The Huntingdon Journal.

VOL. 49. HUNTINGDON, PA., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1874. NO. 13.

The Huntingdon Journal.

J. R. DURBORROW, J. A. NASH,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS.

Office on the Corner of Fifth and Washington streets.

THE HUNTINGDON JOURNAL is published every Wednesday, by J. R. DURBORROW and J. A. NASH, under the firm name of J. R. DURBORROW & Co., at $2.00 per annum, IN ADVANCE, or $2.50 if not paid for in six months from date of subscription, and $3 if not paid within the year.

No paper discontinued, unless at the option of the publishers, until all arrearages are paid.

No paper, however, will be sent out of the State unless absolutely paid for in advance.

Transient advertisements will be inserted at TWELVE AND A-HALF CENTS per line for the first insertion, SEVEN AND A-HALF CENTS for the second, and FIVE CENTS per line for all subsequent insertions.

Regular quarterly and yearly business advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	3 m	6 m	9 m	1 y		3 m	6 m	9 m	1 y
1 Inch	$ 3 50	$ 4 50	$ 5 50	$ 8 00	¼ col	9 00	18 00	$ 27	$ 36
2 "	5 00	8 00	10 00	12 00	½ "	24 00	36 00	50	65
3 "	7 00	10 00	14 00	18 00	¾ "	34 00	50 00	65	85
4 "	8 00	11 00	15 00	21 00	1 col	36 00	60 00	80	100

Local notices will be inserted at FIFTEEN CENTS per line for each and every insertion.

All Resolutions of Associations, Communications of limited or individual interest, all party announcements, and notices of Marriages and Deaths, exceeding five lines, will be charged TEN CENTS per line.

Legal and other notices will be charged to the party having them inserted.

Advertising Agents must find their commission outside of these figures.

All advertising accounts are due and collectable when the advertisement is once inserted.

JOB PRINTING of every kind, in Plain and Fancy Colors, done with neatness and dispatch.—Hand-bills, Blanks, Cards, Pamphlets, &c., of every variety and style, printed at the shortest notice, and every thing in the Printing line will be executed in the most artistic manner and at the lowest rates.

Professional Cards.

A. P. W. JOHNSTON, Surveyor and Civil Engineer, Huntingdon, Pa. OFFICE: No. 113 Third Street. aug21,1872.

S. T. BROWN. J. M. BAILEY.

BROWN & BAILEY, Attorneys at-Law, Office 2d door east of First National Bank. Prompt personal attention will be given to all legal business entrusted to their care, and to the collection and remittance of claims. Jan.7,71.

DR. H. W. BUCHANAN, DENTIST, No. 228 Hill Street, HUNTINGDON, PA. July 3, '72.

D. CALDWELL, Attorney-at-Law, No. 111, 3d street. Office formerly occupied by Messrs. Woods & Williamson. [ap12,'71.

DR. A. B. BRUMBAUGH, offers his professional services to the community. Office, No. 523 Washington street, one door east of the Catholic Parsonage. [jan.4,'71.

E. J. GREENE, Dentist. Office removed to Leister's new building, Hill street Huntingdon. [jan.4,'71.

G. L. ROBB, Dentist, office in S. T. Brown's new building, No. 520, Hill St., Huntingdon, Pa. [ap12,'71.

H. C. MADDEN, Attorney-at-Law Office, No. —, Hill street, Huntingdon, Pa. [ap.19,'71.

J. FRANKLIN SCHOCK, Attorney-at-Law, Huntingdon, Pa. Prompt attention given to all legal business. Office 229 Hill street, corner of Court House Square. [dec.4,'72

J. SYLVANUS BLAIR, Attorney-at-Law, Huntingdon, Pa. Office, Hill street, three doors west of Smith. [jan.4'71.

J. CHALMERS JACKSON, Attorney at Law. Office with Wm. Dorris, Esq., No. 403, Hill street, Huntingdon, Pa. All legal business promptly attended to. [jan15

J. R. DURBORROW, Attorney-at-Law, Huntingdon, Pa., will practice in the several Courts of Huntingdon county. Particular attention given to the settlement of estates of decedents. Office in the JOURNAL Building. [feb.1,'71.

J. W. MATTERN, Attorney-at-Law and General Claim Agent, Huntingdon, Pa., Soldiers' claims against the Government for back pay, bounty, widows' and invalid pensions attended to with great care and promptness. Office on Hill street. [jan.4,'71.

L. S. GEISSINGER, Attorney-at-Law, Huntingdon, Pa. Office one door East of R. M. Speer's office. [Feb.5-1y

K. ALLEN LOVELL. J. HALL MUSSER.

LOVELL & MUSSER, *Attorneys-at-Law*, HUNTINGDON, PA. Special attention given to COLLECTIONS of all kinds; to the settlement of ESTATES, &c.; and all other legal business prosecuted with fidelity and dispatch. [nov6,'72

R. A. ORBISON, Attorney-at-Law, Office, 321 Hill street, Huntingdon, Pa. [may31,'71.

WILLIAM A. FLEMING, Attorney-at-Law, Huntingdon, Pa. Special attention given to collections, and all other legal business attended to with care and promptness. Office, No. 229, Hill street. [ap19,'71.

