THE CENTRE REPORTER,

FRED. KURTZ.....Editor.

Centre Hall, Pa., Feb. 23., '72.

We have just been informed from Harrisburg what our member is "doing" for the congressional apportionment:

Potter, Tioga, Cameron, Clinton, Centre and Union. This is bad, terribly bad, iftrue, and we call upon democrats to enter an immediate protest, or the democracy of this district are sold out body and breeches.

From the legislative proceedings, of 15th inst., we notice that another smuggled bill has been unearthed. The matter was referred for investigation. Those are nice chaps at Harrisburg.

Window Shades.

Mr. Mumma offered a resolution directing the clerk to furnish the windows of the senate chamber with shades.

The above we clip from the senate proceedings at Harrisburg, of 15th inst. We thought the recent "fitting up" of the windows, at an enormous cost, was about the end of that string. We think the sooner some of those scamps are put in the shade by their constituents, the better for the taxpayers.

The democracy of Jefferson county, in their convention last week, instructed for Thomas A. Scott for President, and Gen. Cass, of Pittsburg, for Governor. Scott to make it hot, and Cass to make it pass.

Our Schools.

In the legislature of this state several bills have been presented, which are of general interest, and of which we here furnish a synopsis.

One bill, we believe, makes the minimum school term five months, instead of four as now.

The Senate has under consideration a bill intended to regulate and make uniform the salaries of School Superintendents. The bill provides, that one dollar per square mile shall be paid each school Superintendent for services; but the salary in the aggregate shall not be less than one thousand dollars, except, in cases where there are less than one hundred schools in which case the salary shall be eight hundred dollars. There was a good deal of opposition manifested to the bill, although from the debate there appeared to be a general belief among Senators, that some regulation looking to uniformity should be enacted. It is probable that the effort will result in some substantial good when the proposition is again considered.

Another act provides, that from the passage of this act the morning session of the primary, secondary and grammar schools shall be devoted to recitations by the pupils and explanation by the teachers; the afternoon sessions shall be given entirely to the preparation of lessons by the pupils, under the care and supervision of the principal and assistant teachers. Home study may be optional with pupils, but shall not in any case be required by teachers. When text books are taken home by pupils, it shall be those only each day in which recitations have been prepared in the afternoon for the ensuing day, and no addition shall be made to the lessons assigned on account of the books being taken home. The true principle in education being "not how much, but how well," short lessons are enjoined in all cases. It shall be the duty of the State and county superintendents to see that the provisions of this act are properly enforced.

The Lewistown *Gazette*, radical, takes exceptions to our charging the radical party for the huge job of fitting up the two legislative chambers at Harrisburg, at a cost of nearly $40,000. The *Gazette* would like to saddle the thing upon Jacob Ziegler, late democratic clerk. That won't do. The clerk of the house is a radical, and the balance of the machinery belonging to the state government, is in the hands of the radicals, and of course this and all other extravagance in the affairs of the state, rightfully rests upon the shoulders of the radical state government. Col. Ziegler had nothing whatever to do with making out those exorbitant bills. They were made out by the parties who did the work, and presented by them to Auditor General Hartranft, a radical, who accepted and settled them, without a protest. Col. Ziegler, we will venture to say, never saw these extraordinary bills until they were held up to the public gaze by the newspapers. We do not think it honest, in a radical paper, to attempt to screen its party, when guilty of such abuses. Let it take a lesson from the democracy, who are as ready to punish the guilty in its own ranks as these so often found in the radical ranks.

"In a few weeks," that's ominous. We consulted the Delphic oracle astride its tri-pod, and its answer of course, was, that somebody would be annihilated, for

It saw a crow,
Mount a hoe,
Pick its toe,
And swear a row.

"In a few weeks,"—well, Snyder may as well now look out for a substitute, while all the rest are advised "to take the first steamer and depart for South America." "The ablest," "In a few weeks," we like that, coming from our substitute broker. As we put ourselves "into our little bed," we saw visions of lines before us, such as, "He who fights and runs away, may live to fight another day," "He marched up the hill, then down again," we saw the form of pollution gargling its putrid throat, and then spit up, "In a few weeks."

Hon. Henry Sherwood and Hon. Wm. M'Clelland, have our thanks for favors from Washington.

Fraudulent Medical Diplomas

Bogus doctors, as well as bogus statesmen and politicians, are now manufactured at so much per head. Any man who knows how to prepare a toddy for the belly-ache, can get a diploma as a doctor, if he has the stamps. The Patriot brings the result of a recent investigation of this:

The senate committee on irregularly or fraudulently issued medical diplomas held their fifth meeting at the Jones house last evening. Senators Randall, Crawford, Billingfelt Weakley, Nagle and Humphreys were in attendance, Senator Strang alone being absent. Four witnesses were examined, which brings the number up to about twenty-five since the organization of the Committee.

The first witness examined last evening was I. Davis, of Mahanoy, Schuylkill county. He testified to having received a diploma from the American University, Philadelphia, for a consideration of ninety dollars. He had gone through four lecture courses in London but had never attended the college from which he received the diploma.

