THE CENTRE REPORTER,

FRED. KURTZ.....Editor.

Centre Hall, Pa., Nov, 17, '71

TERMS.—The CENTRE HALL REPORTER is published weekly at $2 per year in advance, or $2,50 when not paid in advance. Halfyearly and quarterly subscriptions at the same rate. Single copies five cents.

Advertisements $1,50 per square (10 lines) for three insertions. Advertisements for a longer period, at a reduced rate.

Business cards of five lines, $5 per year

Communications recommending persons for office, 5 cents per line. Communications of a private nature and obituary notices exceeding five lines, five cents per line. Business notices in local column 10 cents per line, for one insertion.

Notices of deaths and marriages inserted free of charge. Our friends, in all parts of the county will oblige by sending us local items of interest from their respective localities.

The figures set to the address upon each subscriber's paper indicate that the subscription is paid up to such date, and answer the same as a receipt. Persons remitting by mail, or otherwise, will understand from a change in these dates that the money has been received

Poor Mexico.

The country of the Montezuma's, it would seem, will never get rid of internal war. The latest advices from Mexico tell of anarchy, revolution, rapine and murder. News from the capital, dated Oct. 30., says, that anarchy prevails in many States of Mexico. The revolution in Nuevo Leon still continues. The revolutionary movements are spreading in other provinces. The Revolutionists in Zacatacas have invaded the State of San Luis Potosi. Numerous bands of men are sacking villages and haciendas in the States of Hidalgo, Mexico, and in the Federal district. Robberies are committed in sight of the gates of the city. The authorities of the State of Oaxeco have neglected to promulgate the re-election of Juarez.

Our readers may wish to know what has become of the movement in favor of Thomas A. Scott for president. We can say that it has not died out, but on the other hand seems to be gaining strength. Many democratic papers have expressed themselves strongly in favor of making Mr. Scott the nominee, particularly the Cincinnati Enquirer, which has published a strong and able article in his favor. Mr. Scott would undoubtedly be popular, and there is no doubt about his democracy, it is vouched for that he never cast any other but a democratic vote; and that he possesses great administrative and executive ability, needs no endeavor to show, as his whole life, since he has attained to manhood, is abundant proof of it.

Thomas A. Scott is no second rate man; he has done more to foster the great railroad enterprizes of the United States, than any fifty men living, and look at the results of his labors—the country has been built up, by a development of its resources, the wildernes has been opened and made easy for imigration, and towns and cities almost numberless have been called into existence, as if by magic, through operations of Col. Scott. In short, it is doubtful whether there is a man now living, between Maine and California, to whom the country is more indebted for real, substantial benefits, and for what it has gained in solid advancement, inside the last fifteen years, than to Col. Thomas A. Scott, and should he be the democratic nominee, we would cheerfully work for his election.

In a solemn proclamation, under date of the third instant, President Grant corrects the error in placing Marion county, South Carolina, under the suspension of the habeas corpus. He says he has ascertained that unlawful combinations do not exist there to the extent asserted in his former proclamation. Union county, which was omitted in the former ukase, is to be placed under martial law at the close of five days.

Grant's Thanksgiving Proclamation must have been written by himself. It has all the ambiguity of a speech of the ex-Emperor Napoleon, and gives signs of intellectual acquirements of of which the best expression is silence. This perspicuous document says that "the calamities of some should be an occasion of rejoicing to the many who have been more favored," while the "people" are recommended to invoke the Divine protection and kindness "for their less fortunate brethern."

We agree weth the Louisville Courier-Journal that the administration has a queer way of showing that it is no respector of persons—Pardoning Bowen, and prosecuting Brigham Young.

Some of the leading democrats of New York are in favor of nominating Chas. O'Conor for the presidency. A very excellent man, an honest and faithful president would he make.

There is no duller blunder, says a writer in Harper's Weekly, than the supposition that the schemers and tricksters and unscrupulous men of a party are its shrewdest managers, and that honor and decency are impracticable in politics. And the writer in Harper is right.

Says the Morning Patriot:

It is reported that the Hon. Samuel Josephs was a personal applicant for the pardon of Irwin, the radical deputy sheriff of Philidelphia, who was recently convicted of extorting illegal fees. That fact need not have had any influence on an honest governor.

Some people *may* know what kind of a fellow this Sam Josephs is—a pretty hard case, and ten years a member of the legislature; but not all may know who was "Sam Joseph's candidate for speaker."

Inferior lawyers, sometimes bring reproach upon their noble profession by insulting witnesses, and it is then comforting to see them disagreeably rebuked. A Mr. Watson, of Indiana, when a witness requested leave to go to her sick husband, answered no; if her husband died she could easily get another. The woman then slapped his face in open court, and the verdict was that it served him right. Again in a court in Philadelphia the judge fined a lawyer $25 for declaring that a witness was guilty of perjury. In this country, then, witnesses have some rights that lawyers must respect.

