

Beaver Radical



PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. S. RUTAN. TERMS—TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOLUME V.

BEAVER, PENN'A, FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1873.

NUMBER 10

The Beaver Radical.

The RADICAL is published every Friday morning at the following rates: ONE YEAR, (payable in advance,) \$2.00 SIX MONTHS, " " " 1.00 THREE " " " .50 SINGLE COPIES, " " " .05

Papers discontinued to subscribers at the expiration of their terms of subscription at the option of the publisher, unless otherwise agreed upon.

Professional or Business Cards, not exceeding 10 lines of this type, \$5.00 per annum. Advertisements of 10 lines or less, \$1.00 for one insertion, and 5 cents per line for each additional insertion.

All advertisements, whether of displayed or blank lines, measured by lines of this type.

Advertisements by the month, quarter or year received, and liberal deductions made in proportion to length of advertisement and length of time of insertion.

Special Notices inserted among local items at 10 cents per line for each insertion, unless otherwise agreed upon by the month, quarter or year.

Advertisements of 5 lines or less, 50 cents for one insertion, and 5 cents per line for each additional insertion.

Marriage or Death announcements published free of charge. Obituary notices charged as advertisements, and payable in advance.

Local news and matters of general interest communicated by any correspondent, with real name disclosed to the publisher, will be thankfully received. Local news solicited from every part of the county.

Publication Office: IN THE RADICAL BUILDING Corner Diamond, Beaver, Pa.

J. S. RUTAN, Proprietor.

All communications and business letters should be addressed to SMITH CURTIS, Beaver, Pa.

Attorneys.

A. SMALL, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BEAVER, PENNA.

OFFICE IN THE COURT HOUSE. [de20-ly]

JOHN E. AKIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW, MAIN ST., BEAVER-FALLS. [ja10-73]

JAMES CAMERON, JOHN Y. MARKS, CAMERON & MARKS, ATTORNEYS AT LAW AND REAL ESTATE AGENTS, ROCHESTER, PA.

Will attend promptly to all business entrusted to their care, and have superior facilities for buying and selling real estate. [dec13-ly]

F. H. AGNEW, J. M. BUCHANAN, AGNEW & BUCHANAN, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, (NEAR THE POST OFFICE,) BEAVER C. H., PA.

GILBERT L. EBERHART, ATTORNEY AT LAW.

Will give prompt attention to Collections, Promissory Notes and Pensions, Buying and Selling Real Estate, etc.

OFFICE ON BROADWAY, Opposite R. E. Hoopes' Banking House, NEW BRIGHTON, BEAVER CO., PA.

JOSEPH LEDLIE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, (Office, in the Radical Building,) BEAVER, PA.

All business entrusted to his care will receive prompt attention. [dec4-83-ly]

J. H. M'CREERY, ATTORNEY AT LAW, THIRD STREET, (First door below the Court House,) BEAVER, PA.

CENTRAL CLAIM AGENCY, JAMES M. SELLERS, 144 SOUTH SIXTH STREET PHILADELPHIA.

Handles Pensions, Back Pay, Horse Claims, etc. Claims, &c., promptly collected. No charge for information, nor when money is not collected. [de10-73]

JOHN B. YOUNG, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BEAVER, PA.

Office and residence on Third st. east of the Court House. All law business entrusted to my care shall receive prompt attention. Also, persons having real estate for sale, and those wishing to buy town property, coal or farm lands, may save time and money by calling at my office. [ap22-73-ly]

MARSHALL SWARTZWELDER, JNO. C. BARR, SWARTZWELDER & BARR, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, No. 66 GRANT STREET, PITTSBURGH. [de23-71-ly]

JACOB DAVIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW, No. 75 GRANT STREET, (FIRST FLOOR,) PITTSBURGH.

READ BY EVERYBODY, THE BEAVER RADICAL

FROM PITTSBURGH.

Temperance Meeting at City Hall Pittsburgh on Thursday Night—Outpouring of the People. Correspondence of the Radical.

PITTSBURGH, February 28, 1873.