John Stevenson, a colored Methodist minister of Wilkesbarre, stated that he had received a diploma from the same university. He had never been regularly under the instruction of a physician. He had been examined by two professors. His diploma had cost him nothing. He had practiced medicine since receiving it.

John B. Nicholas, of this city, freely gave what information he possessed. He had attended a course of lectures at the Eclectic college, Philadelphia, where he was examined by one professor and received a diploma. He had came to the conclusion while at college that things were conducted loosely and became thoroughly disgusted. He had not practiced medicine and never intended after receiving the diploma.

W. W. Brown, of Bellefonte, stated that he was a lawyer and editor. He had received the honorary degree of LL. D., from the American University, Philadelphia, unasked and unsolicited. The parchment had come to him very carefully wrapped up. He had no idea what it was before opening it and expected nothing of the kind. He had never attended a course of lectures at the university and had given or done nothing as an equivalent for the diploma. He thought he was entitled to the honor, as he was thoroughly competent. He had been to the Allegheny college four years and six months. The diploma might have come through the influence of Dr. Bissell, one of the professers of the Eclectic college, with whom he was well acquainted. He had given the university a complimentary newspaper notice after the reception of the diploma—none before.

After the examination of Mr. Brown the committee adjourned to meet at the Girard house, Philadelphia, on Saturday morning at ten o'clock, when the professors and others of the two colleges in question will be examined.

We mentioned in our columns last week the sentence of the radical defaulters in Philadelphia, who had been tried and found guilty. In pronouncing the sentence upon Marcer, the Judge used the following language, which should be applied to some more scoundrels of the same kind, but who go unwhipt:

Joseph F. Marcer—The rule for a new trial in your case having been refused, and the motion in arrest of judgement overruled, it remains for the Court to impose such sentence as the nature of your offense requires. I do not desire to add to the pain of your position by any extended remarks. I cannot let the occasion pass, however, without expressing an emphatic condemnation of your offense. The misapplication of public money has become the great crime of the age. If not promptly and finally checked it will ultimately destroy our institutions. When a Republic becomes honeycombed by corruption its vitality is gone. It must crumble upon the first pressure. In my opinion the public are much to blame for your offense and others of similar character. Heretofore official fraud has been regarded with too much indifference. What we need is a higher and purer political morality, a state of public opinion which would make the improper use of public money a thing to be execrated. It was the lack of this which made your offense public.

Beyond this we see nothing of extenuation in your case. The public had confided to you the custody of their money. It was a high and sacred trust. You should have guarded the doors of the treasury even as a Cherubim protected the Garden of Eden, and should have turned the flaming sword against every one who approached it improperly. Your position as a member at the bar, and for some years as chairman of the Finance Committee of Councils, gave you ample opportunities of knowing the law. You have sinned against the light. In view of the facts of your case, we can do no less than impose the full penalty of the law.

Fraudulent Legislation.

We last week made reference to fraudulent legislation at Harrisburg, by which bills, that never passed either house, are palmed off as laws. This is about the boldest species of villainy of modern times, and goes ahead of the plans of the devil himself. But when forgers and other political villains are elected to the legislature, what better can the people expect, and who else are to blame for this demoralized state affairs but the people who claim to be honest and upright, and yet favor the election of such characters as lawmakers. Upon this matter we copy further from the last Clinton Democrat:

It seems as though rascality in legislation at Harrisburg cannot reach a climax. What laws are really passed contain enough wrong to make many intolerable to the people, but it appears that we suffer not only the evils of these but also those that have not passed. The Patriot of the 8th inst., informs us that "Mr. Dill read a bill to repeal a certain act relating to railroad corporations which was approved by Governor Geary on the 19th June, 1871. As soon thereafter as resolutions were in order Mr. Petriken introduced a resolution in regard to this act," which asked for an investigation. The resolution declares that private investigation shows "that said bill was not considered or passed by either the Senate or House of Representatives, and that the records relating thereto were falsely and fraudulently made and entered."

The Patriot says further that, on June 5th, the "attention of Governor Geary was called to this pretended act by a prominent Senator, who assured him that it was a fraud; that it had never received the sanction of the legislature, and that it had not even been considered in the Senate. The Governor responded that he would be in no haste to sign the bill, having until next session to consider it." Yet he did sign it on the 19th of June.

On the 9th instant, through the Pittsburg Post, we learn that—

Mr. Dechert drew attention to the fact that an important Senate amendment to the bill relative to the pay of Philadelphia policemen, was omitted by the transcribers before being sent to the Governor, who signed the bill without it.

Remarks followed from Messrs. Davis, Buckalew, Gray, Brooke and White, in which facts in past legislation were cited, showing that bills became laws without ever having passed either House, or were deliberately mutilated before reaching the executive.

