The Democratic Watchman.

BELLEFONTE, PA.

FRIDAY MORNING, APIL 17, 1868.

Minority Report on the Robison-Shugert Contested Election Case.

The report of Geo. D. Jackson and R. L. Linderman, the minority of the Committee, sworn to try the matter of the contested election in the 21st Senatorial district, between John K. Robison, contestant, and Samuel T. Shugert, sitting member.

Respectfully showeth, that the election returns in said district, which is composed of the counties of Blair, Centre, Huntingdon, Mifflin, Juniata and Perry, gave Sam'l T Shugert, 14,124 votes and John K. Robison 14 102 votes thus giving a majority of 22 votes to Samuel T. Shurgert the sitting member.

The committee were sworn on the 9th day of January, 1868, "to try the matter of the petition and to give true judgment thereon, according to the evidence."

This to us seemed clearly to confine the committee within the charges alleged in the petition, then presented to the Senate. Several days after being thus sworn, a paper seems to have been left with the clerk of the committee, which was never presented to the committee, or read, and which contained many charges in addition to those specified in the petition, which we were sworn to try.

The sitting member moved to dismiss that paper, and strike out all of the matter contained in the testimony under the same for the following reasons

First Because the so called "Amendments" were not signed by the Petitioner, as required by the statute, to wit "By at least, twenty qualified electors of the district."

Second Because the alleged "Amendments" are not accompanied by an affidavit taken and subscribed by at least five of the Petitioners, that the facts herein stated are true to best of their knowledge and belief, as required by the statute.

Third Because the alleged "Amendments" are not accompanied by a certificate from the Treasurer, Prothonotary or Commissioners of the county where the Petitioners reside, setting forth that the said Petitioners, at the time of signing the same, were qualified electors of the district, as required by statute.

Fourth Because the alleged "Amendments" to the petition were not presented to the *Senate* within ten days after the organization of the Legislature next succeeding the election, as required by the statute, to give the Senate jurisdiction in the case: which statute provides and enjoins as follows: "But no petition complaining of an undue election or false return of a person elected Governor, Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives, *shall be acted* upon by the Legislature" unless the foregoing requisites are complied with.

Fifth Because this Committee has no power, right or authority in law, nor discretion in equity or otherwise, to permit, allow or consent, that the original petition presented to the Senate in this case, shall, may or can be amended in the manner proposed in this case, or in any other manner whatsoever, as the Committee have no jurisdiction or control over the question of "Amendments" to the original petition.

Sixth Because the issue in this case between the Contestant and Respondent is founded by and upon the petition, and answer, which can neither be enlarged nor diminished by the Committee.

Seventh Because the Committee are solmnly bound, by the oaths they have taken in this case, "to try the matter of the petition, and to give a true judgment thereon according to the evidence, unless the Committee be dissolved."

Eighth Because the Committee are not sworn to try or decide any facts set out in the so-called "Amendments to the Petition."

Ninth Because even if the statute were not imperitive in forbidding the Committee to exercise jurisdiction in allowing amendments to the petition, it would be both inequitable and unjust to allow or act upon the amendments in this case, for the reason that the Committee have refused to allow amendments to Respondent's answer, or hear evidence of facts not set out in the answer.

In support of these reasons, the statute in reference to contested elections is cited—Act of July 2, 1839, sec. 129, Pamph Laws, 527: Pur Dig p. 388, pl 158, and pl 166—179.

Dauphin County, ss

Samuel T Shugert, being duly sworn, deposeth and saith that the facts set forth in the foregoing "Reasons," are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

SAMUEL T. SHUGERT.

Sworn and subscribed before me, this 24th March, 1868

OLIVER EDWARDS,
Mayor of the city of Harrisburg, Pa.

We were off the opinion, and are now of the opinion, that this motion should have been allowed.

The evidence given in support of this paper, falling with it, and neither being any part of the case, and both being beyond our jurisdiction, the case of the contestant utterly failed, for under the petition we were sworn to try, the preponderance of evidence was largely in favor of the sitting member.