City Hall was crowded last night by an orderly and intelligent audience to hear speeches on the Local Option question. Although the call for the meeting was by the friends of temperance, yet the platform was free, and friends and opponents met to discuss the merits of the measure in twenty minutes speeches. James Park, Jr., presided, and introduced as the first speaker George W. DeCamp, Esq., who apologized for his inexperience in addressing an audience upon so momentous a question, took strong ground against License, and said the question to be decided was whether the people are to permit the moral and social happiness of a great portion of the community to be destroyed by granting license to sell intoxicating drinks; that he did not profess to be an able constitutional lawyer, but he did profess to say that no man whose opinion was worth twenty shillings would say that the people of a district had not the right to say whether liquor should be sold in their midst or not. How was the Constitution adopted but by the people? He had nothing to say in condemnation of the members of the Legislature for their course in this matter, but he did not think that they could so far forget their duty as to vote for a law protecting those who not only make their families, friends and neighbors unhappy, but inflicted upon the community a demon more to be feared than a pestilence or a famine. The gentleman sat down amid great applause.

Then Thomas M. Marshall, who was the next speaker, after being greeted with an outburst of cheers, began as follows: Mr. M. said that he had not attended the meeting for the purpose of making a speech, but simply as a citizen. He was pleased to note that as far as order and decorum prevailed that the meeting would

be a success. He said that on Saturday night in the same hall [Laughter.] The gentleman regretted that he was not at that meeting, as it would have pleased him very much to have seen his American, German and Irish friends for once coalescing, if it was on a subject of such mighty importance as local option. As a citizen he desired to express his opinion on the question of allowing the people to say whether or not liquor should be sold in their district. To those who dispute the question of privilege he said that is not law—no, not schoolboy's law. The gentleman here reviewed the case coming under the decision of Judge Bell in regard to the power of the Legislature to delegate to the people the right to make law. He held that the Legislature delegated to the people the power to amend the Constitution of the State, and if such a power was given the people, surely they should have the power to legislate an eight by ten grog shop from their midst. Not constitutional! As an illustration—directly underneath is a market house. Every market day the butchers stand at their stalls and the gardeners at theirs. Legislation provides that meat shall be sold here and greens there, yet we cannot get legislation to say that liquor shall or shall not be sold in the "Old Bloody Fifth." How absurd! Legislation says that frame houses shall be erected in certain wards and not in others—a wise act tending to the general good—yet there is no law to decide whether liquor shall be sold in certain districts. Was there ever more absurd reasoning? If the Legislature can throw safeguards around the sale of oil in certain districts why not around that of whisky? The Supreme Court itself derives its authority from the people and the Court will do just as you say. You will hear it said that the civil government could not be carried on one day without what is called delegated civil power. If the Legislature can delegate power to the City Councils it can delegate the same to you. The gentleman concluded with some humorous remarks in regard to women suffrage, yet claimed that had women the right to vote on local option, the fate of the tavern keepers would be sealed, indeed.

After Mr. M. had closed W. D. Moore, Esq., a representative of the liquor side, made an argument against local option, taking the ground that neither votes nor might could settle great moral questions. Might never made right, nor never could. The people of Israel had set up a golden calf and worshipped it as the true God. The Jewish people crucified the Son of God, and mobs had committed many acts of tyranny and oppression. After illustrating this point, he passed to the constitutional view of the question. There

were natural rights and constitutional rights, which could not be denied or withheld. The right to sell intoxicating drinks was undeniable. As to alcohol, man never made a drop of it, nor ever could. It could only be made in the laboratory of nature. It was the gift of God. Man could determine the conditions, but nature must produce the alcohol. He then advanced the argument that the use of liquor was in itself lawful and right, and the abuse of it only hurtful and wicked. It was not contrary to religion or good morals to use liquors, but on the other hand their use was fully recognized by the Redeemer, and their abuse only condemned by Him. The appetite for strong drink was irresistible in the nature of man, and defied reason, conscience, religion, heaven and hell. The sale of intoxicating liquors was a nuisance and a curse. (Tremendous and long continued applause, which almost disconnected the speaker.) After silence had been restored, Mr. Moore continued and said that the abuse of ardent spirits was the point to which moral reformers should direct their efforts. The speech was closely listened to, but its sentiments did not meet the approval of the audience.

