

THE SONS OF LIBERTY.

Testimony of Hon. C. L. Vallandigham before the Military Commission in Cincinnati.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM, a witness, subpoenaed by the defense in the trial of the alleged Chicago conspirators, before a military commission convened in Cincinnati, gave his testimony on Wednesday last. This distinguished gentleman, as is well known, was the supreme commander of the secret political organization, known as the Order of American Knights, or Sons of Liberty. The position of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM, and the efforts which have been made to fasten the charge of disloyalty and treason upon this organization, gives his testimony an absorbing interest and will excite the attention of the country. We regret that we have no space to give the evidence in full, for, for the Cincinnati Enquirer justly characterizes it: "It is a complete vindication not only of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM, but of the secret order to which he belonged." No arguable case was ever more industriously and persistently maligned than the "Sons of Liberty," and all for the accomplishment of partisan purposes.

The influence and power of the government has been brought to bear against it, and the purpose has been to hold the organization responsible for the crimes and errors of a few bad or misguided men. This morning we have only space to give the leading points in the examination of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM, which was most rigorous and searching throughout.

According to his statement, in the month of February, 1864, at Windsor, Canada West, opposite Detroit, he was solicited to become a member and chief officer of what he understood to be the Order of American Knights. In his reply to this request he gave what he understood to be the objects of the organization, his reasons for joining it, and the attending circumstances:

My answer was that I had understood there was some such organization, perhaps known by that name, in existence a year or more; that I never heard of it previous to the fall of 1862; that I had always declined having any connection with it, because I apprehended that it might have some connection with the southern government, or place members of it under some sort of obligation, with reference to that government, that was inconsistent with the oath of allegiance of a citizen of the United States; and that I would belong to none, directly or indirectly, looking to any sort of connection with those who were in arms against the federal authorities. I went on, then, to express my convictions as to secret political organizations; that circumstances had altered some, and, however, I had a strong impression that the organization was a member of the democratic party, but that I believed the time had come when they were useful and necessary, provided they were kept legitimate and lawful. The assurance was given by these gentlemen that there was nothing of the kind I had apprehended; at all events, there was to be a change made, or a new arrangement in the organization, and that all objections of the kind I had expressed, would be obviated; and further, that they proposed a simple and informal communication of the ritual, principles and obligations; with reference to the purposes of which I have spoken, they assured me that they were political or patriotic, having reference to affairs in the states that had adhered to the union, and recognized the federal government and its authorities; accordingly, I consented, and informally, by reading in part, and showing in part, without any attempt at ceremony, the ritual, principles and obligations were made known to me; no part of any of them was read in full to me, but the books and pamphlets were left with me for examination.

The principle object, with reference to which I made inquiry, as stated there, were declared to be of a political character, and for the defense of members of the democratic party. Those were the circumstances, and that was the extent to which I was a member of the organization.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM states that the ritual and the form of expression, at least of the principles and some of the obligations of the order of American Knights, were changed a few days after his initiation, and the name of the order was altered because the idea of knighthood was objectionable. On occupying the position of chief officer he details the following circumstances:

There was no form of oath prescribed in writing. It was suggested to me what should it be. I answered that it should be an oath to support the constitution of the United States, and to fully discharge the duties of chief officer of this organization. In that form the oath was administered by Dr. Mussey. Whether he had authority I do not know. He so administered it at all events. The papers were changed, and the ritual given. Large changes were made in the ritual; in the first place, a large amount of it was stricken out. I desired to strike it all out; it was of no value, but merely a promise or obligation, and the retention of it was a principle, but others thought it was better, for some portion, at least, for the form and ceremony in secret societies, and borrowed all, I believe, from the same fountain head. There was one portion of the oath or obligation, (it was not called an oath in the order, but a promise, which I noticed, after Mr. Green and Mr. Barrett had left, in the middle of February, and as soon as the gentleman came I called their attention to it, and they said, whatever might be its actual purpose, it was, at least, an obligation calling upon men to give aid and comfort to the southern government. Whether I was right in the interpretation, I do not know. Accordingly that portion of the oath from the Order of the American Knights was stricken out, and remitted in the revised obligation. The rest was merely form and ceremony. A great deal was stricken out which was mere verbiage, and which I regarded as beneath the dignity of men, and the portion of the same sort, however, was retained. There was but one change or addition made to the principles of the order.