Hotels.

JACKSON HOUSE.

FOUR DOORS EAST OF THE UNION DEPOT,

HUNTINGDON, PA.

A. B. ZEIGLER, Prop.

Nov12,'73-6m.

MORRISON HOUSE,

OPPOSITE PENNSYLVANIA R. R. DEPOT

HUNTINGDON, PA.

J. H. CLOVER, Prop.

April 5, 1871-1y.

Miscellaneous.

H. ROBLEY, Merchant Tailor, in Leister's Building (second floor,) Huntingdon, Pa., respectfully solicits a share of public patronage from town and country. [oct16,72.

R. A. BECK, Fashionable Barber and Hairdresser, Hill street, opposite the Franklin House. All kinds of Tonics and Pomades kept on handand for sale. [ap19,'71-6m

HOFFMAN & SKEESE, Manufacturers of all kinds of CHAIRS, and dealers in PARLOR and KITCHEN FURNITURE, corner of Fifth and Washington streets, Huntingdon, Pa. All articles will be sold cheap Particular and prompt attention given to repairing. A share of public patronage is respectfully solicited. [jan.15,'73y

WM. WILLIAMS, MANUFACTURER OF MARBLE MANTLES, MONUMENTS, HEADSTONES, &C., HUNTINGDON, PA STER PARIS CORNICES, MOULDINGS, &C ALSO SLATE MANTLES FURNISHED TO ORDER. Jan. 4, '71.

GO TO THE JOURNAL OFFICE For all kinds of printing.

FOR ALL KINDS OF PRINTING, GO TO THE JOURNAL OFFICE

New Advertisements.

SHERIFF'S SALES.

By virtue of sundry writs of Fi. Fa. Vend. Exp. and Lev. Fa. to me directed, I will expose to public sale at the Court House, in Huntingdon, on MONDAY, April 13, 1874, at 1 o'clock, p. m., the following described real estate, to wit:

All of defendant's right, title and interest in all that certain messuage and tract of land situate in West township, Huntingdon county, State of Pennsylvania, adjoining lands of Wm. Stewart and Dorsey's heirs on the west, lands of John and Michael Ware on the south, and lands of Wm Reed on the east, containing 102 acres and 37 perches, having thereon erected a two story dwelling house, frame barn, and other outbuildings.

ALSO, All of defendant's right, title and interest, in a certain tract of land in Jackson township, county of Huntingdon, and State of Pennsylvania, bounded on the east by land of George W. Johnston, on the north by land of James Fleming, on the south by land of Greenwood Furnace Company, containing 160 acres, more or less.

Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of George Warfel.

ALSO—All that certain two story frame dwelling house, with a basement story, being about twenty-five feet in front by nineteen feet in depth, located on a lot or piece of ground in the village of McConnellstown, Walker township, in the county of Huntingdon, on the west side of the public road leading from Huntingdon to Bedford, adjoining lot of Jonas Buckwalter on the north, and a sixteen foot alley on the south and west, together with the ground covered with said building, and so much other ground immediately adjacent thereto and belonging to the above named Daniel Megahan as may be necessary for the ordinary and useful purposes of the same.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Daniel Megahan.

ALSO—All of defendant's right, title and interest in all that certain tract of land situate in the township of Springfield, county of Huntingdon, Pa., bounded as follows: on the south and east by lands of Elisha Green's heirs, on the south west by lands of Wm. H. Logth, on the north west by lands of John Star's heir's, on the north by lands of Caleb Brown and Benjamin Ramsey, on the east by lands of Henry C. Cremer, containing 198 acres, more or less, having thereon erected a small frame barn, two dwelling houses, one and a half stories each.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Samuel H. Anderson.

ALSO—All of defendants' right, title and interest in a certain tract of land situate in Henderson township, Huntingdon county, Pa., bounded as follows: On the north by lands of Joseph Trymer, on the south by lands of Clarence Trymer, on the east by lands of William Rupert, on the west by lands of —— Shonter, containing 60 acres, more or less, having thereon erected a two story log dwelling house and a log stable.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Jacob Shenefelt and George Jackson.

ALSO—All of defendant's right, title and interest in all that certain lot of ground situate in that part of the borough of Huntingdon known as West Huntingdon, at the south-west corner of Fifteenth and Mifflin streets, fronting fifty feet on said Mifflin street, and extending back at right angles to same 150 feet to a fifteen-feet alley.