This result becomes to us apparent in view as well of our oaths, as of the words of the statute, and the clear policy of the law in restraining charges of this character within (10) ten days of the meeting of the Legislature.

Here, in our view, the case should have ended with a report in favor of the sitting member.

The majority of the committee having decided otherwise, we proceed to detail the evidence as it came before us.

The whole committee agree in ignoring the question of the legality of alleged *deserter* votes, and in having this class of voters where the general election returns have placed them.

The whole of the committee unite in throwing out of the return the whole vote of Taylor township, in the county of Centre, for the reason that the election was not held at the place fixed by law, or the Sheriff's proclamation; the majority in that township for the contestant was eighteen (18) votes, which is to be deducted from the whole number of votes given for John K Robison, the contestant.

The sitting member proved sixty-eighty illegal votes cast for John K. Robison, the contestant, in different parts of the district, comprising those under age, not paying taxes, aliens and non-residents.

The contestant claimed to have proven twenty three (23) votes of this character in different parts of the district: of these there were but five (5) votes which were clearly proven to have been illegal, and three thereof were not proven to have voted at the sitting member.

Under this branch of the case, there are sixty three (63) votes which should be deducted from the return of John K Robison.

We find no reason for complying with the request of the contestant to throw out the vote of the township of Carbon, in the county of Huntingdon.

The election was held at a hotel, the place fixed by law; there was neither charge nor evidence of fraud or unfairness in holding the election.

The election box contained the list of voters and oaths of the officers of the election, the tally list there found agreed with the return of the election made to the Prothonotary and produced before the Committee.

The Assessor of the district was called and sworn, and there was no proof made by him, or any other witness that any one voted at the polls who was not duly assessed and paid taxes. The only evidence to affect the poll was that the doors were open during the day and whilst the votes were being counted the only evidence of disorder was that a drunken man came into the room and was put out during the election. There was evidence that William Plumb an unnaturalized foreigner, voted but was not proven to have voted and there was no evidence that any but this one Plumb vote was received in the absence of the full board of officers. There was no evidence produced to show that the list of ten day assessments was upon the list of taxables furnished by the clerk to the county commissioners.

There were therefore no such irregularities as should vitiate the poll.

This result of opinion will produce justice to a large number of legal voters as well as to that district as in the districts of Porter, Lincoln, Union, Dublin and Cass in Huntingdon county, which cast an aggregate majority for Robison of about three hundred and sixty seven (367) votes, all of which under the doctrine contended for by the counsel for the contestant, we would be compelled to throw out, and we are clearly sustained in this ruling by the decision of the committee, the majority of which refused to receive testimony in support of the allegations of respondent's answer, "that the election officers in Taylor township Blair county, were not sworn as required by law," the proof of which was ready to be produced but the majority decided *that even if it were proven that the officers of that poll were not sworn, such an irregularity would not vitiate the said election.*

It was clearly proven that in Porter township Huntingdon county; all of the workmen at Barree Forge and Hafle d's iron works voted without having first paid a State or county tax, as required by law, and the word tax does not appear opposite the name of a single voter on the whole list, which contains three hundred and thirty four (334) names although it was shown that very many of them voted on tax. It was also clearly proven that the ballot box of Lincoln township Huntingdon county, was not left in the custody of a justice of the peace, as required by law, but was left with a man named Beaver, and that the election officers refused to give that box to the justice of the peace when he called for it.

It was proven that at the election in Union township, Huntingdon county, the doors were open, and persons other than the officers were in the room all day; that the ballot boxes were exposed in such manner as to give ample opportunity for stuffing the same, and it was proven by one witness that he went twice to the window to vote, and found no officers in charge of the ballot boxes at either time, and when he did vote he was obliged to call the officers together to receive it, that he went into the room, found a crowd of persons in there, but did not recognize any of the officers of the election among them.

It was proven by one of the inspectors that in Dublin township, Huntingdon county, the election officers left the house and closed the polls for nearly an hour, in violation of law; that during the election the room was full of persons having no authority there, and that whilst the votes were being counted the room was crowded with those persons, who surrounded the table and hindered the officers thereof in the performance of their duties.