The next speaker called upon was Marshall Swartzwelder, Esq. The gentleman was enthusiastically received, and on being introduced by the President, made one of the most logical, concise and interesting addresses of the evening. He simply attended the meeting as a citizen, and not with the intention of making a speech. From a legal aspect the question before the people were, should the liquor traffic be abolished or should license to sell liquor be granted. What might be the effect of the passage of the bill in question? If the Legislature has not the power to delegate to the people the question of local option, it certainly has the power to throw certain restrictions around the granting of licenses, and if it can do the one it certainly can do the other. The Legislature says that the drugger shall not sell poison save on the prescription of a reputable physician, then why should the Legislature throw the same restriction around that slower, but no less certain poison—whisky. While scriptural quotations may be made in defense of the wine, yet that grand old sentence "Lead us not into temptation" may also be found in the Book of Books. If you apply the latter quotation the Local Option bill will pass. It has been urged that no law will prevent the sale and disposition of liquor. Very good. If it drives its devotees to dark cellars and removes the glittering sign of the tavern keeper or the grog seller from our highways it at least keeps us from temptation. Let the temptation be removed, and the people would soon find that they could get along without taverns or dram shops. Hide the jug, and the temptation is gone. It has been asserted that it would be unjust to legislate away the large capital now invested in the liquor trade—a capital invested under the laws of the State and the United States—wrong to do away with the great revenue which the business yields to the State and National governments. But let us strike a balance between revenues, and we will find that the expense connected with our hospitals, our almshouses, our work houses, jails and penitentiaries has been ten fold the amount derived from the source named.

The gentleman's address was frequently applauded, and had great effect upon his hearers.

The Committee on Resolutions appeared and reported the following through the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Porter:

To the Honorable Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

We, the friends of the Local Option law, citizens of Allegheny county, assembled in mass meeting at the City Hall of Pittsburgh, Thursday evening, February 27, 1873, hereby place on permanent record an expression of our wish and of our will, and respectfully memorialize your honorable bodies.

Our prayer is that you will give immediate and earnest heed to the demand of this community to remove from us a disability which it is believed now exists which, if this fear is well grounded, will deprive us of the right of suffrage on a measure that concerns our highest interests, a right now exercised under the general law throughout the State. Such discrimination is unfair and unjust. The trouble of which we complain has arisen, we believe, through no design on your part, as the makers of the law, but the efforts to remedy the defect have met with the most subtle and determined opposition at every step up to yesterday.

The record of the action of the House

yesterday fills us with high hope. The threat that the bill for our relief should be hidden in Committee has fallen to the ground, through the wise and judicious action of those who are willing that the voice of the people shall be heard.

We desire to express our liveliest satisfaction at the record of the large majority, and we now earnestly petition that this bill may be carried through all the stages of legislation at the earliest moment possible, that thus we may be secured in our rights.

Having thus concisely stated what we deem essential to secure us these rights, we would further declare:

1. That we believe the highest interests of the community are at stake in this matter; men of all parties and all shades of political opinion are united in favor of this measure, wives and sisters and parents, whose homes and lives are made miserable and wretched by liquor, plead for it through the hope it holds out to them. The great body of the law loving, law abiding people, in country and city alike, look to it as giving them an opportunity to rid themselves of a terrible curse.

2. The feeling in favor of this measure is no less permanent and growing than it is widespread. For years the burden of the traffic in liquor in the shape of crime and vice and poverty and increase of taxation consequent upon it, has been growing greater and greater, and repeated efforts have been made to shake it off. With every failure of the friends of law and order, the determination has grown deeper that the grievance should at some future time come to an end. Now, with nothing in National or State politics to distract our attention for years to come, we see our opportunity and pray you relieve us speedily of the embarrassment which threatens to prevent us from embracing it.

There were other speeches and an eloquent letter read from Rev. Father Hickox. The meeting adjourned at a late hour and was in every way a great demonstration.

FROM WASHINGTON.

(Correspondence of the Radical.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 4, 1873.

Investigations are the order of the day, and the present Congress will be known in history as the Congress of Investigations.

During the present winter there have been appointed the following committees of investigations:

1. The Poland Committee, by the House to investigate charges against members of Congress for dealings of corruption in connection with the Union Pacific Railroad Company and the Credit Mobilier of America.

2. The Wilson Committee, by the House, to inquire into the state of these companies and ascertain the causes of failure on the part of the Union Pacific Railroad Company to pay the interest upon bonds due to the United States, now amounting to more than five millions of dollars.