The ties that connect business men with the public—advertise.

A Governor who Does his Duty.

The facts as to the killing of Thomas W. Grosvenor by an extemporized sentinal in Chicago we have already published, and we are not surprised that Gov. Palmer has required the law officers of the State to have the case judicially investigated. He has written a letter to the Attorney General of Illinois, showing that the Mayor of Chicago had no authority to raise troops or to establish military law there; and this letter he concludes with the following words.

"It is not necessary in determining upon the line of duty to be adopted to inquire whether the Mayor of Chicago, Lieut.-Gen. Sheridan, and Frank T. Sherman and his associates and subordinates, who were the agents by which the death of Thomas W. Grosvenor was produced, in assuming powers they did not possess, and which cannot be conferred upon them, were influenced by proper or improper motives or purposes. They assumed to suspend the operation of the Constitution and laws of the State, and substitute in their stead law and military force to be defined and appointed by themselves. They, by their lawless acts, attacked and insulted the dignity and authority of the State, and have, by their dangerous example, weakened the public confidence in the Constitution and laws; and in their attempt to enforce usurped and lawless authority, they have sacrificed the life of a peaceable citizen. Animated by the confidence I have thus expressed, and confident in the belief that the State of Illinois, acting through the proper departments of its government, is capable of protecting its own people and of enforcing the dignity and authority of its own laws, I have to request that you, in conjunction with the State's Attorney of the Seventh Circuit, will bring all the facts before the Grand Jury of Cook county, in order that all persons concerned in the unlawful killing of Thomas W. Grosvenor may be brought to a speedy trial."

The reasons here given by the Governor are most weighty and cogent; and we do not doubt that they will have the approval and support of thinking men everywhere.

Charles A. Dana on the Situation.

Linaoln's Assistant Secretary of War Compares Grant with Tweed.

The New York Sun, of the 9th published the following editorial, doubleleaded:

All other questions that have hitherto divided the Amrrican people disappear before this one: Can public corruption be stopped? Can public robbery be put down? Can political frauds be suppressed and prevented? Can bribery and present-taking be banished from political affairs?

Ten years ago the great question was slavery. It was settled through the war of the rebellion, with its immense losses of life and treasure and its gigantic heritage of public debt Since then other questions growing out of the war have arisen. Fortunately, they are now all ended and cleared away; and there is no other subject to distract the attention of the people from this one supreme issue: Can robbers, thieves, bribe givers, bribe takers, present takers and official blackmailers be driven from power and honest men put in their places? Can the fatal system of corruption now so universal be brought to a close, and a system of honesty, frugality and purity be substituted in its place?

If our public affairs continue for five years longer upon the same downward course as they have done for five years since the close of the rebellion, we shall no longer have a country to be proud of; and the great American experiment of self-government, in which the hopes of all humanity were bound up, will end in rottenness and shame.

This is not a matter to be disposed of by either of the existing parties. Both of them are alike in a state of putrefaction, and no spirit of life and of safety can come forth from either. If the Republic is to be saved at all, the work must be done in the nation as it was done in this city on Tuesday. Upright and patriotic men of all parties must combine for this exclusive purpose. Democrats and republicans must forget their old quarrels, and strike hands in one united effort. What are the differences of opinion and of policy that have hitherto separated them, compared with this one all-embracing, all-absorbing danger? And of what use will it be to them to continue to call themselves republicans or democrats if all that is worth living for in our free institutions is destroyed by robbers like Tweed and present-takers and corrupters of the public conscience like Grant.

NOT A PARTY TRIUMPH.

The New York Tribune of the 9th says that "in New York party organizations coalesced, and the grand Reform victry was the joint triumph of honest democrats and honest republicans against the thieves." In another article it says: "It is a great and inspiring triumph; but it is a triumph of People rather than Party. We have no desire to claim for any political organization in this city the fruits of a victory which has been the result of the uprising of a great people." Mr. Greeley's candor will hardly be relished by the minions of Grant, who loudly boast of the result in New York as an administration victory.

A Model Congreesman.

Washington, October 26.—For the past three months the government detectives have been on the track of a number of southern bounty swindlers.

A whole nest of these has been discovered in Tennessee under the leadership of ex-Congressman Stokes, working in collusion with a respectable clerk in the second auditor's office. The latter, who is named Victor G. Powell, was arrested last night and held in $10,000 bail, which has not yet been procured.

Mr. Stokes was arrested this afternoon, but was afterwards released on $15,000 bail. The amount involved is over $60,000.

There are other well known politicians connected with this scheme whose names are withheld to enable the detectives to arrest them, all radicals of course,

Petition from Morman Women Fity Feet Long.