It was proven that in Cass township, Huntingdon county, that one Clarkson acted as clerk in the absence of the sworn clerks, that he kept the tally lists while the ballots were being counted, and that he was not an officer of the election, nor sworn; that names were added to the lists of voters after the polls were closed, and the votes counted; that two of the officers were absent at times, and votes were received in their absence, that the doors were open to all comers and goers, and that crowds of such persons surrounded the table whilst votes were being received and counted.

We cannot assent to the doctrine that the legal voter is to be disfranchised by the act of the fraudulent voter; nor that whole districts are to be throw out upon trifling irregularities, on the part of election officers, but if this doctrine were sustained, we feel assured, that an impartial investigation of all the facts surrounding the condition of the poll in the several townships of Carbon, Porter, Lincoln, Cass, Union and Dublin, in the county of Huntingdon; Taylor and Rush, in the county of Centre, and Taylor in the county of Blair, will give to the sitting member, Sam'l T. Shugart, his seat by more than two hundred majority.

For these reasons we cannot agree to reject the poll of the townships of Carbon in the county of Huntingdon, and for like reasons we cannot assent to throw out the whole poll of the township of Rush in the county of Centre.

The township of Rush and district of Philipsburg, are connected and vote in the same building, and contestants alleged that forty two persons whose names they give, were unnaturalized foreigners, and voted at those polls. The poll lists of both of these districts were produced, and established the fact that but fifteen of the persons named, voted at those polls, *three*, thereof, to wit: Mathew Smith, Michael McDonough and Michael Feeny in Rush township, and the remaining twelve in the borough of Philipsburg two of these twelve, John Gibbons and Martin Fallow, were proven to be citizens of Philipsburg, and did not belong to the railroad gang. Certificates of naturalization were produced under the seal of the proper officer showing that six of those voting in Philipsburg, and alleged to be unnaturalized, were naturalized citizens. It was proved that William Carrigan, who was alleged to be unnaturalized, did vote and vote the Republican ticket. Of the remaining six who voted in these two districts, there was no proof as to how they voted nor for whom they voted, but the poll list of Rush township shows that Samuel T Shugart had nine votes *less* for Senator than Sharswood had for Supreme Judge and it was proven that in Philipsburg two men voted on naturalization papers granted in the State of New York, and several others on papers granted in Cumbria and Elk Counties.—It was also shown that one of these voting in Rush township voted on a paper, certified in the State of New York.

The sweeping allegation of fraud charged in reference to these two districts are not sustained by the proof in the case, because the whole number of votes polled in 1867 were but six more than those polled in 1866, while the locality is the terminus of a recently completed railway, and is a growing and thriving village, they are based upon the statement of one Michael O Meara, who is shown to have been in communication with one H. B. Swope, before the election, in reference to this vote. O'Meara was a boss upon the railroad, and was discharged for misconduct, on the 24th of September before the election.—His testimony was mainly hearsay, except that he swore that he aided in bringing to the polls a number of Irishmen, whose names he gave. He was flatly contradicted by proof, that five of the persons he said had voted at Philipsburg under his direction, did not vote at all, and were not upon the job at the time of the election, but had been discharged weeks before and were not in the neighborhood, at all; That James McDonald, who was one of them was called to the stand and testified that he did not vote in Philipsburg or Rush township but that he did vote in Bradford township Clearfield county, and voted the Republican ticket.

Witnesses were produced from every locality in which O Meara said he had lived, all of whom fifteen in number—proved him to be a man of bad character and utterly unworthy of credit. It was also proven, that he, O Meara, received money in pursuance of the arrangement made before the election.

The testimony of this man was successfully impeached, and should not be taken into consideration in determining the case. Without it, there was no evidence of forged naturalization papers or any one coming to the district in reference to the vote of the Irish railroad hands.