ALSO—All of defendant's right, title and interest in all that certain lot of ground situate in the western part of the borough of Huntingdon, at the south-west corner of fifteenth and Moore streets, fronting fifty feet on said Moore street, and extending back at right angles to same 150 feet to a fifteen-feet alley.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Jacob Stahley.

ALSO—All of defendant's right, title and interest in all that certain lot or piece of ground situate in West township, Huntingdon Co., Pa., bounded as follows: on the north by the public road leading to Warrior Ridge from the main road running from Petersburg up Shaver's Creek Valley, on the east and south by lands of John Rung, on the west by the public road running from Petersburg up Shaver's Creek Valley, containing about one acre, having thereon erected a three story building about 30 by 20 feet, with a kitchen attached, and the curtilage appurtenant thereto.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Henry Rudy.

ALSO—All of defendant's right, title and interest in a certain lot of ground situate in the borough of Petersburg, Huntingdon county, Pa., bounded and described as follows: On the west by Washington street, on the south by an alley, on the east by King street and on the north by lot now or formerly owned by Henry Grazier; said lot being No. 64 in the plan of said borough, and having thereon erected a frame or log house and other outbuildings.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Jacob Bruner.

ALSO—All of defendant's right, title and interest in all that certain messuage and tract of land, situate in the township of Penn, county of Huntingdon, Pa., bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a post thence by land of Isaac Peightal N. 41 degrees E. 69 perches to a stone heap; thence by land of Joseph Norris, N. 53 degrees W 41 perches to a post; thence by land of R. O. W. Wall, N. 48¾ degrees W. 65¼ perches to a post; thence by land of John Lee, S. 56¼ degrees W. 46 perches to a post; thence by lands of Samuel Harris' heirs S. 38 degrees E. 122¼ perches to the place of beginning, containing 40 acres and 73 perches net measure, having thereon erected a one and a half story log dwelling house and a log stable.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Israel Merkel.

ALSO—All of defendant's right, title and interest in a certain tract of land situate in the township of Cass, county of Huntingdon, Pa., bounded as follows: on the east by land of Solomon Mirely, on the west by land of John Steaner, on the north by land of Jesse D. Shore and on the south by land of Benjamin Everett, containing 143 acres, more or less, having thereon erected a two story dwelling house, a log barn and other out buildings.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Joseph Harbaugh.

ALSO—All the defendants' right, title and interest in 251 acres of land in Clay township, adjoining land of Samuel Bowser on the west, Benjamin Shope on the east, M. J. Ashman on the south, and David Stover on the north, with a large dwelling house, large barn and other outbuildings.

Seized, taken in execution, and to be sold as the property of Samuel L. Glasgow and Harriet N. Glasgow.

☞ Bidders will take notice that 20 per cent. of the purchase money must be paid when the property is knocked down, or it will be put up again for sale.

AMON HOUCK, Sheriff's Office. } [Sheriff.
Huntingdon, Mch. 25, '74.

TO ALL PERSONS INTERESTED. Take notice that John S. Nimmon and A. A. Skinner, Assignees of William P. Ramsey, of the township of Dublin, have filed in the office of the Prothonatary of the Court of Common Pleas of Huntingdon county, their account as Assignees aforesaid which will be presented to the said Court on the second Monday of April next, for confirmation and allowance, and will be so confirmed and allowed unless exceptions be filed thereto.

T. W. MYTON, March18,'74. Prothonotary.

TO ALL PERSONS INTERESTED. Take notice, that Robert Cunningham, committee of John B. Tussey, a lunatic, late of Porter township, deceased, has filed in the office of Prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas of Huntingdon County, his account as committee aforesaid which will be presented to the second Monday of April next, for confirmation 3rd allowance, and will be so confirmed and allowed unless exceptions be filed thereto.

T. W. MYTON, March18,'74 Prothontory.

TRIAL LIST FOR APRIL TERM 1874

FIRST WEEK.

Lowell Shumway who hath survived W. A. & L. Shumway, partner lately trading as W. A. & L. Shumway vs. James Dunn.

SECOND WEEK.

Harriet C. Reese by her father Dr. J. A. Shade vs. C. A. Reese
Mary J. Mitchell's use vs. William McClure
Henry Grallins for use of Robert A. Laird vs. The Township of Porter and the Borough of Alexandria.

T. W. MYTON, March18,'74. Prothonotary,

NOTICE IN DIVORCE.

ROBERT PALMER, vs. MARTHA PALMER } In the Court of Common Pleas of Huntingdon County. January Term, 1874. No. 27. Divorce.

To Martha Palmer, respondent above named.

You are hereby required to appear before our Judges at Huntingdon, at a Court of Common Pleas, there to be held on the second Monday of April next, to show cause why a divorce from the bond of matrimony, as prayed in the libel filed, should not be decreed in the suit.

It has been impossible to serve you with the above notice personally, by reason of your absence from the jurisdiction of the Court.

AMON HOUCK, March18-4t Sheriff.

The Story-Teller.