The character of the petition from Utah, fifty feet long and signed by about twenty-five hundred woman of that territory, was unintentionally misstated. Instead of being "against," it is in "favor" of polygamy, and was sent to the executive mansion by Delegate Hooper. The petitioners say their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers are now being exposed to the murderous policy of clique of federal officers intent on the destruction of an honest, happy, industrious and prosperous people; and they therefore ask for the removal of the federal disturbers of the peace, or, at least, to stop the disgraceful court proceedings, or send candid and reliable men to Utah to investigate the question of the constitutional rights and liberty of the people. The petitioners express their approbation of polygamy, asserting that it was sanctioned by Christ's teachings, and that the institution is being perverted by federal officers.

Reverdy Johnson's Speech.

Hon. Reverdy Johnson, delivered a very able speech at Baltimore, on the 2nd inst., from which we make the following extract:

There is one consideration, however, of a general nature which should persuade the people that the party in power, legislative and executive, have not, since the termination of the war, wisely administered the government. The war ended in April, 1865. Since then no body of men, nor, so far as I know, any individual man, has raised his arm against the authority of the United States. The judiciary of the United States was almost at once reinstated in each of the States which had been in rebellion, and they have ever since administered their functions, not only without resistance, but without the show resistance. All the forts in these States have remained in the quiet posession of the government. Our commercial marine visits every Southern port without opposition, and is as safe there as in any of the other ports of the country. The laws of the United States have been administered without opposition, and the general acknowledgment of the authority of the United States and of the duty of allegiance has everywhere prevailed. Each of those States is now represented in both branches of Congress. Each has its governor, legislature, and judiciary, and has enacted and administered its own laws, recognizing throughout the paramount authority of the Union. Notwithstanding all this they are now subjected, not only to oppressive laws, but to laws which I think are in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States, and in their nature destructive to the liberties of the people. So far from this conduct having brought about a restoration of good feeling, which could have been accomplished by friendly and constitutional measures, the people of one of those States are now subjected to the greatest conceivable oppression, and are denied rights which, in the most express and unambiguous terms, are guaranteed by the Constitution. And the States themselves are practically treated as if they were not States of the Union and as such entitled to all the powers not conferred upon the general government—powers belong to them by force of the Constitution itself—the Constitution expressly providing that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Now a word or two more to show that the particular measure that I have in view, and the manner in which the President is carrying it out, are at war with the Constitution, and inconsistent with every idea of civil and political liberty. The measure is the act of Congress, 20th of April, 1871, called the Ku-Klux law. Its title is "An act to enforce the provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the U. S. and for other purposes." It will be seen that the only authority asserted for this law is the fourteenth amendment. Of the meaning of that amendment I shall hereafter speak. But let me first show you what the provision in the law is which is now being enforced by the President in certain portions of South Carolina. After giving to individuals whose rights under the fourteenth amendment may be violated a civil action against the wrongdoer for the recovery of damages, and making such wrong-doer liable to a criminal prosecution, it provides that in certain cases mentioned in the section the alleged offenses "shall beemed a rebellion against the United States," and during the existence of such supposed rebellion, and within the limits where it may exist, "the President, when in his judgement the public safety shall require it," is authorized "to suspend the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus, to the end that such rebellion may be overthrown." It will be seen from the title of the act that the only warrant asserted for it is the fourteenth amendment. The inference from this is, that in the judgement of Congress, independent of that amendment, no such authority could be found. Now, this being conceded, let me for a moment examine into the meaning of that part of the fourteenth amendment relied upon. By a clause in the first section, in connection with the fifth section, Congress has assumed the power to pass the act. By that part of the first section it is provided that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," by the fifth section, "Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation the provisons of this article." It will thus be seen that what is prohibited in the portion of the first section quoted is that "no State" shall do the acts prohibited. Before I proceed to consider the meaning of this section, I call your attention to the terms of the fourth section of the act. By the ninth section of the first article of the Constitution it is declared "that the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it." In commenting upon this clause, Story says: "It would seem, as the power is given to Congres to suspend the writ of habeas corpus in the cases of rebellion or invasion, that the right to judge whether the exigency had arisen must exclusively belong to that body." Now, whether this be absolutely true, and that they cannot confer the power upon the President, yet it is obvious that to do so in a measure defeats the object of the prohibition, as it practically leaves to the President to decide upon the existence of the exigency. He is, in other words, to determine not only whether a rebellion or invasion prevails, but whether the public safety requires the suspension of the writ. How formidable this power is, and how dangerous to the liberty of the citizen it may be when vested in one man, however exalted his official position, must be obvious. Without, however, denying that the power may be delegated to the President, one thing would seem to be perfectly clear, that the privilege of the writ cannot be denied to the citizen unless there be in fact a rebellion or an invasion and the public safety demands the denial. Can it for a moment be reasonably maintained that the fact of the existence of either rebellion or invasion is to depend upon the mere will of Congress or the will of the President? This is also certain, that Congress, if it has the authority to delegate the power to the President, can only authorize him to suspend the writ when there is, in the sense of the prohibitory clause of the Constitution, a rebellion or an invasion. The meaning of those two terms now is what it was when the Constitution was adopted. Neither that clause nor any other in the Constitution gives to Congress the right to define what rebellion is, and by such definition to make it what it is not according to its ordinary and well-understood meaning. A different doctrine would give to Congress the power to escape entirely from the prohibition. If they can declare that the acts specified in the third section of the statute constitute "a rebellion against the government of the United States," there is no limit to their power to defeat the obvious design of the clause. I have not time to quote the acts specified in the sections referred to, but many of them are clearly not within the meaning of the term rebellion as used in the constitution. Rebellion, in the sense of the Constitution, means revolt, rising, insurrection, or, in other words, insurrection against lawful authority. Now, there is not the least evidence to show—certainly none has been laid before the country—that there was any insurrection of revolt against the authority of the general or State government in South Carolina. Outrages have, perhaps, been perpetrated upon individuals in the State, as they have been and will be upon individuals in every State. For their redress the laws of the State and of United States afford a remedy. This very statute gives such a remedy to the parties who may be agrieved, and subjects the offender to a criminal prosecution. There is not only nothing to show that the State courts of the United States have not the power to enforce these remedies, but, on the contrary, no process of either of these courts has been resisted by arms, or resisted at all. Indeed, as is now seen, there has been no difficulty in making arrests. So far from there being interference by force with this authority, the statement is that hundreds are flying from the State to avoid the illegal captures which are now making, and the imprisonment consequent thereupon—an imprisonment from which they cannot be released by virtue of any legal remedy. The arrests are made without any warrant coming from any judical officer known to the constitution, and the prisoner is not informed of the cause of his arrest, is not afforded the security which the Constitution provides of a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, but he is subjected entirely to the will and pleasure of the President and his officers.

