the Department is not countermanded, it will be satisfactory evidence to me that any orders issued from the War Department by direction of the President, are authorized by the Executive." The President issued an order to you to obey no order from the War Department, purporting to be made by direction of the President, until you have referred it to him for his approval.—You reply that you have received the President's order and will not obey it, but will obey an order purporting to be given by his direction, if it comes from the War Department. You will obey no direct order of the President, but will obey his indirect order. If you say, there has been a practice in the War Department to issue orders in the name of the President without his direction, does not the precise order you have requested and have received change the practice as to the General of the army? Could not the President countermand any such order issued in the name of the President, to do a special act and issue an order directly from the President himself not to do the act? Is there a doubt which you are to obey? You answer the question when you say to the President, in your letter of the 3d inst., "the Secretary of War is my superior and your subordinate," and yet you refuse obedience to the superior out of deference to the subordinate.

Without further comment on the insubordinate attitude which you have assumed, I am at a loss to know how you can relieve yourself from the orders of the President, who is made, by the Constitution, the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, and is, therefore, the official superior, as well of the General of the Army, as of the Secretary of War.

Respectfully yours, ANDREW JOHNSON, Gen. U. S. Grant, Commanding the Armies of the U. S., Washington, D. C.

Subsequently the President transmitted to the House the following communication, which he had just received from General Grant. It is a pitiable reply:

GENERAL GRANT TO THE PRESIDENT. HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 11, 1868.

His Excellency Andrew Johnson, President of the United States. Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 10th inst., accompanied by the statements of five Cabinet ministers of their recollection of what occurred in the Cabinet meeting on the 14th of January. Without admitting anything contained in those statements, when they differ from anything heretofore stated by me, I propose to notice only the portion of your communication wherein I am charged with insubordination.

I think it will be plain to the reader of my letter of the 30th of January, that I did not propose to disobey any legal order of the President distinctly given, but only gave an interpretation of what would be regarded as satisfactory evidence of the President's sanction to orders communicated by the Secretary of War. I will say here that your letter of the 10th instant, contains the first intimation I have had that you did not accept my interpretation.

Now for the reason for giving that interpretation: It was clear to me, before my letter of January 30 was written, that I, the person having more public business to transact with the Secretary of War than any other of the President's subordinates, was the only one who had been instructed to disregard the authority of Mr. Stanton, whose authority was derived as agent of the President. On the 27th of January I received a letter from the Secretary of War (copy herewith) directing me to furnish an escort to the public treasure from the Rio Grande to New Orleans, &c., at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury to him. I also sent two other inclosures, showing a recognition of Mr. Stanton as Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, in all of which cases the Secretary of War had to call upon me to make the orders requested, or give the information desired, and where his authority to do so is derived in my view as agent of the President, with an order so clearly ambiguous as that of the President's here referred to, it was my duty to inform the President of my interpretation of it, and to abide by that interpretation until I received other orders.

Disclaiming any intention, now or heretofore, of disobeying any legal order of the President distinctly communicated, I remain very respectfully, Your obedient servant, U. S. GRANT, Gen.

A Dry-goods house in New York advertised, two or three days ago, for an entry clerk, and at six o'clock on Tuesday night more than six hundred applicants had been received.