Courtship After Marriage.

A STORY FOR WIVES.

"Now this is what I call comfort," said Madge Harley, as she sat down by her neighbor's fire one evening; "here you are at your sewing, with the kettle steaming on the hob, and the tea things on the table, expecting every minute to hear your husband's step, and see his kind face look in at the door. Ah! if my husband was but like yours, Janet."

"He is like mine in many of his ways," said Janet, with a smile, "and if you will allow me to speak plainly, he would be still more like him if you took more pains to make him comfortable."

"What do you mean?" cried Madge; "our house is as clean as yours; I mend my husband's clothes, and cook his dinner as carefully as any woman in the parish, and yet he never stays at home of an evening, while you sit here by your cheerful fire night after night as happy as can be."

"As happy as can be on earth," said her friend, gravely; "yes and shall I tell you the secret of it, Madge?"

"I wish you would," said Madge with a deep sigh; "it's misery to live as I do now."

"Well, then," said Janet speaking slowly and distinctly, "I let my husband see that I love him still, and that I learn every day to love him more. Love is the chain that binds him to his home. The world may call it folly, but the world is not my law-giver."

"And do you really think," exclaimed Madge in surprise, "that husbands care for that sort of thing?"

"For love, do you mean?" asked Janet.

"Yes; they don't feel at all as we do, Janet, and it don't take many years of married life to make them think of a wife as a maid-of-all work."

"A libel, Madge," said Mrs. Matson, laughing; "I won't allow you to sit in William's chair and talk so."

"No, because your husband is different, and values his wife's love, while John cares for me only as his housekeeper."

"I don't think that," said Janet, "although I know that he said to my husband the other day that courting time was the happiest of a man's life. William reminded him that there is a greater happiness than that, even on earth, if men but give their heart's to Christ. I know that John did not alter his opinion, but he went away still thinking of his courting time as of a joy too great to be exceeded."

"Dear fellow," cried Madge, smiling through her tears, "I do believe he was very happy then. I remember I used to listen for his steps as I sat with my dear mother by the fire longing for the happiness of seeing him."

"Just so," said Janet;" do you ever feel like that now?"

Madge hesitated. "Well, no, not exactly."

"And why not?"

"O, I don't know," said Madge, "married people give up that sort of thing."

"Love, do you mean?" asked Janet.

"No, but what people call being sentimental," said Mrs. Harley.

"Longing to see your husband is a proper sentiment," replied Janet.

"But some people are ridiculously foolish before others," reasoned Madge.

"That proves they want sense. I am not likely to approve of that, as William would soon tell you; all I want is that wives should let their husbands know they are still loved."

"But men are so vain," said Madge, "that it is dangerous to show them much attention."

Her friend looked up, "O, Madge, what are you saying? Have you, then, married with the notion that it is not good for John to believe you love him?"

"No, but it is not wise to show that you care too much for them."

"Say me and him; do not talk of husbands in general, but of yours in particular."

"He thinks quite enough of himself already, I assure you."

"Dear Madge," said Janet, smiling, "would it do you any harm to receive a little more attention from your husband."

"O! of course not. I wish he'd try," and Mrs. Harley laughed at the idea.

"Then you don't think enough of yourself already? and nothing would make you vain, I suppose?"

Madge colored, and all the more when she perceived that William Matson had come in quietly, and was now standing behind Janet's chair. This, of course, put an end to the conversation. Madge retired to her own home to think of Janet's words, and to confess secretly that they were wise.

Hours passed before John Harley returned home. He was a man of good abilities, and well to do in the world; and having married Madge because he truly loved her, he had expected to have a happy home. But partly because he was reserved and sensitive, and partly because Madge feared to make him vain, they had grown cold toward each other, so cold that John began to think the ale house a more comfortable place than his own fireside.

That night the rain fell in torrents, the winds howled, and it was not until the midnight hour had arrived that Harley left the public house and hastened toward his cottage. He was wet through when he at length crossed the threshold, he was, as he gruffly muttered, "used to that;" but he was not "used" to the tone and look with which his wife drew near to welcome him, nor to find warm clothes by a crackling fire, and slippers on the hearth; nor to hear no reproach for late hours, and neglect, and dirty footmarks, as he sat in his arm-chair. Some change had come to Madge he was very sure. She wore a dress he had bought her years ago, with a neat linen collar round the neck, and had a cap, trimmed with white ribbons on her head.

"You're smart, Madge," he exclaimed at last, when he had stared at her for some little time in silence. "Who has been here worth dressing for, to-night?"

"No one until you came," said Madge, half laughing.

"I? Nonsense; you didn't dress for me!" cried John.

"You won't believe it, perhaps, but I did. I have been talking with Mrs. Matson this evening, and she has given me some very good advice. So now, John, what would you like for your supper?"