There was no proof showing that "upwards of eighty" Irish railroad hands were sent to Philipsburg and Rush township for the purpose of voting. The contestant's petition charged but 42, and the proof sustained but 15 votes in both districts. It was distinctly proven that they were taken there, to complete the work at that point; that the location and flatness of the ground prevented the work being done earlier, and that the right of way, and change of the bed of the creek were obstancles to earlier completion of the work. There was no proof that any of them were assessed before they came into the district. James McDonald, a Republican, testified that he was present when James Collins and Gorman directed the men to go to Philipsburg, and he directly contradicted the statement made by O Meara that they were sent there to vote the Democratic ticket. There was evidence of small tickets having been voted, both by railroad hands and others, and the proof was that the Republican ticket used that day was similar in size and appearance to the small Democratic ticket. It was also proven that the said small tickets were generally circulated through both districts.

The judge of the election of Rush township swore that but six Irishmen voted at that poll all day, and the poll list shows that but three of those were of the number charged as fraudulent by the contestant. This number, even if fraudulent, which is not shown, is too small to cause the rejection of the entire poll.

The board of election of that district was legally constituted, the judge was elected by the people, and the inspector having the next to the highest number of votes being absent, the person having the next highest number of votes for judge, acted as inspector under the law, and the other inspector was appointed by the judge according to law. We can therefore see no reason for rejecting the entire poll on this ground. In our opinion, there is no sufficient evidence either of the use of fraudulent naturalization papers; of illegal voting; of how the alleged fraudulent voters did vote, or of such substantial irregularities in conducting the elections in the districts of Philipsburg and Rush township, Centre county, as to cause either the whole poll, or any part of the individual votes, to be thrown out of the count.

Upon a recapitulation of the facts as we find them, we find the following to be the result, to wit:

Samuel T. Shugart received as per official return	14,124	
John K. Robison, as per official return received	14,102	
Deduct Taylor township, Centre co. 18 votes:		
Deduct difference in illegal voting 63 "		
	81	
		14,021
Leaving a clear majority for Samuel T. Shugart of		103

votes.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

GEORGE D JACKSON.
R. S. LINDERMAN.

——The Ohio legislature has passed a metropolitan police bill.

Grant and the Jews.

The "*Israelite*," the Western organ of the Jews, has dragged to the light, the well remembered order of Gen. Grant in relation to that class of people. It calls upon the Jews throghout the nation to condemn its author at the polls. We apprehend, that there is not one of that sect, who will give his support to a man who could thus wantonly insult and proscribe "this people."

—Headquarters 13th Army Corps,
Dept. of the Tennessee,
Oxford, Miss., Dec. 17, 1862.

General Order No 11.

The Jews, as a class, violating every regulation of trade established by the Treasury Department, also department orders, are hereby expelled from the department within 24 hours from the receipt of this order by post commanders.

They will see that all this class of people are furnished with passes and required to leave; and any one returning after such notification will be arrested and held in confinement until an opportunity occurs of sending them out as prisoners, unless furnished with permits from these headquarters.

No passes will be given this people to visit headquarters for the purpose of making personal application for trade permits.

John A. Rawling,
Assistant Adjutant General.

General Grant will discover that these men, whom he expelled from the Department of Tennessee within twenty-four hours from the receipt of this order by the post commanders, know how to resent such a flagrant outrage. The Jews are a power in this country. Many of them possess immense wealth and exercise a large influence. Their support as a domination is not to be lightly estimated. Immediately upon the publication of this order, Mr Pendleton, then a member of Congress, introduced in the House of Representatives, a preamble declaring the order "tyrannical, cruel and illegal," closing with the resolution, "that the said order deserves the earnest condemnation of this House and of the President as Commander in chief." It was tabled, by a vote of 68 to 53, Mr Colfax, the present Speaker, voting in favor of the resolution and thus expressing his censure of Grant's conduct. President Lincoln, when convinced that Grant had really issued this order, revoked it, and took occasion to express his hearty indignation, at the outrage. The article in the *Israelite* closes as follows.

