Auburn Morning News.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 6, 1872.

Attempts to Bribe Senators.

Notwithstanding the denial of the President and his friends, of the grave charge of Senator Schurz, of an attempt to bribe him in support of the San Domingo scheme, the evidence is conclusive in favor of the Senator.

It is a matter of general notoriety, that previous to that time, Carl Schurz and other Senators who opposed the scheme throughout, had previously been on good terms with him; while, on the other hand, Cameron and other Senators who fell into support of the treaty had previously been upon ill terms with him. This fact, of itself, would be conclusive, in many minds, of the accuracy of Mr. Schurz's statement, but when is added the positive affirmance of Gen. Pleasanton, there is no longer room for doubt. What truth is more fully written in reference to Grant's administration than that the men who opposed the corruption were deposed from position, and ostracised, while those who obeyed the mandate of the King, were petted, and pampered, and thereafter enjoyed the patronage of the government. The following is General Pleasanton's letter:

New York, Jan. 25, 1872.

Dear General—Regarding the conversations you refer to in our note, I remember it was with the knowledge and consent, and after I had a conversation with him (the President) that I called upon you and had the conversation you spoke of. My impression at this time is, that the President desired your support for the San Domingo scheme, and wished to be on such terms with you that your support could be obtained. I do not now remember any particular language used at my interview with the President, and would not hazard doing him an injustice by attempting to quote from memory, but the impression made upon my mind was fixed and distinct. Truly yours, in haste,

A. PLEASANTON.

Senator Schurz afterward received from Gen. Pleasanton the following note:

New York, July 25, 1872.

Dear General—Of course I have no objection to your giving my name to the public, in explanation of the facts. I would say that, being a friend of the President as well as of yourself, I desired you should be on good terms, and you should understand that there was no personal feeling in the way of relations mutually satisfactory. Your statement is correct that the President wanted your support for his San Domingo scheme, and that you could have had patronage of the government for giving it. That was the distinct impression the President's conversation made upon my mind, and I communicated it to you at the time. If the President positively denies having had any such conversation, I regret it. I may console myself with the reflection that it is the first time that any statement of mine has been questioned, while the President has had occasion before this to distrust the accuracy of his recollections.

Truly yours,

A. PLEASANTON.

At the time the San Domingo job was before the Senate, Gen. Pleasanton enjoyed the fullest confidence of the President, and was generally regarded as belonging to the military ring. No one at that time would be more likely to be entrusted with the performance of such work.

Gen. Pleasanton is a soldier of long service, and of high personal character. He and Gen. Grant were associates together at West Point, thirty years ago, and soldiers together during the late war. When Mr. Grant was elected President, he appointed Pleasanton to an Internal Revenue Collectorship, and subsequently made him the head of the Internal Revenue Department, in which position of power and patronage and influence he was when the San Domingo Treaty was pending.

The effect of his statement in Washington is thus described by a correspondent of the World:

"The publication of the Schurz-Pleasanton correspondence fell with bombshell explosiveness in the administration ranks here today, and produced a very forcible reminder of the previous instance in Grant's career in official life in Washington. Among other things, Mr. Conkling says that on visiting Niagara in 1871, and finding that there were no such Commissioners there as had been represented to him,

"Mr. Greeley, in place of denouncing the cheat and repelling the imposition, and clearing the President's skirts by showing the two letters which he had been instructed to show, went into a correspondence with these brazen impostors."

But Mr. Greeley was never authorized to show the President's letters to "brazen impostors," nor anything of the kind, but only to persons who had authority from Rich-mond to make peace. Finding that the persons there had no such authority, but offered to procure it, he telegraphed this to the President and, awaiting his orders, had nothing more to say to the Rebels. The only overture made to them afterward was made by the President through one of his own Secretaries.

Mr. Conkling states that, on leaving Niagara,

"Mr. Greeley sent word to the Rebel Commissioners that he regretted the end and termination of the interview taken for peace, in consequence of the change made by the President."

Mr. Greeley sent to those Rebels no "word" or message of any kind. His dealings with them terminated when he had learned that they were not "Commissioners" but private persons, though he, at Major Hay's request, accompanied the latter across the river, while the Major delivered the card "to whom it may concern." The Major awaited an answer; Mr. Greeley did not. He easily felt that an opportunity to make a good impression on the public mind, North and South, had not been used to the best advantage; that was all.

Mr. Conkling says that Mr. Lincoln

"Wrote to Mr. Greeley for permission to publish the correspondence, omitting only such parts as carried an exaggerated idea of our military and political condition; this request Mr. Greeley refused, unless all parts of the letters were published."

"The letters," Mr. Greeley only intimated that his own letters should not be mutilated to his prejudice. He had privately written to Mr. Lincoln that a reasonable offer of peace from him would powerfully aid the anti-Lecompton (virtual Peace) party, then contesting North Carolina—an election of Governor, Legislature, &c., being imminent. This was one of the passages in his own letter which Mr. Greeley was asked to strike out, allowing the reader to go to the people as though mutilated. He objected. Had he not reason?