If this is not "piling on the agony," fellow-citizens, we would like to know what will do it. Is'nt it outrageous? We are not only the victims of special laws corruptly passed, but we are under the yoke of those that never have passed. If this is not the climax of audacity among the rascals who speculate in legislation, what can it be that will come next?

A special investigation committee—Messrs. Dechert, Petriken and Gray—has been appointed, and it is to be hoped they will probe the matter thoroughly and bring the guilty to deserved punishment.

The Nation gives the following beautiful picture of carpet-bagism:

It is certain that none of the carpet-bag governments at the South, not even the South Carolina ring, is more corrupt and debassed than that of Loiusiana. Under it the taxes have risen from thirty-seven and a-half cents on the one hundred dollars in 1866, to two dollars in 1871, and it has raised the State debt from fourteen thousand five hundred in 1868, to nearly forty-nine millions in 1871. Before the war, a sixty days' session of the legislature cost from one hundred thousand dollars to two hundred thousand dollars; the regular and extra session of the legislature cost seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars in 1870, and the regular session alone of 1871 cost over nine hundred thousand dollars. The modes of stealing, too, adopted by these rascals bear the most striking resemblance to the operations of the New York ring, from which they have doubtless been copied. We have before us the report on the accounts of of the legislature 1871, made by order of the district court of New Orleans, in proceedings instituted against the State auditor. The commissioner only got hold of the books with great difficulty, and he found enormous frauds of five kinds; alteration and erasure of warrants; forgery of names on warrants; issue of warrants by unauthorized persons, for purposes forbidden by law, or in payment of services nor rendered. The legislature appropriated for the expenses of the General Assembly six hundred and forty-seven thousand four hundred and forty dollars for 1871. Under this the thieves forthwith issued warrants for eighty-eight thousand one hundred and twenty-eight dollars; and when inquiry is made, it is found that the books of the warrant clerk and of the chairman of the committee on contingent expenses have been lost! The committee on charitable institutions stole seven thousand four hundred and twenty dollars by drawing mileage for tours of inspection which they never made. The committee on railroads stole thirteen thousand three hundred and fifty-six dollars in a similar manner. The committee on banks stole six thousand two hundred dollars in the same way, and the committee on canals and drainage followed their example.

Governor Reed Impeached.

Tallahassee, February 12.—The resolution impeaching Governor Harrison B. Reed passed the house of representatives by the necessary two-thirds vote, and was sent to the senate and officially received by that body. Lieutenant Governor Samuel C. Day, an honest republican, will take the oath of office as acting governor to-night or to-morrow morning.

The fight is entirely in the radical ranks, between the carpet-bag ring from the north—which has plundered the state already of millions, and is now scheming to squeeze the last dollar from the state before it goes into bankruptcy—and the repbblicans permanently settled here and identified with the interests of the state. The passage of the impeachment resolution is looked upon as a stunning blow to the "ring" and as a victory which will probably result in the complete overthrow of the corruptionists.

There is but little doubt of conviction. Of course the acts complained of can be clearly proved, and are sufficient to send Reed to the state penitentiary, much less oust him from the governorship; but the facts have little influence on the question like this, while money and politics have much. The senate is composed of eleven democrats and thirteen republicans, making seventeen votes necessary for conviction.

The democracy of Bedford in their recent county convention unanimously passed the following:

"*Resolved*, That it is the earnest desire of the democrats of Bedrord county, as it should be of all patriotic citizins, that the several political elements whose common creed is the preservation of our liberal from of government and resistance to the centralizing influences and corrupt practices which under the present nond-script administration are so rapidly undermining the foundations of our republican system, may unite upon candidates and a platform of principles at the impending presidential election, and that mutual concessions looking to such a union may be freely and cheerfully made."

This resolution is of the true patriotic temper, and will be endorsed by every democrat who sincerely desires the overthrow of the present dominant party.

Activity of the Bonapartists.

Paris, February 15.—The Bonapartist adherents are exerting themselves to create a feeling among the workmen of certain cities in favor of the ex-Emperor.

The Alabama Claims.

Paris, February 15.—It is reported on good authority that the United States will not waive their claims on England for indirect damages, but may be induced to moderate them.

Hon. Chas Francis Adams, American member of the Geneva Tribunal, will return to Europe in May.

Three Children Burned Alive.

Winona, Minn., February 13.—In Jefferson, in this county, early on Tuesday morning, the residence of Julius Haus, together with his live stock, were burned. The wind was blowing a gale, and before the inmates could be awakened the entire upper portion of the house was a mass of flames. Three children were burned to death.

What the British Press Says On the Alabama Claims.

[From the London Times, January 31.]

The Treaty No Agreement at All.