"We have to say this: As a Jew, we cannot and will not vote for a man who has done as a more shameless injustice than any man in power, in this century, has done in any civilized country. Therefore, we hope and expect that the entire Jewish press will come out boldly and justly against the movement to nominate General Grant as President of the United States.—*Valley Spirit*

Patriotic.—Expressions like the following, from the Waxahacie Argus would no doubt be regarded by many at the North as eminently disloyal. We think, however, they are patriotic as well as just, and that the right sort of men at the North will indorse them, and consider them much more favorable to the Union than the absence of any such feeling or interest on the part of the South could be. The editor is speaking of radical policy:—*Ex*

But when we look at these things from the stand point from which they are viewed by foreign nations, we feel humiliated, degarded, and ashamed, of our American citizenship. for as American citizens we are all viewed and al alike held responsible by the world. To foreign nations, then, we stand in a position to be viewed as a people continually boasting—arrogantly boasting of our constitutional government, and the perfect protection it gives to life, liberty and property, and yet, at the same time, wilfully, deliberately and avowedly violating that constitution, inflicting capital punishment without legal trial, imprisoning without warrant and refusing the writs of habeas corpus, and destroying property by violence, fraud and confiscation. And as if this were not enough to disgust a christian world, and complete the picture of shame and degradation, we deliberately seek notoriety in infamy.

Wilson Tells a Lie.—Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, has published a letter, in which he declars that Gen Grant is not the habitual drunkard he is represented to be. Indeed, according to Wilson, the great smoker is an advocate of temperance! Forney publishes, in his "two papers, both daily," Wilson's letter, and expresses the hope that it will be read in every temperance lodge in Pennsylvania and the United States." Now, both Wilson and Forney, in attempting to represent Grant as a temperance man, know that they lie. Wendell Phillips, Rev Theodore Tilton and other Radicals, have seen Grant drunk on the streets of Washington on Sundays as well as other days and they have published what they saw with their own eyes, and have dared contradiction. More than this, it is notorious that Grant has been a hard drinker for the last twenty-five years, and had to resign his commission in the army on account of his habits. We don't know that Grant's weakness in this respect will injure him with the prominent men of his party, nearly all of whom drank to excess, but yet they should not attempt to represent him as a friend of the temperance cause when they know that he has been a sot for a quarter of a century. Such a palpable lie will only be laughed at by those who know Grant. He is a drunkard, and everybody about Washington knows this. *Carlisle Volunteer*

——We have two horse-riders as candidates for the Presidency, Dan Rice and General Grant. We propose, that in order to a correct decision as to their respective claims, there shall be an exhibition of their respective powers.—Their respective friends can agree upon the time, place, and conditions. We cannot consent to act as one of the judges, as we have already expressed our opinion very strongly in favor of Dan. But impartial judges can undoubtedly be had.—*Ex.*

Stanton on the Stand.---Possible Examination, and the "Sticking" Witness Struck.

Mr. Stanton called on witness stand:

Counsel for President—Are you Secretary of War?

Stanton—I am.

C, for Pres.—By what authority do you hold your office?

S.—By appointment of President Lincoln, confirmed by the Senate January 13, 1862. I have a commission of that date.

C. for Pres.—Admitting the constitutionality of the Tenure of Office act, when, by the terms of that act, did that commission expire?

S.—The 4th of April, 1865. The act provides that the Secretary of War (together with the rest of the Cabinet) shall hold his office during the term of the President, by whom he was appointed, and one month after.

C.—for Pres.—Have you been appointed by President Johnson and confirmed by the Senate since that date?

S.—No.

C.—for Pres.—Admitting that President Johnson is only serving out President Lincoln's second term, were you appointed by President Lincoln and confirmed by the Senate between April 4, 1865, and April 14, the day of Lincoln's death?

S.—No.

C. for Pres.—Can you show any warrent or commission for holding the office at the present time?

S.—No.

C. for Pres.—Does not the Tenure of Office act expressly provide that nothing in said act shall be construed so as to prolong the term of office of any person beyond the term for which he was originally appointed and confirmed?

S.—Yes.

C for Pres.—You have, therefore, no authority for holding the office?

S.—No.

C for Pres.—Why do you presist in holding on to it?

S.—Because I am an obstinate mule, and Sumner told me to stick, and I stuck.