3. In the Senate the Morrill committee, to inquire into the conduct of members of that body in relation to the same subjects.

4. The Frelinghuysen committee, to inquire into charges of bribery against Senator Pomeroy in recent efforts to secure his return to the United States Senate by the Legislature of Kansas.

And besides these—5. The Standing Committee of the Senate on Privileges and Elections have been investigating similar charges against Senator Caldwell, from the same State. And also the political condition of affairs in the State of Louisiana.

The last committee have made a report that Senator Caldwell's election was illegal and fraudulent, and that the Senate ought to declare his seat vacant.

In the case of Louisiana, the same committee have also reported in part upon the state of facts in Louisiana, exhibiting an extent of demoralization and corruption in the primary meetings of the people and at the ballot box, which is saddening to the heart of every honest man and upright citizen.

The report of the Poland investigation committee, and the action thereon in the House, has created a profound impression. No such document has been introduced in Congress since the foundation of the Government. It reviews the history of the building of the Pacific railroad; explains the nature and character of the company known as the Credit Mobilier of America; discusses the growing corruptions and dangers of large and powerful monopolies and monied organizations; sets forth the operations of Messrs. Ames

and Brooks, and the connections with the matter of Messrs. Blaine, Dawes, Scofield, Bingham, Garfield, and Kelly, as well as of certain Senators and ex-members and other persons outside of Congress, and expounds at large the question of Congressional jurisdiction over subjects of this character.

This report is understood to be unanimous, having the approval of all the Republican and Democratic members of the committee, so that it can be said to be in no sense a political, partisan report. It announces as the result that Speaker Blaine is entirely exonerated from any participation in or connection with these affairs, save his conversation with Mr. Ames as to the purchase of stock, and his prompt rejection of all idea of such proposals; that Messrs. Dawes, Scofield, Bingham, Garfield, and Kelly are shown to have purchased stock of Mr. Ames, but it does not appear that they had any corrupt knowledge or motive in so doing, and therefore they may be excused, with the admonition that they should have been more careful and scrutinizing in their business transactions; and that Messrs. Ames and Brooks deserve to be and should be expelled from the House.

Mr. Voorhees defended Mr. Brooks, Mr. Butler Mr. Ames, while Banks, Shellabarger and others sustained the committee's report in favor of the expulsion of the corrupt members.

The debate closed on Wednesday, and the following resolutions of Mr. Sargent's were substituted over those of the committee's, and the first passed, yeas 181; nays 98; the second, yeas 174, nays 93.

Resolved, That the House absolutely condemn the conduct of Oakes Ames, a member of this House from the State of Massachusetts, in seeking to procure Congressional attention to the affair of a corporation in which he was interested, and whose interest directly depended on the legislation of Congress by inducing members of Congress to invest in the stock of said corporation.

The second resolution was then adopted as follows:

Resolved, That the House absolutely condemn the conduct of Oakes Ames, a member of this House from the State of Massachusetts, in seeking to procure Congressional attention to the affair of a corporation in which he was interested, and whose interest directly depended on the legislation of Congress by inducing members of Congress to invest in the stock of said corporation.

The Republican party has not quite done its duty, and these exposures will trouble it hereafter. It should with its own hand of power cleanse the Augean Stables. The party is in a more critical condition than its leaders seem to be aware of, a cloud over shadows its character and if the thunderbolts do not descend and destroy its power, we may thank a kind providence and not our Representatives in Congress.

A strange spectacle occurred in the House when the vote was declared. Mr. Brooks conspicuously left his seat and went first to Elliott, colored Representative from South Carolina, and in the presence of hundreds in the rear of Elliott's seat, thanked him at length and emphatically for the vote which he had given, and he then did likewise to Rainey, also from South Carolina, whose seat was in a distant part of the House. This spectacle attracted general attention.

The President has signed the bill to allow the Northern Pacific Railroad Company to build a bridge across the St. Louis river, between Rick's Point, Minnesota, and Conner's Point, Wisconsin.

Mr. Morrill, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported, without amendment, the House bill appropriating \$300,000 to purchase a site for government buildings at Pittsburgh.