The addition I made was the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, constituting part of the "Sons of the Inner Temple." I cut them out of an old volume of the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions of 1798 and 1799. I think it was the second Virginia and the first Kentucky. The only one of that I am not positive; but they were the Virginia resolutions without any alteration, except a local allusion to the time they were passed, and the state of Kentucky in 1798, which were omitted as a declaration of principles; that was all the change that was made.

In reply to the question what he understood to be the objects of the order as he learned them as supreme commander, Mr. VALLANDIGHAM replied:

The objects of the order were first, political, the advancement and success of the democratic party, especially with reference to the presidential election. The second, and to that extent an object to the organization, known as the Local Union League. Another object was the protection of democrats against violence by mobs; the destruction of democratic newspapers, and assaults on members of the democratic party. The order, and, ultimately, one dependent entirely upon whether the contingency ever arose, was to protect the ballot box in case of the attempt to suppress state elections, or the election of the president of the United States by force of arms. Beyond that I never knew or heard of any other purpose of the order as an organization, nor had I any connection with it as such. If there was any other, it was the individual members only that were concerned, in disobedience to the known and understood purpose of the order.

Question—Had this order any such purpose as affording aid and assistance to the confederate army, or rebellion of the southern states?

Answer—Under no circumstance whatever. On the contrary, I had refused to join a preceding order because of a suspicion in my mind that it might be something of that kind.

Question—Was the release of the confederate prisoners of war one of the objects contemplated by this order?

Answer—It never was. I never heard that subject being discussed, or mentioned in any informal one being the one I presented at the organization, nor by any member of that organization, to me.

Question—When did you first learn of the existence of any such purposes as that from persons belonging to the order?

Answer—Never. Until I read of the arrest of Harrison in Indianapolis, and saw, perhaps a month or so later, charges and specifications of the judge advocate. That was the first knowledge that I ever had of any such purposes being entertained by any member, and never by the order as an organization.

Question—Did the order have in view, or take any action in reference to the release of confederate prisoners in Chicago?

Answer—It never did, and I never heard, until the development of these trials that any attempt was being made in Chicago at the time of the conference in Warsaw. I did hear, I was much surprised as any one, though I had heard that a large body of troops had been sent to Chicago during that conference, and that there were some apprehensions that it was intended to prevent the confederate being held. I thought it was from prudential reasons, on account of the vast concourse of people there; and had no idea that that was to be made the occasion of an attempt to release the confederate prisoners.

Q—Did this order have in view as one of its purposes, to render aid and afford protection to escaped rebel prisoners of war?

A—I never heard of it in that connection, nor did I ever hear any member of the organization make any statement of that kind; the purpose of that order was to disconnect itself utterly from everything of that kind.

Q—Was it any purpose or object of the order to furnish arms, supplies or supplies to the southern confederacy?

A—It was not.

Q—State if this order had for one of its objects the establishment of a northwestern confederacy.

A—I never heard the subject of a northwestern confederacy mentioned in connection with this organization until yesterday, in conversation with Judge Bartley. My own opinions as to a confederacy being held by the order, I thought it was considered pertinent to this matter, they are easily accessible.

Question—With respect to the instructions and directions which you gave to those members of the order, I ask for those which you gave as supreme commander of the order, in or out of the order.

Answer—I never issued any order in writing, at all, or of any formal order to be promulgated, but I issued orally to officers of the order, and on the occasion when a number of officers of the order were officially present, in April, that very question was considered; and I there defined the position that the rule was that, inasmuch as we had no peaceful mode of revolution, it was better to acquiesce in arbitrary arrests, the contemplated suppression of the liberty of the press, and all else that has been complained of by the Democratic party, rather than resist forcibly, until it came to the destruction of that mode of peaceful revolution, and then I believed that the contingency would have arrived for a resort to arms; that would be a matter of defense of the exercise of the right of suffrage, of the right of the people to elect their representatives.