In the conference on the 13th of April, 1871, the part of the treaty relating to the Alabama claims was discussed. They are described in the words of the President, in the original letter of the 30th of January, as "the claims growing out of acts committed by the Alabama and other vessels escaped from British troops, and generally known as the Alabama claims." The terms may seem vague, but it will be observed that the United States commissioners had bound themselves by an introductory statement that they presented no estimate of "indirect losses" (in respect of the prolongation of the war and loss of shipping trade), but reserved their right to make such a claim in the event of an amicable settlement not being made. It appears now that they state that they only meant this account of their claim to operate in case of the adoption of the particular "amicable settlement" then proposed by them—namely, by the Joint High Commissioners agreeing upon a gross sum to be paid by the United Kingdom. That mode of settlement seems to have been at once declined by the British Commissioners but the definition of the claim was not withdrawn. From that moment the two contracting parties do not appear to have meant the same thing by the words which they used, and with all the signing and sealing, there was no real agreement come to.

All Depends Upon What the Commissioners Say—Probably "the Most Tremendous Blunder Ever Perpetrated."

[From the Pall Mall Gazette, Jan., 30.]

If we now look to the language of the treaty for support of our own view of the agreement, we find no positive support in it at all. It is sufficiently negative for our argument, and that is the best we can make of it. It is perfectly compatible with the American demand, but it does not discountenance the assertion that the whole of that demand, as now presented, was not included in the understanding on which the treaty was based; it leaves us free to maintain that the admission of claims for indirect loss as matter of probability was no part of the understanding. We shall be lucky if we have anything to show the real scope of the argument, and that it was by implication limited to direct losses. Of this we the public cannot yet judge; but there is too much reason to fear that no documentary or other tangible evidence to that effect exists. Probably, therefore, everything turns upon the question whether as a matter of fact, of which there is and can be no doubt in the minds of the British commissioners and the British government, the good faith of the understanding is violated by the American demand; whether they can assert in perfect confidence that to the knowledge of the American commissioners no such demands were meant to be admitted for arbitration or would have been admitted; and that to use the language of the treaty in support of the claim for such admission is to force on it a significance it was never intended to bear. Of course, if our government cannot say this with absolute certainty of being in the right there is an end of the matter. In that case, we must take the consequences of one of the most tremendous blunders ever perpetrated.

To the Tribunal All Must Go.

[From the London Morning Post.]

We have no right to complain of the construction which the American government seeks to put on the treaty. This is made on all-fours with the speech of a plaintiff's counsel when submitting his client's cause to the jury. The proper course for her Majesty's government to take is to prepare in due course a reply to the American government, leaving to the latter the opportunity, to which it is undoubtedly entitled in equity, to reply, after the lapse of two months. We have no right to call upon the tribunal to reject peremptorily on motion any claims, however preposterous, which may be put forward by the American government. The construction of the treaty, and of everything connected with it, has been referred by us, as by the government of the United States, to a special tribunal, and we, like our opponents, must be content to leave everything unreservedly in its hands.

Mr. Patterson, from Liverpool, Astonished—The President Did Not Tell Him Anything About the "Case."

[To the Editor of the London Times.]

Sir: I have read with some concern, and I must add, considerable surprise, your article upon the Alabama claims, from which I learn that "the case" upon behalf of the United States suggests England's liability for an enormous sum, in the shape of indirect damages for the prolongation of the war, or, in other words, remote consequential damages. I beg to say that no such view of the Washington Treaty came under my observation in the last four months, which I have mainly spent in the United States, having only left New York a fortnight ago. It is true General Butler some three months ago endeavored to fasten odium upon the United States government by alleging that the treaty surrendered American fishing privileges; and also that a foreign diplomatist, who is probably now in England, on route for a colder climate, did at a social party in my presence "nag" some American gentlemen, including a United States Senator, with suggestions of its involving claims for all the cotton, &c., burnt at the South owned by British subjects. Another British gentleman and myself were informed that we had surrendered fifty miles of coast in the Pacific, which did not appear to us, however unhappy, to involve national decadence. There was, however, no suggestion of liability for consequential damages, even from that lynx-eyed critic who was conspicuously anxious to find "a hole in your coats," and had the will to "prent it;" nor in any other company or place, private or public, in America, in speech, writing, or print, did the suggestion reach me; nay, I my add, I am pursuaded that to the mercantile communities it will come as a disagreeable surprise when they read in the *Times* of this morning of England's liability for $1,000,000,000 indirect damages occasioned by the Alabama. I have enjoyed frequent opportunities of conversation upon international topics with merchants, bankers, lawyers and even statesmen, such as Mr. Sumner and others, including an interview with the President at Christmas; *and notably from him*, but I may add universally, I met expressions of satisfaction at the treaty, as assuring the permanent reunion of good feeling and lasting friendship between the ocean-divided, English speaking peoples. Your obedient servant,

JOHN PATTERSON.

Liverpool, January 29.

CONGRESS.

THE SOUTHERN VULTURES.

A Kentucky member stirring up the Unclean blood.

A Scathing Personal Explanation—Masterly Ruling of Speaker Blaine—The Thieves of the South Stripped to the Buff, and Exhibited to the Country.

Washington, Feb. 16.—In the House today, Mr. Beck (Dem., Ky.) asked leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr Stevenson (Rep., Ohio) inquired whether Mr. Beck intended to say anything personal to a Senator.