C for Pres.—Have you no other warrent for holding it.

S.—No.

C. for Pres.—You may sit down.

——Notwithstanding the radical claim that their party is made up of the "pure virtuous and temperate," of the country, it would appear from the following that they have trouble with one of their leading saints, U S Senator Richard Yates of Illinois. Richard has got to be a very bad man—he will get drunk very drunk and as his party can't keep his drunkenness any longer a secret, they go for him rough, as the following from the Chicago *Journal*, a leading radical paper would indicate:

"He is intoxicated nearly all the time, day and night, and unless he changes his course soon, or resigns, the Senate will expel him. He has not been in his seat once since the opening of the impeachment trial, and on several occasions his vote would have decided important questions. The statement of these painful facts will sadden many of the friends of the once beloved and honest Governor Yates, who, it is now evident, has lost all self-respect, as well as the respect which is due to his constituents and to the body of which he is a member. If he will not resign, the sooner he is expelled the better. Illinois must be fully represented in the Senate the final vote on the impeachment trial is given. The present is no time to trifle with the patience of the Senate and the people of Illinois are in no temper to justify encourage or tolerate the disgraceful course of a drunkard in a public office of trust and responsibility."

Richard intimates that perhaps he might reform if he did not have to associate with such leading radicals as Chandler, Sprague, Nye, Wade and other Senators. He hints that such associations would corrupt the very best of men, himself not excepted. Richard doubtless believes in the maxim that "evil association will lead to bad habits," Richard's philosoph is good.

The Registration Law.—The Radical majority in our State Legislature have forced through a registration law modeled after the most improved Yankee pattern. The Harrisburg *Patriot & Union* says:

"The main feature of objection to the bill, so far as we can ascertain from a casual inspection, is the obstacles which it interposes to the exercise of the right of suffrage, and the loss of time which it entails upon the working class of people and naturalized citizens. The bill requires the assessor and board of election to meet, ten days before each general election, for the correction of the registry lists, between the hours of 9 a m., and 6 p m. Of course workingmen will have to lose a day's work to tend to getting registered. At the final meeting on the last Thursday preceeding the election the board sit between the hours of 9 and 10, a m and 6 p m, again requiring the loss of a day's work. In addition to this, every applicant for registration on that day must bring a friend, a legal voter, and both must sign affidavits setting forth his claim to vote. After all this loss of time and trouble the voter is still subject to challenge at the polls, and there required to again submit his proof of a right to vote.

Naturalized citizens are required, upon all occasions, to produce their papers, and their certificate of naturalization is to be produced at every poll, so that the board may write "voted" upon it, with the date. Then again, at every general election the polls are to be opened between the hours of 6 and 7 a. m. and close at 6 p. m.—again requiring the loss of time from the working man."

——Every now and then reports are transmitted to Washington of serious troubles in Tennessee, accompanied with an appeal to General Grant to order General Thomas to interfere with the troops under his command. As this State was reconstructed exactly in accordance with the Radical theories, and so effectually that at its last general election the Radicals polled 74,484 votes of a total vote of 97,032, we beg to ask, in the words of the late Artemus Ward, "Why is this thus?" In the eyes of the Radicals, Kentucky and Maryland are rebel States, yet we never hear of any disturbances in them so serious as to require the interference of the military. Will the *Tribune* please enlighten the men and brethern on this subject.—*Clarion Democrat.*

Applying the Gag to Rob the Treasury.

The Harrisburg *Patriot and Union*, in refering to the legislation which is being enacted at Harrisburg, says the Appropriation bill, which was on its final passage in the Senate, voted out of the Treasury four millions and a half of money to all sorts of purposes. When it came up on third reading in the Senate, on Friday, Senator Wallace attempted to obtain the floor to move to go into committee of the whole for special amendment, and to reduce the size of the bill about $400,000, as shown by his proposed amendments. The Speaker refused to give him the floor, and yielded it to Connell, Ertet, Ridgway and others, who called the previous question on the bill, thus gagging the attempt to reduce the immense and unnecessary appropriations. On motion to sustain the previous question the Democrats voted "no" and Messrs Billingfelt, of Lancaster, and Brown of Mercer, voted with them, but the call for the previous question was sustained, and the minority were thereby gagged. The main question then came up—"Shall the bill pass?" and on that question all the Democrats and Messrs. Ridgway, Shoemaker, White, Billingfelt, Cowles and Smyrman Radicals, voted "no," and the bill fell by a vote of yens 12 nays 20.