Question—Did this order contemplate the use of arms, or the use of force, or the use of violence, or the use of any other means, to achieve its purposes, resistance to the authority of the federal government?

Answer—It did not except in that contingency to which I have alluded, the contingency of defending the right of elective franchise.

Question—Had you any knowledge that any lodge, or portion of this order, contemplated any attempt to release the confederate prisoners at Camp Douglas?

Answer—Most distinctly I had not; neither at Camp Douglas, nor at any other camp, nor at any other place.

In the cross-examination, in reply to the questions of the judge advocate, Mr. VALLANDIGHAM thus repeated what he understood, as supreme commander, to be the object of the organization:

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP.

Speech of Hon. Henry Winter Davis in the House of Representatives, March 2, 1865.—The Administration Denounced by one of its Supporters.—The Horrors of Military Law Envoiced.

Mr. Davis, of Maryland.—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the weight of the criticism of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Stevens), and I am sure that nobody will say that I have ever embarrassed the proceedings of this House by my pertinacious adherence to the tenets of my own views. I have never embarrassed the House week after week by motions to tax or exempt whisky on hand. That would have been a more appropriate criticism than such an amendment as mine, which never came early, and can never be too late until the voice of liberty shall cease to be heard in the United States. Then it will be impertinent to arrest the progress of legislation for the government by calling the attention of the representatives of the people to the rights of their constituents.

Let this bill perish a thousand times rather than any vote should be cast on the records of the House declaring that the protection of the liberties of the citizens of Massachusetts and of Maryland is to be secured by the violation of their rights. There has been no other period, sir, at which I could obtain the aid of the House on such an amendment.

Q—Did this order have in view as one of its purposes, to render aid and afford protection to escaped rebel prisoners of war?

A—I never heard of it in that connection, nor did I ever hear any member of the organization make any statement of that kind; the purpose of that order was to disconnect itself utterly from everything of that kind.

Q—Was it any purpose or object of the order to furnish arms, supplies or supplies to the southern confederacy?

A—It was not.

Q—State if this order had for one of its objects the establishment of a northwestern confederacy.

A—I never heard the subject of a northwestern confederacy mentioned in connection with this organization until yesterday, in conversation with Judge Bartley. My own opinions as to a confederacy being held by the order, I thought it was considered pertinent to this matter, they are easily accessible.

Question—With respect to the instructions and directions which you gave to those members of the order, I ask for those which you gave as supreme commander of the order, in or out of the order.

Answer—I never issued any order in writing, at all, or of any formal order to be promulgated, but I issued orally to officers of the order, and on the occasion when a number of officers of the order were officially present, in April, that very question was considered; and I there defined the position that the rule was that, inasmuch as we had no peaceful mode of revolution, it was better to acquiesce in arbitrary arrests, the contemplated suppression of the liberty of the press, and all else that has been complained of by the Democratic party, rather than resist forcibly, until it came to the destruction of that mode of peaceful revolution, and then I believed that the contingency would have arrived for a resort to arms; that would be a matter of defense of the exercise of the right of suffrage, of the right of the people to elect their representatives.

Question—Did this order contemplate the use of arms, or the use of force, or the use of violence, or the use of any other means, to achieve its purposes, resistance to the authority of the federal government?

Answer—It did not except in that contingency to which I have alluded, the contingency of defending the right of elective franchise.

Question—Had you any knowledge that any lodge, or portion of this order, contemplated any attempt to release the confederate prisoners at Camp Douglas?

Answer—Most distinctly I had not; neither at Camp Douglas, nor at any other camp, nor at any other place.

In the cross-examination, in reply to the questions of the judge advocate, Mr. VALLANDIGHAM thus repeated what he understood, as supreme commander, to be the object of the organization:

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP.