Messrs. Dawes, Banks, W. R. Roberts, and other members sustained the right of Mr. Beck to make a personal explanation, even though he did reflect on a Senator.

The Speaker put the question as to whether there was objection, and none was made.

Mr. Beck then proceeded with his remarks. He did not intend, he said, to use any billingsgate or slang, or to degrade the House by any allusions which members would say were not eminently proper. It was more important to him that he should be right, and that the House should say that he was right in the remarks for which he had been arraigned in the Senate. In that speech he had said that Gov. Brownlow, of Tennessee, had

Made A Pendemonium

of that State. He (Mr. Beck) had been on the committee to investigate the condition of the South, and when he had come to look over the condition of things in Tennessee, from the close of the war for four years, he saw such a state of things as existed nowhere else on the American continent; and it was because he found that state of things so existing that he had made the remarks to which exception had been taken. If those facts did not exist then he was guilty of slander; but if they did exist, and if he should prove to the House that State had been by misrule made a pandemonium for four year, after the war closed, then he was not guilty of any slander. He should either stand before the House as a wilful and malicious libeller, or he should stand confirmed by the facts, as he would show them. Before he would say a word as to the personal attack upon himself, he wanted to show to the House that he was right in saying that Tennessee had been a pandemonium for four years.

Raising a Point of order.

Mr. Stevenson (Rep., Ohio) asked the Chair, as a question of order, whether in a personal explanation a member had a right to proceed in a general discussion on the State of Tennessee.

The Speaker replied that it had been repeatedly ruled that when a member was permitted to make a personal explanation he was not limited as to what he should say, except that he must be within the rules of the House.

Mr. Beck said he desired to show the condition of things in Tennessee, as that was the great point in the matter. He detested the right of any member to make use of the privileges of the floor to malign or slander, any one outside of it and whatever he had said he had said on his responsibility as a man, and he was prepared to prove its truth. He then proceeded to show

The Condition of things in Tennessee

from 1865 to 1869; how the Legislature, by a series of acts unparalleled in American history, constituted itself a body not representing one-tenth part of the population; how seditious laws were passed; how persons were arrested for speaking disrespectfully of the Governor; how there was an outlawry of persons, an outlawry of the press, an outlawry of the franchise, an outlawry of everything which did not bow to the mandates of the men in power. He showed how seventy thousand citizens of the State had been disfranchised by law; how the Governor had disfranchised twenty-eight counties in Tennessee because they had elected to the Legislature men who were hostile to him; how he had reduced the vote of the State from 150,000 to 39,000; how he had only allowed nineteen men to be registered in the whole county of Henry, and how no man was allowed to vote who was not known to be in favor of the Legislature and the Governor, and of everything that they did.

Renewing the point of order.

Messrs. Garfield and Stevenson (Rep., Ohio) renewed the point of order that the remarks of Mr. Beck were not in the nature of a personal explanation.

The Speaker overruled the point of order, and was sustained in his position by Mr. Banks, who said that the Speaker was entirely correct, and that Mr. Beck was in accord with the practice of the House.

Mr. Garfield sent to the Speaker a written question—"Whether, when a member gets permission to make a personal explanation, it is on the implied pledge that he will confine himself to the personal explanation, and not make a general political speech?"

The Speaker replied that that still left the original question open as to whether the gentleman himself regarded his own remarks as a personal explanation. The present occupant of the chair had always endeavored to circumscribe and confine personal explanations somewhat more within bounds than had been the usage. He recalled on one distinct occasion the speech of his immediate predecessor, Mr. Colfax, and a similar ruling of his other predecessor, Mr. Banks, who had so kindly given him the aid of his experience to-day—that where the consent of the House is given for a personal explanation, it is within the discretion of the gentleman himself to say what he chooses within the rules of the House.

Mr. Bank's (Rep., Mass.)—That is the practice.

A Third Interruption.

Mr. Beck resumed his remarks, but was soon interrupted again by a point of order made by Mr. Hale (Rep., Me.) similar to those already made and overruled.

The Speaker in overruling it remarked that in his judgement neither the gentleman from Maine (Hale) nor neither of the gentlemen from Ohio (Stevenson and Garfield) could dictate to the gentleman from Kentucky the line of argument.

After further interruptions Mr. Beck resumed his remarks, and repeated that the great point which he desired to make was that he had not falsely charged any man when he said that a pandemonium had been in Tennessee. If he had said that the condition of things in Tennessee was a hell, he would have been nearer the truth.

Mr. Stevenson (excitedly)—And made so by demons. [Laughter.]

Brownlow's Rule in Tennessee.

Mr. Beck—I say now that no man can read over the record of Tennessee and see how, step by step, that condition of things was produced, how men were disfranchised; how a militia was organized and put over the people; how military orders were executed; how proclamations were issued; how martial law was declared and executed, without seeing that what I said of the State in that connection was strictly true, and that it was the worst governed State on the American continent.

He proceeded to read from the testimony of witnesses who, he said, were strictly loyal men, and said that he would print the rest of it in the *Globe*.