"John," who was wont to steal to the shelf at night and content himself with anything he could find, thought Madge's offer too excellent to be refused and very soon a large bowl of chocolate was steaming on the table. Then his wife sat down, for a wonder, by his side, and talked a little, and listened, and looked pleased, when at last, as if he could not help it, he said, "Dear old Madge!"

That was enough; her elbow somehow found its way then to the arm of his great chair, and she sat quietly looking at the fire. After a while John spoke again:

"Madge, dear, do you remember the old days when we used to sit side by side in your mother's kitchen?"

"Yes."

"I was a young man then, Madge, and, as they told me, handsome; now I am growing older, plainer, duller. Then you—you loved me; do you love me still?"

She looked up in his face, and her eyes answered him. It was like going back to the old days to feel his arm around her as her head lay on his shoulder, and to hear once again the kind words meant for her ear alone.

She never once asked if this would make him "vain;" she knew, as if by instinct, that it was making him a wise, a more thoughtful, more earnest hearted man.—And when after a happy silence, he took down the Bible, and read a chapter, as he had been wont to read to her mother in former times, she bowed her head and prayed.

Yes prayed—for pardon, through the blood of Jesus Christ—for the strength to fulfil every duty in the future—for the all-powerful influence of the Spirit, for blessings on her husband evermore.

She prayed—and not in vain

Reading for the Million.

Argument of S. T. Brown, Esq.,

Before the Joint Committee of Investigation, on the Cassville Soldiers' Orphan School, in the Senate Chamber, Harrisburg, March 19th, 1874.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee:—It was assigned to me to speak in reply to such arguments as should be produced on the part of the defendant here, and my being called at this time is owing to an arrangement entered into just at the commencement of the argument of Mr. Doty, the counsel for the defense insisting that we shall occupy a full hour and a half of our time before they were called on to reply. This being the case, of course I have made no preparation, to speak in chief, and shall occupy a portion of the time left us by referring to a few points of the testimony which have been very cursorily glanced at by my colleague. Before doing so, however, I would just remark that the testimony of the prosecution in this case is not that of one or two witnesses, but of many. It is true that the main witnesses are five in number, three females and two males. The females have all been named here by Mr. Doty. They are Miss Hanculf, Miss Pope and Miss Barclay, now Mrs. Funk. The two boys were Alfred Hanculf, and John R. Strickland. The first three were girls who testify to the criminal acts attempted on themselves. The two boys testify to crimes, so shameful to humanity that they ought to be unmentionable in their details, of which they also had personal knowledge, because perpetrated on themselves. But before referring to the details of these charges, or the answers made to them, I will read an extract or two from the testimony of Miss Hanculf. Mr. Doty referred, at some length, to the testimony of Miss Hanculf, in relation to the first outrage attempted,—that which occurred in the room or office of A. L. Guss, when she was between the age of 13 and 14 years, but merely hinted at two or three other insults, of equal or greater aggravation.

After detailing the insults referred to by Mr. Doty, as occurring in the room, she is asked the question, "Did he ever do anything, on any other occasion, and if so when and how long after that?" Answer—"I presume it was a year or more after; it was not more than two years at the farthest, when I remained there during vacation, before I was 16, the last vacation I spent there; he met me in the hall, and asked me to take a walk to the spring. I inquired who was to go along—a little suspicious, you will observe, of her preceptor and teacher—he allowed, 'we will do.' I remarked I would rather have some more to go along. * (Here follow several extracts from the testimony, which, though proper for the Committee, who were to pass upon it, yet it is of such an obscene character as to be unfit for publication, and we omit it.) Next day when I went to his office for a hammer to nail my trunk, he got it and handed it to me, and as I turned to leave the room, he said, 'Look here, Kate, you will not tell what has happened between you and me, and if I can do you a good turn I'll do it; but never tell your friends about what has happened."

Now, gentlemen, Guss has undertaken to give an account of this occurrence himself. He was called to the stand, and related his long, tedious story. You will remember that after having taken the stand as a witness, he finally came down to this point in the case, and denied that he ever had any criminal intimacy with any of these girls, and never did anything improper, except on one occasion he did put his arm around Kate Hanculf and kissed her. He says he was in his office, sitting on the table, and she came in, and he got down and put his arms around her and kissed her! That was a scene worthy of a painter—a scene that ought to be depicted by a Reuben or a Hogarth! Imagine to yourselves this clergyman (!) sitting in his office, in the deepening twilight, and and Miss Hanculf, a well developed young girl of sixteen, enters the office; the door closes with a spring lock behind her. There she stands, in the presence of this man, who is meditating a sermon, perhaps, or perhaps upon that lecture on Solomon's Temple; upon the felicity of that great Prince who had built the temple, and who had three hundred wives and seven hundred concubines; but he deliberately gets down off the table, places his arm around the young girl, presses her to his bosom and kisses her. That was all according to to his statement. But do you believe it, gentlemen? A man like *that*, with a face that *alone* would justify a prosecution for adultery and incest every day in the week! If that *was* all, gentlemen of the Committee, it was only because he was repelled by the stern virtue of this girl of sixteen. I believe I have occupied the balance of the one and a half hours.