Speech of Hon. Henry Winter Davis in the House of Representatives, March 2, 1865.—The Administration Denounced by one of its Supporters.—The Horrors of Military Law Envoiced.

Mr. Davis, of Maryland.—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the weight of the criticism of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Stevens), and I am sure that nobody will say that I have ever embarrassed the proceedings of this House by my pertinacious adherence to the tenets of my own views. I have never embarrassed the House week after week by motions to tax or exempt whisky on hand. That would have been a more appropriate criticism than such an amendment as mine, which never came early, and can never be too late until the voice of liberty shall cease to be heard in the United States. Then it will be impertinent to arrest the progress of legislation for the government by calling the attention of the representatives of the people to the rights of their constituents.

Let this bill perish a thousand times rather than any vote should be cast on the records of the House declaring that the protection of the liberties of the citizens of Massachusetts and of Maryland is to be secured by the violation of their rights. There has been no other period, sir, at which I could obtain the aid of the House on such an amendment.

Q—Did this order have in view as one of its purposes, to render aid and afford protection to escaped rebel prisoners of war?

A—I never heard of it in that connection, nor did I ever hear any member of the organization make any statement of that kind; the purpose of that order was to disconnect itself utterly from everything of that kind.

Q—Was it any purpose or object of the order to furnish arms, supplies or supplies to the southern confederacy?

A—It was not.

Q—State if this order had for one of its objects the establishment of a northwestern confederacy.

A—I never heard the subject of a northwestern confederacy mentioned in connection with this organization until yesterday, in conversation with Judge Bartley. My own opinions as to a confederacy being held by the order, I thought it was considered pertinent to this matter, they are easily accessible.

Question—With respect to the instructions and directions which you gave to those members of the order, I ask for those which you gave as supreme commander of the order, in or out of the order.

Answer—I never issued any order in writing, at all, or of any formal order to be promulgated, but I issued orally to officers of the order, and on the occasion when a number of officers of the order were officially present, in April, that very question was considered; and I there defined the position that the rule was that, inasmuch as we had no peaceful mode of revolution, it was better to acquiesce in arbitrary arrests, the contemplated suppression of the liberty of the press, and all else that has been complained of by the Democratic party, rather than resist forcibly, until it came to the destruction of that mode of peaceful revolution, and then I believed that the contingency would have arrived for a resort to arms; that would be a matter of defense of the exercise of the right of suffrage, of the right of the people to elect their representatives.

Question—Did this order contemplate the use of arms, or the use of force, or the use of violence, or the use of any other means, to achieve its purposes, resistance to the authority of the federal government?

Answer—It did not except in that contingency to which I have alluded, the contingency of defending the right of elective franchise.

Question—Had you any knowledge that any lodge, or portion of this order, contemplated any attempt to release the confederate prisoners at Camp Douglas?

Answer—Most distinctly I had not; neither at Camp Douglas, nor at any other camp, nor at any other place.

In the cross-examination, in reply to the questions of the judge advocate, Mr. VALLANDIGHAM thus repeated what he understood, as supreme commander, to be the object of the organization:

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.

Question—You say, do you, that you have heard of members having other objects?

Answer—I have heard of some developments that there were men connected with the order who proposed things that were totally false to the objects and intentions of the order; some of them were evidently detectives in the service of the government, and some were professed members of the order.

Question—Did you assent to and endorse the principles enunciated in this work? (The ritual of the order.)

Answer—I could not have expressed them in the language they have there, but they are the doctrines I hold now, and have held ever since I first studied politics at all.

Our space will not permit us to give further extracts from the testimony of Mr. VALLANDIGHAM to-day. Hereafter we will give his response to the questions of the judge advocate upon the cross examination, in explanation, and in vindication of the objects and principles of the order, as he understood and accepted them as its supreme commander.

Question—Do I understand you to say, that the purpose and object of this order, so far as you are concerned, was the protection of the democratic party, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to protect themselves from mob violence, and to be ready in case their rights were taken from them at all points?

Answer—Yes, sir, that were the chief objects of the organization; I never heard of any other intentions or purposes of the order.