Mr. Stevenson objected to the printing of anything that was not read.

Mr Beck—Then I will read the whole of it; and I give notice that nothing shall go in the *Globe* in the future that is not read. He then went on to quote from the testimony of witnesses, and said;

Denouncing Brownlow's Slander.

On that I was assailed. I was charged with being the vilest of men, with having left a livery stable and taken up the slave drivers' lash, and deserving the scorn and contempt of all decent men. I would not notice it, but for the fact that what has been said against me will go to all the world. I am willing to stand on my record before my people at home. They knew me, they have trusted me, but they cannot speak to the whole American people as I can speak to-day from this place; and when gentlemen rise in their places anywhere—I do not care where,—and charge that I am a man who is not to be trusted or believed because I am so vile, and came from so vile quarters, and am guilty of such vile practices, I denounce it here and denounce it everywhere. I know why all these charges were made. What I said about a pandemonium in Tennessee was said about all the other Southern States, and a good deal more about some of them. One man, Davis of Texas, was looking me in the face when I said it. I said more against Gov. Bullock of Georgia, who sat by my side, and they are not all cripples, not all embeciles. I have

Never Told a Lie,

and I am prepared to prove every fact I have stated here or elsewhere. They thought they would put a man to speak against me of whom they could say that he is a cripple, that he cannot write, that he cannot read, that he cannot walk, and they shield themselves behind him. They are not all cripples. All the rest of them can walk. I will prove what I said against every one of them, and it is because they know that I will do it; it is because Reed of Florida, Scott of South Carlina, and Davis of Texas, and all of them know that I will prove it, because they know that I have been prominent in getting up a report which will be before the country in less than a week, that they are trying to blacken me so that when people take up the report and read it they may say: "Oh, it's that fellew Beck, who was a negro driver that says this!" That is their game, that is the reason why they selected a poor old imbecile to attack me.

Mr. Stevenson again, made a point of order against Mr. Beck, and was again overruled by the Speaker, who said he had been listening very attentively and the gentlemen from Kentucky had not violated any parliamentary rule.

The charge preferred that he had been a slave driver was a lie, and he hurled it back on all those men with the scorn it deserved. He felt humiliated at having to tell all this, and he would not have done so had the attempt merely been to injure him personally; but the object to was to destroy the power and effect of what he had said, and of what he would continue to say against the carpet-bag governments of the South, and all their frauds, all their corruptions, all their rascalities. He knew what it was all done for; he knew why a feeble old man had been selected to attack him by others who were more deeply implicated than he. In order to exhibit Mr. Brownlows' consistency in attacking any man as a slave-driver, he read some extracts from the debate between Messrs. Brownlow and Pruyn, twelve or fifteen years ago, in the House, in which Mr. Brownlow took the position that American slavery ought to be perpetuated; that slavery was the inevitable condition of human society, and that God always intended the relation of master and slave to exist. He (Mr. Beck) commended these extracts to the other side of the House. [Laughter.] He asked them to read Mr. Brownlow's speeches made in 1860, in which he denounced the Abolitionists, and spoke of

Vice-President Hamlin as a Free Negro.

As to Mr. Brownlow's laying the lash on his (Mr. Beck's) back, if he were stronger, than he was, he said, no man ever laid a lash on his back or struck him a blow, and no man should and live. Mr. Brownlow could not say so much for himself, as Fayette McMullen knew. He (Mr. Beck) was no braggart, and no blackguard; any fishwoman could beat him at abuse; but he repelled with honest indignation the charge made against him that he had ever been guilty of anything unworthy either of himself, his family, or his people. He represented the proudest district in America, a district which had more capacity to produce all that was requisite for human life than many of the states. It had sent men to Congress who were worthy of their positions, however unworthy he himself might be. He was following men whose names it was unnecessary to mention, and who recalled

The Time-Honored Ashland District

of Kentucky. They had seen fit to send him here three consecutive times. He had come among them poor, friendless, and so far from feeling that he disgraced them because he had been poor, and had labored for a living, his example had been held up to the young men of the district. He knew that he had been denounced because he had always been the advocate and friend of the poor down-trodden Southern States. He had married a Virginia woman, and his children were the great great grandchildren of the full brother of George Washington. He loved the South, and would stand by it as long as he had a voice to speak. When he abandoned her because he was maligned, slandered, or ridiculed by any combination of men, might his right hand wither and his tongue cleave to the roof of his mouth. He had meant no disrespect to the Senator in any allusion he had made to it. He regarded the Senate of the United States as the highest and most honorable body on earth. There was not a man in the House who did not want to go to the Senate. [Laughter.] He knew it was

The Most Honorable Body on Earth,

and when he spoke of some of those Southern Governors who were candidates for the Senate he was not reflecting on the Senate. If anything he said looked like a reflection on the Senate he apologized for it. Clay had been there, Webster had been there, Wright had been there, Calhoun had been there. Their memories made it a sacred place. He had not said anything to reflect on the Senate; but he saw vultures sitting in the nest of the eagle and baboons taking the place of the lion, he protested against the outrage. He wanted to keep the Senate pure and high minded. He wanted to see the States represented by honorable men, not by men who forced themselves in there at the point of the bayonet, or by fraud, corruption, chicanery or ostracism. That was the way he looked at it; that was the way he felt like speaking about it. In conclusion, he thanked the House for the courtesy it had extended to him.