THE CHAIRMAN:—You have six minutes yet.

MR. BROWN:—But this is a small part of the testimony and cross-examination. The most searching and the most insulting questions were put to her. It was well for the Committee to give the defendant and his counsel all the latitude they wanted for their defense, but I say they put questions which were an insult to their own manhood, and all in the attempt to torture her into some contradiction that they might take advantage of. But did they do it? I say they utterly failed, in all this hour and a half of cross-examination, commencing their questions with the time when she come to the school, a child of eleven years of age. She innocently remarked that before she come to the school she knew nothing about such things, and had never heard of them. But I tell you, gentlemen, that when a young girl got into that school, it was not long until she learned something about them, either from the teacher or the general report current among the employees or boys; and I say that is one of the most damaging features of the evidence—that the children talked about these things—that the boys and girls talked about them—the boys had their suspicions, and the girls knew they were true.

Time up.

Woods follows.

Adjourned till 7½ P. M.

EVENING SESSION.

Petriken opens.

BROWN: *Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee:*—The case of the prosecution having been presented by my colleague, Mr. Doty, and the testimony having been commented on to some extent, it now becomes my duty to answer, as far as I can, in the limited time left me, the arguments presented on the part of the defense. The nature of this duty precludes, of course, that preparation which would enable me to make an orderly and methodical presentation of the case, and I trust I shall be indulged if somewhat wandering in my remarks. The review of my colleague, happily relieves me from many of the loathsome details of this evidence. I am glad it is so, because he has done it well, and because it is unpleasant for me to dwell upon such disgusting details. I would have been content to close this case when the testimony closed, without a word of argument—content even to have permitted them to go on and break the force, and explain away these terrible charges if they could. But they insisted on their right to be heard; it was granted, and it has imposed on us the duty of replying. We have assumed that duty, and are here to discharge it to the best of our ability.

What is the nature of the defense set up here? If I understand rightly their arguments, the defense consists in the first place, of the allegation that these witnesses for the prosecution are of bad character, and have sworn falsely. Second, They say that the charges were made for political purposes. Third.—That Guss himself has denied them, and Fourth. That Guss is a man of good character, and that everybody says so about Cassville. Under these four heads are included all the arguments and the positions they have taken. The first two relate to the witnesses for the *prosecution*; the other two to the testimony of the *defendant*. They say, in the first place, that these girls and boys who have testified to these damaging facts against Prof. Guss, are of bad character and ought not to be believed. They called a number of employees of the school, over about Cassville, who said they knew these girls when at school, and some said their characters were not very good, and others that they were bad, and so it went.