The Judge Sherman case at Washington has gone from the Committee of Ways and Means to the Committee of the Judiciary of the House to inquire whether Judge Sherman ought to be impeached for asking a ten thousand dollar fee on the ground of having procured certain legislation for the New York Board of Brokers.

The Senate, after a lengthy discussion, has adopted an amendment to the sundry civil expenses bill, transferring the printing of the debates of Congress to the Congressional printing office. At present the contract is held by private parties.

The House Committee on Appropriations has considered the Senate amendments to the Postoffice Appropriation bill, and agreed to non-concur in the amendment forbidding the transmission of all free matter so far as the same affects exchanges among newspapers.

The bill to create a new judicial district out of the Western District of Pennsylvania, which passed the House some time since, it is now understood, will not be acted upon by the Senate this session.

A new revelation, it is asserted, is made here in regard to Colfax, and first published in the New York World, that rivets fast upon him the long line of deception and falsehood that he has gradually developed from his South Bend speech to the present hour. It will be remembered that in his very latest explanation he insisted that George F. Nesbitt, of New York, had given him the \$4,000 at odd times in the summer of 1868 as voluntary contributions, out of friendship, though a total stranger, and that all the favor that was ever returned was a few tickets to the inauguration ceremonies in the spring of 1869. Now it has just come to light, from the official records of the Post Office Department, that Mr. Colfax was the attorney and lobbyist of Nesbitt, and that he filed an argument in reply to one made by the Attorney General for the extension of the stamped envelope contract then in the hands of the very same Mr. Nesbitt. It is there endorsed as submitted by him.

In order that no injustice may be done Mr. Colfax, it should be stated that while the twenty pages of arguments in Nesbitt's behalf are not in his handwriting, his letter indorsing it and transmitting it is there. It may have been copied for him, or it may have come from Nesbitt's lawyer, but Mr. Colfax alone appears on the record as making the appeal for Nesbitt in violation of the act of 1868, making such an offence from the Vice President or Senator or member the subject of criminal indictment. It is not believed that Mr. Colfax will rise to explain any more.

It is but just, however, to say that the Postmaster General denies the above report. He says that finding the Nesbitt contract for stamped envelopes had been extended by his predecessor without advertising for competition, he referred the question of its legality to the Attorney General, who decided it to be without the sanction of the law, and said that the Department should terminate the same on reasonable notice, and issue proposals for a new contract which was done. In the meantime the question arose as to the temporary supply until the new supply of the new contract should commence, and it was this temporary supply that Vice President Colfax urged that the heirs of Nesbitt having the necessary buildings, machinery and materials, and not having forfeited their contract by any malfeasance, should have opportunity to work up, until the new contract was let; or that they be allowed to present argument as to the validity of their contract as extended.

The history of the transaction is simply this: When Postmaster-General Randall retired from the department he allowed this contract to continue without advertising for competition. When Postmaster-General Cresswell came in he thought this was irregular, and called on the Attorney-General for an opinion, which was soon forthcoming, and adverse to Mr. Randall's course. It was to this that Mr. Colfax filed a reply, and on this Nesbitt's contract was allowed to run until some time after, when bids were invited.

The fourth of March is near but there would be no difficulty in Congress having time to dispose of all important legislation by Tuesday noon, if the members would work upon the important matters; but there is a disposition among a large number to waste valuable time in debating unimportant matters, to put themselves on record as champions of some impossible project.

The Senate has agreed to the House appropriation for the improvement of the Ohio river, and payment of debt of Louisville canal, which will speedily reduce the toll to the cost of repairs and attention.

The inauguration to-day was a grand success. Everything passed off according to previous arrangement. President Grant's inaugural was brief and to the point concerning which you will receive fuller information through the dailies than I have time or space now to give. The city is filled with strangers from all parts of the United States, West Pointers, cadets, and crack military companies are here. The Inauguration Ball this evening promises to be a brilliant affair.

SAM. An excitable individual writes to the Johnstown Mountain Voice that he has examined the poor-house accounts, as presented by the auditors, and has "come to the conclusion that the whole arrangement is a barefaced and unblushing fraud." Warning with his theme, he insinuates that the \$140 charged for "produce" was spent "for groceries purchased from wholesale liquor dealers." All of which rather reflects upon the good name of Johnstown auditors.

FOREST COUNTY wants the office of County Superintendent abolished.