Mr. Conkling means at the terms of peace which Mr. Greeley privately suggested to Mr. Lincoln to be offered to the Rebels. This reached on Mr. Lincoln, who, with Mr. Greeley's letter open before him, responded:

"If you find any person, anywhere professing to have any proposition of Jefferson Davis in writing, for peace, embracing the restoration of the Union and the abandonment of Slavery, whatever else it embraces, say to him he may come to me with you."

And this he subsequently repeated in his card "To whom it may concern." In fact there was no difference between the two but this: Mr. Greeley believed that an offer—no matter though informally made—by our Government of reasonable terms of Peace, would weaken the Rebellion and strengthen the National cause; Mr. Lincoln wished to deal only with authorized Commissioners. Yet he did, in the last resort, make through Major Hay a general public overture to the Rebels, which he had not authorized Mr. Greeley to do.

Of how much value are the statements of a public speaker, when he misrepresents facts as Mr. Conkling has done?

Presidential Sharp Practice.

In the month of February, 1869, President Grant, having contracted to sell his gift horse to Mayor Bowen for $40,000, it is reported, wrote to A. T. Stewart, who was one of the subscribers to the Sheerman fund and one of the committee having it in charge, requesting him to influence the committee to purchase the identical horse for Sherman. Mr. Stewart did as he was asked, and the horse was bought for $55,000, neither General Sherman nor any one in his behalf having been consulted.

To make the sale, however, he was obliged to back out of the trade with Bowen, although the contract for its sale had been signed by the President. Mayor Bowen writes that he shall commence a suit for the recovery of the money.

But the transaction has another aspect. If $40,000, the sum which Bowen agreed to pay, was a fair price for the property, Mr. Grant, by this bit of underground business, took just $52,000 out of the pocket of his constituents. Grant's letter to Stewart would throw an interesting light on the whole subject, and would unknowingly illustrate the talent of our worthy President in pecuniary affairs. Will Mr. Stewart favor the public by its publication?

How the Tribune is "Pulling Off."

A transcript from the Mail Subscription Books of the Tribune shows the number of mail subscriptions received during the months of June and July last, was 10,328 against 4,407 last year. That's such a falling off as most publishers would admire.

A Tribune reporter has called upon General Pleasanton, and obtained from him personally the facts embodied in the following statement:

About two weeks after entering upon the duties of the office of commissioner of internal revenue at Washington, in January, 1871, Gen. Pleasanton had an interview with President Grant. In the course of conversation, the President introduced the San Domingo question, and remarking that he understood that Senator Schurz was opposed to the treaty, asked Gen. Pleasanton to see Senator Schurz, and tell him that if he would call at the White House the President would be able to place the San Domingo matter in a satisfactory light, and could remove his objections to the scheme. In further conversation with the President, Gen. Pleasanton was led to understand that the President would, in exchange for Senator Schurz's support of the San Domingo treaty, accord him a share of public patronage. Gen. Pleasanton says his impressions on this point are very distinct and unmistakable. This authorized, Gen. Pleasanton saw Senator Schurz and informed him of the President's wish to see him. Senator Schurz replied that he would call at any time he might designate for an interview. Gen. Pleasanton saw the President the next day, and informed him of the Senator's reply, at which the President expressed the gratification and stated that he would send for Senator Schurz in a few days. The interview was not had.

Some weeks later, when it seemed to be assured that Senator Schurz opposed the treaty, Gen. Pleasanton received a memorandum slip from the President, directing the removal of Senator Schurz's brother-in-law, Lunens, from the office of collector of internal revenue at Chicago. "at once." The unusual nature of this imperative removal attracted Gen. Pleasanton's attention, and he asked the President to suspend judgment for some weeks, but the President said that he regretted that he could not do so, as he had promised to remove the man at once. A few appointment was made, upon the recommendations of Senators Logan and Congressman Farwell. This action impressed Gen. Pleasanton with the belief that political patronage was considered of more importance at that time than the immediate necessities of the public service. Subsequently, and shortly before Gen. Pleasanton's departure for Europe, Senator Schurz addressed him a letter, asking for his recollection and impressions of the conversation in which the President desired him to call upon the Senator and open the negotiations as mentioned. Gen. Pleasanton responded in a letter which Senator Schurz has made public.

The abuse of patronage at that time and for that purpose was shameless and scandalous to the last degree. Mr. Sumner was directly offered the English mission by Secretary Fish; and because he could have it was removed from the chairmanship of the Foreign Affairs committee, and Simeon Cameron elevated to his place, for the reason that his eyes were opened to the situation.