And one thing more would seem to be perfectly evident, that to authorize the President to interfere by force in any of the States, another provision of the Constitution must be complied with. The members of the convention by whom it was framed, and the members of the several State conventions by which it was adopted, were most sollicitous to exempt States from the power of the United States in all cases over which the States had jurisdiction. They were, therefore, careful to prohibit the government of the United States from interfering by force of arms with the legal jurisdiction of the States, and permitted it only in one condition of things—the existence of invasion or domestic violence. The language of the provision is that the United States "shall protect each of them" (the States) "against invasion, and, on application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence." Under this latter authority, Congress passed the act of 28th Febuary, 1795, by which it is provided (the restriction of the Constitution being reserved) that in case of an insurrection in any State against the government thereof, it shall be lawful for the President, when called upon by the State Legislature, when in session, or by the executive during the recess, to use such force as he may deem necessary to suppress the insurrection. The statesmen of 95 were careful to observe all the limitations on the powers of the general government, and not to interfere with any of the powers belonging to the States. In passing the act upon which the President is now proceeding in South Carolina, this constitutional security afforded the States of not having the armed power of the general government to suppress domestic violence within its limits, unless applied for by the government of the State is totally disregarded. Congress, in the first place, by the act, decides for itself when the force of the United States is to be used, and the President is to decide for himself whether it is to be used or not. He may, therefore, use it, and Congress may authorize him to use it, not only without the request of the State, but against its protest. Can any one fail to see that this is not only a violation of the constitution, but necessarily serves to make the United States a consolidated and centralized government and, if acquiesced in by the people, will vest in Congress and the President every political power, and thus defeat the declared purpose of the constitution, and sooner or later be fatal to liberty itself? It seems to me incomprehensible that Congress should have supposed they had authority to pass the law in question under the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment. That, certainly, does not, in express words, give such a power, and I think it may be considered as certain that if it had, in terms, given it, the amendment never would have been ratified The words used are, "Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." Can it be maintained that the means which Congress is authorized to adopt are to be any every means without any constitutional restriction? Congress, under this provision, can, it is true, legislate, but can they legislate in utter disregard of every constitutional limitation upon its power? This can hardly be pretended. Indeed, the provision clothes Congress, with no power which it would not have possessed without it; but this power, whether implied or granted is to be taken in subordination to the express limitations upon its authority, and these are that the rightful powers of the States are not to be interfered with—that the guaranteed rights of the citizens are not to be violated and as one of the securities of these rights that the privilige of the writ of habeas corpus is not to be denied to him in time of peace, and when there is no armed resistance on his part, in conjunction with others and in his State, which, in view of the Constitution amounts to rebellion or insurrection, and the public safety requires to be suppressed by force of arms. The effect of the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus and declaration of martial law is to place the State and its citizens without any security, constitutional or otherwise. For, as was correctly stated by the Duke of Wellington, "martial law is no law at all." It is the mere will of the commander, and during its continance is an unmixed, despotism. Can the people of the United States be so blind and so forgetful of the duties which they owe to the men who achieved our freedom as any longer to permit a continuance of power of the party by which such a law has been enforced. It has been said by an Englishman that our people are more indifferent to the importance and value of the writ of habeas corpus than his countrymen, for ours did not, as his did, obtain it by force; in other words, *fight* for it. The rights secured by our Constitution are in substance, but a transcript of the constitutional rights of England, and especially is that the case with regard to the writ of habeas corpus. Many of these rights are in England's great charter, which was obtained, sword in hand, from King John; and our constitutional provision in relation to the writ in question is taken, almost in words, from habeas corpus act of Charles II. I feel satisfied that if such a law as the one I have examined, and such an execution of it as is now going on in South Carolina, was passed by the English Parliament, and was enforced by the government, the people of the country would with one voice drive from power all the parties concerned in it. Are Americans less devoted to liberty than the subjects of her majesty? Can we who often boast, and heretofore with truth, that we are amongst the freest, if not the freest, people on earth, submit to such legislation, or will we not, when the proper time comes to speak through the ballot-box, with one voice discard from power those who have abused and are abusing the most sacred provisions of our Constitution and the dearest rights of freemen? Is not the right which is now being denied in South Carolina one of the most vital to political and civil freedom? Does liberty exist anywhere where such a right is denied? It must be very clear to the comprehension of any reflecting man that it is not. In the words of Blackstone, himself the advocate of strong government and the warm and able supporter of the prerogatives of crown, in referring to the value of the writ. "If it were once left in the power of any, the highest magistrate to imprison arbitrarilly whomever he or his officers thought proper (as in France it is daily practiced by the crown), there would soon be an end of all other rights and immunities. There are various other views in which the question I have discussed might be presented and enforced, but I have not the time to lay them before you. I believe that I have said enough to convince any reflecting and impartial mind that the act of Congress of April 20, 1871, in the particulars to which I have referred and the President's course under it, have no warrant in the constitution, and are destructive of the rights of the States and of individual citizens.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Sketch of the Early History of the Moravians.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, EASTON PA. Nov. 9th 1871.—Dear Editor—In my last I promised, in connection with Bethlehem the Moravian town in Northampton county, to give a few facts in connection with the history of the United Brethren church.