Mr. Beck was listened to with the greatest interest and attention by the members of the House and by the crowded galleries. He spoke with great rapidity and force, and warmly congratulated by his political friends when he concluded.

The House soon afterward adjourned.

Senate.

WASHINGTON, February 13.

Sale of Government Arms to France.

Mr. Sumner called up his resolution for an investigation into the alleged manufacture of arms for the French in workshops of the United States.

Mr Conkling was anxious to have the the resolution disposed of.

Mr. Sherman said that the resolution would lead to a political debate, and appealed to the Senate not to be diverted from practical business. If Mr. Sumner had been content to omit his long preamble and offer a simple resolution of inquiry it might be passed without debate.

Mr. Anthony objected to taking up the resolution until the appropriation bill was disposed of.

Mr. Conkling said it was not for the importance of the resolution that he wished to have it taken up at once, but on account of its peculiar character, which the rules would not permit him properly to describe. He would, however, suppose a case—the introduction of a resolution casting gross and hateful aspersions, even on the Senate, and not as this one did upon the American Government and the American people. He would say to the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Anthony) that in such case he would insist on the immediate consideration of the resolution, even if one hundred appropriation bills were waiting. So he wanted this resolution disposed of because of the imputations and statements accompanying it, groundless, as he believed them to be.

After further discussion the resolution was taken up and Mr. Sumner addressed the Senate. The subject, he said, was interesting and important in two aspects, as it concerned foreign powers. All must unite in a desire to redeem our country from the suspicion of

Moral Obliquity.

He would speak not of men, but of facts, and if anybody should be pointed at, by the statement he was about to make, it would be the fault of facts and not his.

He had brought forward this subject with great reluctance, and after long delay. The main facts had been brought to his knowledge before Christmas, but he had postponed bringing them into the Senate because he knew they had been laid before the President and Secretary of War, and he had reason to believe that they would institute an inquiry. They had not done so, however, but the Secretary of War had made to the House of Representatives a report upon the subject. The character of that report would judge whether it did not fall under some of the suspicion which attached to the whole transaction. In setting forth facts he must

Introduce Two Characters upon the Scene.

Mr. Place, late Consul-General of France at New York, and Samuel Remington, of Ilion, New York.

Place had been accused of fraud, and upon his second trial had been convicted, mainly upon the testimony of Remington, who was subpoenaed as a witness in the French courts by certificate from our Secretary of War.

At the expiration of the morning hour the Legislative Appropriation Bill came up as unfinished business.

Mr. Trumbull moved to postpone it, and continue the discussion of Mr. Sumner's resolution.

Mr. Sherman appealed to the majority of the Senate not to allow themselves to be drawn into a political debate by taking up this resolution. If they did he would not be present. He warned the majority that it was unwise for them to permit their adversaries to

Drive Them into Wrangling Political Debate,

everytime they chose to wave a red flag in their faces. Everybody knew that there was no objection to any proper inquiry into this matter, but the Senate out to object to this attempt to get up a political debate in advance upon alleged facts not yet investigated.

Mr. Tipton reminded Mr. Sherman of the storm which greeted the tactics of those who opposed the resolution for inquiry at New York, and said the real motive for opposing this one was not because it had a preamble, but because it proposed a thorough, bold and manly investigation. He did not wonder at it, because

The Majority had got Enough of Investigation.

but they must take a little more, and could not escape it by any political subterfuge.

Mr. Wilson favored an immediate and full investigation of this subject, and did not fear that it would injure the administration or the Republican party.

Mr. Morton was ready to vote upon the resolution without debate. He had no power to avoid the debate, and if he had he would not do it. Here was a resolution, involving the most enormous suspicions against members of this Government, and reaching even to a member of the Cabinet, even if not higher. He believed there was nothing in it, that it was

A Mere Blank Cartridge,

but he knew very well that if the Senate should refuse to consider it now, no matter for good reason, the refusal would be made the basis for the most infamous calumnies. The Senate had better let the cartridge be exploded at once.

Mr. Trumbull thought Mr. Sherman's speech remarkable, and wondered what he meant by speaking of

"Our Adversaries, and a Red Flag."

Mr. Sherman said he had alluded to the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) who had introduced this preamble and resolution, and he appealed to Mr. Trumbull to say whether he had ever known a Senator moving an investigation to insist on putting into the preamble the facts to be investigated.

Mr Trumbull replied that the basis of the proposed examination must be set out in some way, and it was a mere matter of taste whether they should be stated in writing, in a preamble, or orally in the Senate. In either case they would go before the public.