This is the first time that the previous question has been sustained in the Senate upon the Appropriation bill, Unhappily, the gross injustice thus putting, ted has met its deserved fate in the defeat of the bill itself. It is to be hoped that those who voted against the bill will now make every effort to strike from it every appropriation not honest or not warranted by the public necessity or requirements. The attempt of a portion of the Radicals to rush the bill through without allowing a fair discussion in regard to its provisions, shows that it will not bear scrutiny into its details. Let it be thoroughly sifted and canvassed, therefore, and if it be found that any Senator, or "ring" of Senators has endeavored to subserve his own or his friends" private interests at the expense of the State Treasury, let him be held up to public scorn and contempt.

Grant as a Church Goer.—The Radical papers announce with a flourish of trumpts that Grant has taken a pew in Dr Sunderland's church. In so doing he has shown his complete subserviency to the party which promises to nominate him for the Presidency. This Dr Sunderland is the same individual who, when Chaplain of the Senate, was rebuked by by a Conservative Senator in the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Chaplain of the Senate be respectfully requested hereafter to pray to Almighty God in our behalf, and not to lecture Him, inform him what to do, or state to Him under pretence of prayer, his, the said Chaplain's opinion in reference to His duty as the Almight, and that the said Chaplain be further requested aforesaid *not under the form of prayer* to lecture the Senate in reference to questions before that body.

After endosing negro suffrage and eating any amount of dirt to secure the radical nomination, Gen. Grant could not more fitly finish up his record of shameless subserviency than by making a pretense of piety and joining Dr Sunderland's church.—*Lan Intel*

Nigger on the Brain.—John Hickman, some time ago a member of Congress, now a member of the House of Representatives at Harrisburg, from Chester county, recently used the following language in his speech in favor of striking the word "white" from our State Constitution:

"I may possibly see the day that I may walk side by side with a colored woman. I have seen a great many colored women that I would rather walk with than a great many white men. I know a great many negroes who I think are better entitled to vote this moment than a great many white men who do vote, and who have long exercised the franchise."

Mr Hickman is unquestionably the ablest Radical member of the House.—He is regarded as exfremely Radical now, but in the words just quoted, he has simply uttered the key note of the Radical party. Ere long, the leaders will all openly take his position, and seek to "educate" the masses into the support of the same doctrine. Let white men open their eyes to the fact, that negro suffrage and negro equality are live issues in the great contest between the two parties of the country.—*Valley Spirit*

——A few day ago the Radical journals announced with great glee that they had elected their candidate for Mayor in Memphis, Tennessee. But how? In the first place over four thousand white men were disfranchised by order of Browlow and the Radical Legislature. In the next, negroes were brought into the city from all parts of the State and their votes county for the Radical candidate. A glance at the result will show how the white and negro vote was distributed. Wickersham, the Radical nominee, received 402 white and 4,213 negro votes. Woodward, the Democratic candidate, was voted for by 2,430 white men, and 93 negroes. This conflict between the races, at all elections, with the victory in favor of the negroes, is thought by the Radicals an excellent way to secure union and harmony.—*Age.*

——The New York *Couoier*, on whose editorial staff is Dr. Thomas Dunn English, gets off the following good thing on the prospective candidate for the Presidency:

"People curious in anecdotes will please to take notice, that it was Gen Washington, and no; Gen. Grant, who said in his youth—You know I *cannot* tell a *lie*, papa."

——When a slander is circulated about a Democrat, he is expected, if sufficiently important, to deny it over his signature, but that is not expected it appears of General Grant, the Republican papers say he has never been in the habit of wasting his powder in that way. His committee will do the denying.—*Post.*