In the ninth century, a sister of the king of Bulgaria, was carried to Constantinople as a prisoner and became a christian; and through her means, on her return to her native land, a church, of which the king of Moravia and Duke of Bohemia were members, was established. A part of these churches were forced into the Roman church, but a select few refused to bow the knee and do homage to the power at Rome.

This little remnant, adhering to the simple doctrines of the primitive church, suffered many persecutions for several centuries and were at last permitted to live in a wasted province of Moravia. Here they established a church in 1457, on what they denominated the "Rule and Law of Christ" and finally called themselves "Unitas Fratrium," or "United Brethern." They were a pure and sound evangelical church a century before the reformation of Luther, and were not in intimate connection with the Waldenses, who have been preserved uncorrupted from the days of the apostles. In 1725 they removed to Georgia and established missions; but refusing to take up arms in defence of the colony, were obliged to leave and sought an asylum in the peaceful domains of Willian Penn, about the year 1739. Rev. George Whitefield, who had labored in conjunction with the Wesleys, had begun to erect a large building in the "Forks of the Deleware," as a school for negro children, to which he gave the name of Nazareth. At his request the Bretheren undertook to finish the building, though attended with great danger—the Indians refusing to quit the country and threatened to murder them; they were compelled to leave it in 1740. Some time after the Brethern purchased the "Manor" house, at Nazareth, from Mr. Whitfield, and finished the house.

Bethlehem and Nazareth continued to increase and prosper; new Brethern came from other stations to labor here, and many believing Indians were baptized. Bethlehem became a central and controlling station from which the Bretheren took instruction from the elders on their departures from time to time, for the different out-posts of the mission on the upper Lehigh, Susquehanna and eventually in the distant wilds of the Allegheny and Ohio rivers, Little villiages of christian Indians, Huts of Grace, Huts of Mercy, Huts of peace were organized at various points.