But what did the Senator (Mr. Sherman) mean by talking of adversaries? Surely the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) was not politically an adversary of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Sherman.) And why did the Senator expect a political debate on this question? Surely this was not a political question.

Mr. Sherman—My honorable friend is very innocen. [Laughter.] Can there be any motive under heaven in pressing this resolution now, except to invite a political discussion. My friends from New York and Indiana (Messrs. Conkling and Morton) are eager for the fray, and my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) is

Eager for the Fray.

Mr. Sumner—I am not. I give notice to my friend that I am not going into a political discussion I leave that to those whom the Senator calls adversaries. [Laughter.]

Mr. Carpenter said the country was on the eve of a political campaign. It was well understood that the President was to be renominated, and it was also generally understood that three or four Senators had long been preparing a bombshell which at the proper time was to be exploded and

Blow Gen. Grant and His Friends out of Water

That bombshell had been introduced into the Senate. The Senator (Mr. Sumner) had just lighted the fuse and he (Carpenter) was in favor of having the explosion at once [Laughter.]

Mr. Scott welcomed the resolution as an indication that we were to have, in this country, genuine civil service reform. A few months since the country had been startled by an exposure of the corruption and frauds of an organization in New York, which controlled the Democratic party.

Ever since, the Democratic leaders had been seeking materials for counter charges. In that search they had been coquetting with persons, who were supposed to be

Disaffected Toward the Administration,

and this resolution was one of the results. He hoped the resolution would be passed and the matter throughly investigated.

The resolution was taken up by a vote of 49 yeas to 7 nays.

Mr. Sumner resumed. The Senators, opposed to this resolution, had professed to be afraid of a political discussion, and had proceeded to discuss politics. They were afraid of an attack on the administration. So they had proceeded to defend it. One of them,

Fearing an Attack on Gen. Grant,

had undertaken to defend him. He (Sumner) was not going to make a political speech at all. He would simply speak of the public service with a view of relieving his country from suspicion. He would neither introduce the name of Gen. Grant, nor make any allusion to him. He would leave that for his adversaries. [Laughter.]

SEEING IS DECEIVING.—Here is a row of ordinary capital letters and figures—SSSSXXXXZZZZ33 38888 They are such as are made up of two parts of equal shapes. Look carefully at these and you will perceive that the upper halves of the characters are a very little smaller than the lower halves—so little that an ordinary eye will declare them to be of equal size. Now turn the page upside down, and, without any careful looking, you will see that this difference in size is very much exaggerated—that the real top half of the letter is very much smaller than the bottom half. It will be seen from this that there is a tendency in the eye to enlarge the upper part of any object upon which it looks. We might draw two circles of unequal size, and so place them that they should appear equal.—*Once a Week.*

INTERESTING TO ALL TRAVELERS.—The Harrisburg Patriot says; "An important railway decision has just received affirmation by the New York Court of Appeals. Dorathe Rawson sued the Pennsylvania rail road company to recover $4,000 for loss of baggage. On behalf of the defense it was insisted that as there was a condition printed on the ticket upon which the plaintiff was riding at the time of the loss, the company would not be liable to exceed $100 and she could not recover more than that sum. On trial below the plaintiff obtained judgement for $4,000, and the Court of Appeals have affirmed that judgement. This decision maintains as law that the clauses on railroad tickets limiting the loss to $100 for baggage does not limit such loss. This is a decision of a long-mooted and frequently contested question."

CAUTION.—Notice is hereby given, that all the personal and moveable property, belonging to George B. Harpster, of Centre Hall was, on the 12th of February, 1872, purchased by the undersigned, at sheriff's sale, namely, all blacksmith tools, machinery, woodwork, finished and unfinished vehicles, &c., belonging to the several shops heretofore occupied by said Geo. B. Harpster, together with the horses, harness, and all the household and kitchen furniture of the same. The same will be left in the possession of said Geo. B. Harpster, at the pleasure of the undersigned, and all persons are hereby cautioned against meddling with the said property in any manner whatever.

O. F. HERLACHER,
GEO. DURST.

NOTICE.

The public are hereby notified that the blacksmithing and coachmaking heretofore carried on at Centre Hall by Geo. B. Harpster, will be continued at the old stand by the undersigned. All contracts for work, in said shops must be made with the undersigned C. F. HERLACHER,
GEO. DURST.
feb16.3t

FURNITURE!
Grand Opening
FOR 1872,
AT
JOHN CAMP'S
MILROY,
where he has opened with a very large stock of the latest styles, both fancy and common
Parlor, Chamber and Kitchen Furniture.
CHAIRS,
of all kinds.
All kinds of repairing done with neatness and dispatch having four good workmen at the bench. I am prepared to do all kinds of custom work, fine or common.
Thankful for past favors, I hope by strict attention to business you and everybody else will show smiling faces at my new ware rooms.
JOHN CAMP.
jan12.tf.

THE MANUFACTURERS OF THE
Reliance Wringer,
Have had unusual opportun