Now, gentlemen, I want you to remember this one thing about the testimony to character, and it is this: they undertook to break down the testimony of these girls before you by evidence relating to their history and character five or six years ago. I believe all these three girls, Hanculf, Barclay, and Pope, are now between 19 and 20 years of age. They went back to the period when they were in the school, and from 14 to 16 years of age, to show what they then were, and I say they did not succeed in shaking the testimony of these girls by any evidence offered on this point. It is not a question of inquiry here whether these girls, when children at school, always told the strict truth; whether they were good, pious little girls; and it is well, perhaps, if they were not, because very good children always die young. That is not the question; but I say, if it were the question, they did not show that they were liars then. Is it to be supposed that because children will tell fibs in school that they are never to be believed under oath afterwards? When is the disability to be removed if not in five or six years? Suppose it could have been proved that Mr. Woods or Mr. Petrekin was in the habit of telling lies when at school,—and I have no doubt it could have been proved by that oligarchy at Cassville School,—why everybody knows that either of these gentlemen would be thrown into spasms at the idea of telling a falsehood now, when they have grown to be men. The question is whether at the time these girls took the book and swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, they were then of such infamous character that you are not to believe them under oath. Now, it seems to me, it comes down to that, and that is the point in the case. If you believe these girls and their statements, can you hesitate for a moment in declaring that this is not the man to train up and guide, and control the children of our fallen Soldiers? I say the main question is, are these witnesses worthy of belief? If these witnesses are not to be believed who can be believed? What is the nature of the testimony they adduced to break them down? When we asked them the question, *why* of bad character? "Oh" they said, "they told stories on the school." What stories? "Oh they raised stories on Prof. Guss," a number of them said this, and I believe some of them said on Mr. Weidman. You heard Weidman's statement and know all about it. But, they said they had raised stories on Guss. That is begging the question, and I tell you, gentlemen, that is where all the trouble arose. Away back five or six years ago, these stories were afloat, and as soon as they got afloat and from that day down to this hour, there has been a systematic effort to break down the character of these *children*, as they then were, and young ladies, as they now are. From that very day it seems to have been the object of this man to break them down, by a systematic and persistent effort. But the question now is, have they succeeded? These stories were afloat. How did they get afloat? Every one of these three girls told her mother. Miss Hanculf wrote to her mother, and Miss Pope, as soon as she got inside of her mother's door related to her the story of outrage and insult. They say she came back to Huntingdon with Guss after the alleged injury. She said on the stand that she had no money to bring her home. Guss had taken her there, and she had not the command of wagons and teams to come and go when it pleased her, nor the means to pay her bills at Cassville. Necessity knows no law, and she was compelled to return home the best way she could. When they ask why Mrs. Hanculf permitted her child to remain there, why send the other younger children there, we give the same answer; she was not able to support them. That is the reason the State supports them, and the reason she sent them there and left them there. She exhausted all her power, and the guardian exhausted all his power to get this girl away and they failed. When these children get into Guss hands he keeps his clutches on them. Did they break down these witnesses? When I want to get to the very bottom of an affair and want to know what the God's truth is, I want to see the witnesses on the stand, and hear them tell their story; to have them submitted to a cross examination I want to understand the *motives* that influence them in giving their testimony, and I would rather have *that* than the gossip of ten thousand of the Gusses and Riendlaubs concerning their character. I want to hear them as you heard them. Did they not sustain themselves? Talk about these trifling contradictions in detail. It strengthens their story, and shows that there is no concert between them. These four or five witnesses, living in different counties, not acquainted, and perhaps never having spoken together since these things took place, and yet testify to facts of the same nature, within their own knowledge, uncontradicted, except so far as they have undertaken to contradict them by evidence against their characters. What were the motives to induce these girls to tell these stories? It is a rule of evidence and of common sense that men and women do not perjure themselves without a motive. It is natural to speak the truth. It is doing violence to our natures to lie, and nobody tells a lie, especially under oath, unless there is some strong counteravailing motive. What motive had these girls in coming here and relating these stories falsely? The motive was all on the other side. Their motive would rather be to conceal. What motive had they to tell these things which they could not tell without bringing more or less of stigma on their own characters? And it was no small load of infamy they took on themselves to have their names associated with this man, one which would go down to the latest hour of their lives. But I say that they are corroborated here by numberless circumstances, and by the conduct of A. L. Guss himself. Why did he send these persons to see this lady, Miss Hanculf? Why did Harper Snyder go to her and try to persuade her to be silent, and why did the sister in law write a letter to her, on the same subject, couched in beautiful but artful language though it be? Do you think, if these three girls had gone on the stand and given evidence favorable to Guss, that they would not have been paraded there as paragons of excellence, angels of purity and truth? If these girls had come to the stand and told their stories and gone away, and you had heard nothing more and seen nothing more of them, you might have doubted whether it was in human nature to commit such acts,—whether any man could be so depraved; but they have undertaken to attack their characters, and I leave it to you whether we did not sustain them. You heard the evidence for and against their characters, and I leave it to you, in the discharge of your solemn duty, to say on whibh side it preponderates. I say that their testimony is more worthy of belief this hour, than if there had not been a word of testimony offered with regard to their credibility. I believe they did not undertake to break down the two boys, Hanculf and Strickland. What about them? Mr. Petrekin talked about them in a very low tone, and a very modest way, but gentlemen, there that testimony stands, and so does the testimony of these girls, yea, and there it *will* stand, until the day when the Great Judge of all, to whom they appealed for the truth of what they were about to declare, shall pass upon it. Did they even attempt to break down the character of these boys? Let us see what they did do. In regard to Strickland, they brought a Miss Somebody from Howard, who said John Strickland was a loafer. How did she know it? She lived three miles out in the country, and he in the village, and she had seen him loafing about the railroad station. If he, living in the village, became a loafer thus, how many times must she have come in, three miles to loaf there to find it out? That was very hefty testimony. It is a rule among lawyers that when an attempt is made to break down a witness and fails, it injures the case of the party who attempts it; and I think the attempt to break down John Strickland's evidence in that way was a failure.

I will now take up the second point, that this is a *political prosecution*, as this persecuted saint would have it. Now, gentlemen, that must mean something. It must mean that these witnesses for the prosecution testify to these things falsely, for political purposes, or else it means that being true somebody has induced them to reveal them for political purposes. Their argument is a little obscure, but it must mean one or the other. Where is the evidence that these young ladies made these statements for political purposes? What political purpose had Kate Hanculf,—a young lady living in Blair county? I do not know that the political fame of Prof. Guss extends up there, and besides she was not a voter. And Lousia Pope, pray what political purpose had she to subserve? She lives in Huntingdon, the present headquarters of the Professor, but she was not a voter, and I doubt whether she knows what political party she belongs to, and Mrs. Funk, or Strickland, or the Hanculf boy,—what political purpose had they to subserve that would induce them to perjure their souls against this man Guss? Why, it is too absurd to talk about. McEldowney is the only voter in the crowd, and what political purpose had he to subserve. I never knew while the testimony was being taken, what his politics were, but I accidentally learned by a gentleman of good standing in the Democratic party last week, that he was a Democrat, and Mr. Petrekin says this is not a fight in their party, but in ours. What political purpose then had any of these six witnesses to subserve?