So frequent were the visits of the missionaries and christian Indians to Susquehanna, that a beaten path was soon run across Nescopeck mountains, between Gnadenhutten and Wyoming. Among those baptied in 1750 was one La-deuhow, called honest John by the English. His baptism was delayed some time because of his wavering disposition, but having been once present at a baptism, he said to one of the Brethern: "I am distressed that the time is not yet come that I shall be baptized in the blood of Christ." He received the sacrament soon after, but finally showed that the doubts of the missionaries, concerning his steadiness, were too well founded. He was like a reed shaken with the wind, and when a scheme was laid to induce the christian Indians to remove out of the settlement, in order that the others might fall upon the Brethern with the exterminating knife, he was one of the most active in the work. The defeat of Braddock, the following year, brought a desolating storm of savage warfare on the whole frontier. Many white settlements near the Blue mountains were cut off and the poor Brethern and Indians at Gnadenhutten did not escape. The Moravians and their Indian converts were in danger between two fires. The hostile Indians were burning and ravaging their villages on the Lehigh. On the other hand, the Irish of the Kittatinny valley viewed with jealous eye, not without some reason, the asylum afforded to parties of hostile Indians at the christian Indian village as they passed back and forth through the country. It was charged, too, against the Brethern, that they would not take up arms against the common enemy and in defence of the colony, and falsely charged that they were in league with the French. It was difficult to convince men enraged and exasperated at the loss of their families, that the charges were not true. They openly threatened to exterminate the Indian converts and it was dangerous for friendly Indians to hunt in the woods. The missionaries themselves were insulted and abused. Under these circumstances, the affrighted Indians, whose towns had been burnt, took refuge at Bethlehem.

The Moravian establishments were a great obstacle to the designs of the hostile Indians, since they could not persuade the friendly Indians to destroy the missionary towns. Sometimes well disposed Indians, at risk of a plot, would walk miles during a whole night to inform the Brethren of their schemes, and thus they were defeated. Great numbers of the distressed white settlers found refuge in the Moravian settlements. Hundreds of women and children came even from distant places, crying and begging for shelter, some almost destitute, having left their all and fled in the night. Some Brethren, going in their wagons to fetch corn from the mill, beyond the Blue mountains, were met by great numbers of white people in distress, the savages having attacked their towns, burned their dwellings and murdered many. The Brethren loaded their wagons with these people and brought them to their homes. After the treaty at Easton, in 1756, it was determined to hold a grand council at Philadelphia, for the purpose of making a general peace with all the Indian tribes, and it became necessary to dispatch a messenger to the hostile tribes on the Ohio. This was a dangerous errand, but christian Frederick Post, one of the Brethren, undertook it; and after going twice, was successful in his mission. In 1758 he arrived at Philadelphia with the deputies and thence proceeded with them to Philadelphia. The journal of Post, a most interesting narrative, is published in the appendix to Trad's history of Pennsylvania. All the property at Bethlehem formerly belonged to the Moravian society, who leased out lots to members of their own community and communion. Each individual, when of age, became a voluntary subscriber to the rules of the society, with the right of withdrawing himself at pleasure. In each case he was required to dispose of his property and remove from the town. Each member pursued his occupation on his own private account, but if any particular trade suffered, on account of too great competition, the society would not permit a new competitor, although of the same faith, to come to the town. This secured to all a competency. Bethlehem was perhaps the only town in the United States in which the common property plan was successfully carried on for any length of time—more than a hundred years. It is remarkable that there was not a single lawyer in the place, nor was there one needed.

Our next will be devoted to Easton.

PAUL WARD.

How the Two Parties Treat the Scoundrels.

The Brooklyn Eagle says:

We have referred to this humiliating spectacle to illustrate the Republican way of dealing with the corruptionists in their own ranks. Honest Republicans must now admit that the Greeley campaign against Murphy and his swindles amounts to nothing at all. It has completely failed of all success. Tom Murphy compels his traducer to preside over his own meeting, to countenance and co-operate in servile praise of Grant, and praise of the action and nominees of the Murphy Convention. The Republican party surrenders to its own scoundrels, and Greeley the loudest to denounce is the first to capitulate. On the contrary, mark how the democrats proceed against the scoundrels in their ranks! Here is the noble record: Samuel J. Tilden and Wm. F. Havemeyer. Democrats, protect the treasury by getting Andrew H. Green, a democrat, made Deputy and Acting Comptroller. Andrew H. Green, Democrat, causes the arrest and committment of voucher thieves. The Rochester Democratic Convention exclude the Tammany Delegates and reorganize party machinery in New York. Attorney General Champlain and Jno. T. Hoffman Governor both Democrats, prosecutor of the frauds and thieves. Chas. O'Conor, Democrat, on the affidavit of Samuel J. Tilden, Democrat, brings Wm. M. Tweed, the Murphy of Democracy, branded into Court, to be tried for his crimes. The Democratic press and orators of the country over, not only denounce but they are the only ones to call for the punishment of the scoundrels. The Democrats of the Union have turned the rascals out of their ranks and given them handcuffied into the clutches of the law. This action, added to the injunction of the Democratic Judge, Geo. F. Barnard, procured by John Fooley, Democrat, all show that the Democrats punish their scoundrels, while the Republicans take them to their bosom and kiss their sores till they glisen like diamonds. Let this different treatment by the different parties of their similar rascals teach voters which side to support.

Hon. Wm. M. Evarts Denounces Dishonest Men.