We gave a four column article, on Monday, from D. C. Forney, of the Washington Sunday Chronicle, in which are portrayed the base character and infamous career of this favorite Senator and chosen associate of Mr. Grant. This man who was removed from the office of Secretary of War by President Lincoln for his monstrous rascalities in transacting the public business, and who was formally censured by a resolution of the House of Representatives on the 30th of April, 1862, after he had been deposed. These parties—the Forneys and Camerons, the it remembered, are all Pennsylvanians, Administration Republicans who know each other well.

Do the people desire a longer continuance of this corrupt administration? Will they suffer it, when, by union on honest Horace Greeley they can overthrow it.

Mr. Conkling Reviewed.

In his late speech, our honorable Senator found his first occasion for venting his spleen on Mr. Greeley, and this he did, by attempting to make that gentleman appear to be in conspiracy with the Rebels. The Tribune candidly reviews Mr. Conkling and shows most of his statements to be false, and others distorted and highly colored.

Among other things, Mr. Conkling says that on visiting Niagara in 1871, and finding that there were no such Commissioners there as had been represented to him,

"Mr. Greeley, in place of denouncing the cheat and repelling the imposition, and clearing the President's skirts by showing the two letters which he had been instructed to show, went into a correspondence with these brazen impostors."

But Mr. Greeley was never authorized to show the President's letters to "brazen impostors," nor anything of the kind, but only to persons who had authority from Richmond to make peace. Finding that the persons there had no such authority, but offered to procure it, he telegraphed this to the President and, awaiting his orders, had nothing more to say to the Rebels. The only overture made to them afterward was made by the President through one of his own Secretaries.

Mr. Conkling states that, on leaving Niagara,

"Mr. Greeley sent word to the Rebel Commissioners that he regretted the end and termination of the interview taken for peace, in consequence of the change made by the President."

Mr. Greeley sent to those Rebels no "word" or message of any kind. His dealings with them terminated when he had learned that they were not "Commissioners" but private persons, though he, at Major Hay's request, accompanied the latter across the river, while the Major delivered the card "to whom it may concern." The Major awaited an answer; Mr. Greeley did not. He easily felt that an opportunity to make a good impression on the public mind, North and South, had not been used to the best advantage; that was all.

Mr. Conkling says that Mr. Lincoln

"Wrote to Mr. Greeley for permission to publish the correspondence, omitting only such parts as carried an exaggerated idea of our military and political condition; this request Mr. Greeley refused, unless all parts of the letters were published."

"The letters," Mr. Greeley only intimated that his own letters should not be mutilated to his prejudice. He had privately written to Mr. Lincoln that a reasonable offer of peace from him would powerfully aid the anti-Lecompton (virtual Peace) party, then contesting North Carolina—an election of Governor, Legislature, &c., being imminent. This was one of the passages in his own letter which Mr. Greeley was asked to strike out, allowing the reader to go to the people as though mutilated. He objected. Had he not reason?

Mr. Conkling means at the terms of peace which Mr. Greeley privately suggested to Mr. Lincoln to be offered to the Rebels. This reached on Mr. Lincoln, who, with Mr. Greeley's letter open before him, responded:

"If you find any person, anywhere professing to have any proposition of Jefferson Davis in writing, for peace, embracing the restoration of the Union and the abandonment of Slavery, whatever else it embraces, say to him he may come to me with you."

And this he subsequently repeated in his card "To whom it may concern." In fact there was no difference between the two but this: Mr. Greeley believed that an offer—no matter though informally made—by our Government of reasonable terms of Peace, would weaken the Rebellion and strengthen the National cause; Mr. Lincoln wished to deal only with authorized Commissioners. Yet he did, in the last resort, make through Major Hay a general public overture to the Rebels, which he had not authorized Mr. Greeley to do.

Of how much value are the statements of a public speaker, when he misrepresents facts as Mr. Conkling has done?

Presidential Sharp Practice.

In the month of February, 1869, President Grant, having contracted to sell his gift horse to Mayor Bowen for $40,000, it is reported, wrote to A. T. Stewart, who was one of the subscribers to the Sherman fund and one of the committee having it in charge, requesting him to influence the committee to purchase the identical horse for Sherman. Mr. Stewart did as he was asked, and the horse was bought for $55,000, neither General Sherman nor any one in his behalf having been consulted.

To make the sale, however, he was obliged to back out of the trade with Bowen, although the contract for its sale had been signed by the President. Mayor Bowen writes that he shall commence a suit for the recovery of the money.

But the transaction has another aspect. If $40,000, the sum which Bowen agreed to pay, was a fair price for the property, Mr. Grant, by this bit of underground business, took just $52,000 out of the pocket of his constituents. Grant's letter to Stewart would throw an interesting light on the whole subject, and would unknowingly illustrate the talent of our worthy President in pecuniary affairs. Will Mr. Stewart favor the public by its publication?

How the Tribune is "Pulling Off."

A transcript from the Mail Subscription Books of the Tribune shows the number of mail subscriptions received during the months of June and July last, was 10,328 against 4,407 last year. That's such a falling off as most publishers would admire