The other branch of the argument, then, is that somebody has induced these witnesses to *reveal* these facts for political purposes. If they mean to insinuate that I or any of these gentlemen associated with me ever breathed a wish or desire that any witness that appeared on the stand, was there for any other purpose than to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, I hurl back with contempt the insinuation. It is not in the case, and there is no evidence of it. I'll tell you, gentlemen, what this argument means. It is that if Gen. Beath and Mr. Vanderslice, and the citizens of Huntingdon county, and you, gentlemen of the Committee, had not stood by these young girls, and said to them, "stand up and tell all you know, and we will protect you from the rage and malice of this man," that they would have been able to *smother* this damning testimony, and God knows, perhaps they could have done it. What were these orphan children against this man, and his array of counsel, and his backers about Cassville? They were powerless. That is what is in the argument, gentlemen, if it means anything at all. I was glad to hear the counsel on the other side argue the case in that way, these constant allusions to Senator Scott and the political purposes, and all that, and I hope you will not be surprised at Mr. Woods, as he has had John Scott on the brain for several years. It is a kind of harmless lunacy, and the people of Huntingdon county are not much affected by it. What was there in the evidence to show that Senator Scott had taken any part in this prosecution one way or the other? If there is anything, I can't remember it; but if such evidence had been in existence, would it not, after the spirit displayed here, have been dragged into the case. The whole amount of it is this, that these stories were afloat for years, that these girls had made these statements, but the whole three had told their mothers about it. They had gone just where nature directs when the the child is injured. A son will generally go to the father, but naturally they go to the mother, but, by God's providence, these children had no friend but the mother to go to, and they went and told their wrongs there, and from that day to this hour these stories were afloat. They told them to their mothers, the mothers had spoken to their friends on the subject, and they thus became spread over the county, and they knew it. Every one of these mothers had written to him, and charged him with it. He knew they were afloat, and the source of them, and he knew that there was nothing political in them.

Now, what induced them to argue this way I do not know, or what private griefs the gentlemen have I know not, and care not; but I was glad they undertook to argue the case on that foundation, not because it was the proper thing to say, but when an attorney undertakes to talk to intelligent men as if they were fools, he is invariably set down at the estimate he places on the intelligence of those who hear him. I was glad they argued it in that way,—on a foundation, which you know to be false, from every word of testimony in this case, from beginning to end.

But Mr. Guss, they say, has denied this thing. He has risen to explain. Well now my province here is to answer the *arguments* on the part of the defense, and not specially to review the testimony of either the prosecution or the defense; but as Mr. Guss' testimony was an argument, and not testimony, it makes it necessary for me to glance at it slightly. You remember, gentlemen, we closed a little before adjourning time at noon, in Huntingdon; everybody else had been heard, as was supposed, on either side until that time; but they were still not quite ready to call Guss. We then adjourned over till 2 o'clock, when Mr. Guss takes the stand, and for three mortal hours occupied your time and our time telling about this case. A person would think he might have denied these things in three minutes. It don't take a man very long to say you lie, or I did not do it; but he commences away back long years ago, and for the purpose of convenience, I will divide his testimony into five chapters. Don't get alarmed, gentlemen, about the number of chapters. The first four have so little in them that I can go through them in forty seconds each. The first told us how he got into the Orphan School business, and for that he makes Dr. Burrowes responsible. I believe the old gentleman is dead now, but if he *was* responsible for putting Guss into the Orphan School business, it was the great mistake of his life. That is all I have to say on chapter first. In the second chapter he told us how he got into politics, and for that he makes Gov. Curtin responsible; he said the Governor solicited his aid and influence to elect a certain Ephraim Baker to the Legislature of Pennsylvania. That will be news up in Huntingdon county, because it was often wondered there how Ephraim did get into the Legislature. Some supposed it was through a little combination that used to exist in Huntingdon county, but does not now, as nobody seems willing to acknowledge that they belonged to it. Ephriam, I had always supposed, was a little like Senator Nye, when he first got into the United States Senate, he said "I looked around among these great men, and said to myself, how did I get here; but after being there a while, I said to myself, how in the devil did the rest of you get here." I think that was about the way with Ephraim, and when this testimony gets out there it will be news indeed; and some things understood that never were before. That is all I have to say on the second chapter. The third tells how this Orphan School grew, from small beginnings, to be a great and flourishing institution, all, no doubt, through the learning, piety, zeal, and diligence of A. L. Guss. He told all about how much the property cost in the first place, and how much he had expended since. He seems to think you are a board of