In replying to an invitation to address the Republicans of Broome county, New York, the Hon. William M. Evarts threw a heavy bombshell at unworthy candidates for office genarally, as follows:

"The favor with which you look upon my efforts in the cause of common honesty, and earnings of the great mass of our people against the rapine and plunder shown by asking me to address you at this time and on this subject, justifies me earnestly urging you not to underrate the weight and completeness or the issue as made up for your suffrages. Upon this issue every candidate for the suffrags of the people for a place in the Senate or Assembly should be free from the least taint in the past, from the least fear for the future. If any candidate is in the field of whom this is not true, let independent nominations be made to meet this difficulty. If of the two candidates of the opposite parties one be clearly honest and courageous and the other knavish and uncertain, let no party considerations or distinctions prevent a concentration of votes upon the worthy candidate. The people of this State are tired of the government of rascals 'without distinction of party,' and now demand honest and incorruptible men without distinction of party.

"The whole question is in a nutshell. We are free to choose whom we will to the Legislature, and the Legislature which we choose has in itself substantially, all the power of the people. A fortnight of the session of an honest Legislature can make it impossible for a knave to keep his foot in office, or even in the State itself, unles within the walls of a jail.

"Press, then, all your efforts to this one point, and prevent the conflagration of every institution of free government and every interest of society now raging in this city, even creeping through the State, from covering us all with one common shame in one common ruin.

WM. M. EVARTS

The first snow of the season fell in Maine, on Tuesday night, covering the ground to the depth of two inches.

More Embezzling.

It appears that General Balloch, disbursing officers of the Freemen's Bureau, has been committing some brilliant financiering, as the phrase goes, and speculating with bureau funds to the tune of about a quarter of a million. The Washington correspondent of the World says:

An order was issued from the War Department for the arrest of Gen. Balloch, and Col. Schriver, Inspector General, took him into custody. Balloch at once said that he could account for the missing money, and proceeding to the Treasury Depot with the officer he produced, or the clerks did for him, packages of coupon and registered bonds anmouting to the sum named, and in Balloch's own name. The officer inquired if he had any more investments, whereupon the clerk produced another fifty thousand dollar package of bonds. Balloch was then asked to explain why he had invested this money in violation of law. To this he replies that he had paid some colored soldiers' bounty claims which afterwards proved to be fraudulent, and he had invested in government funds to secure interest enough to make him whole. No such condition of affairs, however, appears in Balloch's accounts, and he stands clear on the record of receiving thousands from the interest on these bonds How long this has been going on the Lord only knows. Balloch came here poor enough a few years ago. He returns personal property alone including his government bonds, for $71,000. The law covers Balloch's case thoroughly, and it remains to be seen what the officials are going to do about it.

Why is a shoeblack like a clever schoolmaster? Because he polishes the understandings.

SHERIFF SALES.—By virtue of sundry writs of fieri facias, levari facias venditioni exponas, issued out of the Court of Common Pleas of Centre county, and to me directed, there will be exposed to public sale, at the court-house in Bellefonte, on Thursday the 23rd day of November, 1871, as follows, to wit:

The following real estate of defendant, situate in Potter township, Centre county, Pennsylvania, to wit: Bounded on north by lands of Fredericks, east by land of H. Foust, et. al., south by land of William Mayes and on the west by land late of George Foust, dec'd, containing one hundred and twelve acres, more or ess, thereon erected a dwelling house, barn and saw mill.

Seized, taken into execution, and to be sold as the property of Stephen Garraty.

ALSO:

All the right title and interest of the defendant in and to all that certain lot of ground situate in Slabtown, Rush township Centre county, Pennsylvania, bounded on the north-east by Calhoun street, on the south-east by Grant street, on the south-west by Sherman street and on the north-west by lot of —— Barr, being lot No. 7 in the plot of said village, thereon erected a two story frame dwelling house and outbuildings.

Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Benjamin S. Crain.

ALSO:

All the right title and interest of defendant in and to all that certain lot of ground situate in Rush township, Centre county, Pennsylvania, bounded on the north east by land of Morgan, Hale & Co., south by lot of Jerry Reirdan and on the west by land of Morgan, Hale & Co., containing one half acre, more or less, thereon erected a two story plank frame dwelling house and out-buildings.

Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of John Donahoe.

ALSO:

All the right, title and interest of defendant in and to all that certain tract of land situate in Miles township, Centre county, Pennsylvania, bounded on the north by land of Thomas Wolf and John Sholl, east by land of H. W. Wolf and John Sholl, south by land of J. E. Reish and Jonathan Auman and on the west by land of Peter Auman, containing forty two acres, more or less, thereon erected a dwelling house, barn and other outbuildings, (and orchard) and having about twenty five acres cleared.

Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of David Wolf, executor of &c.

ALSO:

The undivided one fourth interest of all that certain messuage and lot of ground situate in the borough of Bellefonte, fronting at a post in public road leading from Bellefonte to Roopsburg, thence south 33 degrees east 18 2-10 perches to post, thence south 58 degrees west 28 9-10 perches to post, in said road, thence along said road north 9¼ degrees east 10 8-10 perches, thence along said road north 35½ degrees east 25 3-10 perches to the place of beginning, containing two acres be the same more or less, having thereon erected a planing mill, dry house and other outbuildings.

Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of William H. Smith.

ALSO:

All the undivided half interest in all that certain Tannery property and messuage or piece of land situate in Millheim, Centre county, Pennsylvania, beginning at corner near Elk creek and corner of John Yerkers lands south 41½ degrees west 11-8 perches to corner, thence along an alley north 88 degrees west 17 3-10 perches to corner, thence partly in road leading from Millheim to Penns creek north 13 degrees west 5 perches to corner in said road thence north 5 degrees west 8 perches to corner, thence along Rebecca Finklemillrace south 88 degrees east 19 8-10 perches to corner of said John Yerker's land, thence along same south 5 degrees east 12½ perches to place of beginning, containing one acre and eighty seven perches net. Thereon erected a large brick house, bank barn, tannery, bark house and other outbuildings.

Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of George M. Swartz and Martha G. Swartz.

ALSO:

All that certain messuage, tenement and tract of land, situate in the township of Ferguson, Centre county, Pennsylvania, bounded and described as follows, to wit: beginning at a white oak corner on land of Samuel M'Williams, thence north 36 degrees west 136 perches to white oak, thence south 35 degrees west 102½ perches to stone thence south 40 degrees east 141 perches to stone, thence north 49½ degrees east 52½ perches to a stone, thence south 36 degrees east 55 3-10 perches to a stone, thence north 44 degrees e ast 60 perches to place of beginning containing ninety acres and allowance, be the same more or less, together with the appurtenances.

Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Julian D. Williams and Robt. L. Williams.

ALSO:

A two storied frame building, twenty five feet front and sixteen feet deep situate on a certain lot of ground in Boggs township, Centre county, Pennsylvania, bounded on the north by a lot of James Aston, on the south by a lot of Lewis Fulton and on the west by land of Joseph Green, and on the east by the railroad, fifty feet in width on railroad and running back one hundred and sixty feet.

Seized taken in execution and to be sold as the property of William Kellerman.

ALSO:

The real estate of the Bellefonte Glass Manufacturing Company, bounded and described as follows, viz: Beginning at a post on land of M. Mackall and Wm. A. Thomas, dec'd, thence south 24½ degrees east to a post on —— road, thence by said road north 62¼ degrees east 72 feet to a post, thence north 25½ degrees east 330 feet to a post, thence north 24½ degrees, west 134 feet to a post, thence north 65½ degrees east 130½ feet to a post, thence north 32½ degrees east 89 feet to a post, thence north 64 2-10 degrees west 86 feet, thence south 24½ degrees east 60 feet, thence south 65½ degrees west 119 feet to a post, thence north 24½ degrees west 83 feet to a post, thence by lands of said Thomas & Martha Mackall, south to place of beginning; thereon erected a Glass Factory with the necessary outbuildings, including four dwelling houses and a boarding house, with a branch of rail-road running through or under a part of said factory,

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of The Bellefonte Glass Manufacturing Company.

ALSO:

All that two storied frame building with two one storied frame back buildings, the main building being 64 feet, 6 inches in front, by 30 feet, 6 inches in depth, and the back buildings each 21 feet, 3 inches in width by 15 feet, 4 inches in depth, and so much of the ground covered by said buildings as may be necessary for the ordinary and useful purposes of the same. The said building is located on a lot of ground, part of a tract of land situate in the borough of Bellefonte, purchased by the said Glass Manufacturing Company, from the trustees of William A. Thomas, dec'd. Siezed, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of the Bellefonte Glass Manufacturing Co.

Sale to commence at 1 o'clock of said day.

D. W. WOODRING, Sh'ff.

Sh'ff's Office, Bellefonte Oct. 31, '71.

HOUSE AND LOT FOR SALE.

A house and lot favorably located on Mainstreet, Aaronsburg, is offered at private sale. The house is a good one, and the lot among the best in town, with an abundance of fruit thereon. Also 10 acres of mountain land. For further particulars apply to JOANNA S. KURTZ,
oct27. Aaronsburg.

Carriage

MANUFACTORY

Centre Hall, Pa.

GEO. B. HARPSTER

Has on had and for sale at the most reasonable rates a splendid stock of

CARRIAGES, BUGGIES,

and every description of Wagons both

PLAIN AND FANCY

warranted to be made of the best and most durable materials, and by the most experienced workmen. All work sent out from the establishment will be found to be of the highest class and sure to give perfect satisfaction. He will also have a fine assortment of

SLEIGHS

of all the newest and most fashionable styles well and carefully made and of the best materials.

An inspection of his work is asked as it is believed that none superior can be found in the country. aug25.tf.

CARD.

J. E. Caldwell & Co.

No. 902 CHESTNUT ST.,
PHILAD