The Huntingdon Journal.

J. A. NASH, - - - Editor.

HUNTINGDON, PENN'A.

FRIDAY, - - - - - MARCH 12, 1880.

Circulation LARGER than any other Paper in the Juniata Valley.

Entered at the Post Office, at Huntingdon, Pa., as Second Class Mail Matter.

Republican State Ticket.

FOR JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT:

Hon. HENRY GREEN,

OF EASTON.

FOR AUDITOR-GENERAL:

Hon. JOHN A. LEMON,

OF BLAIR.

Republican National Convention,

A National Convention of the Republican party will meet at Chicago on Wednesday, the second day of June next, at 12 o'clock noon, for the nomination of candidates to be supported for President and Vice President at the next election. Republicans and all who will co-operate with them in supporting the nominees of the party are invited to choose two delegates from each Congressional district, four at large from each State, two from each territory, and two from the District of Columbia, to represent them in the Convention.

J. D. CAMERON, Chairman.

THOMAS J. KEOGH, Secretary.

COL. TOM SCOTT, as president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, receives a salary of $24,300 per annum.

NEARLY 300,000,000 postal cards were used in the United States last year. Postmasters must have been kept busy reading so many.

ONE of Harrisburg's prominent physicians, Dr. Jno W. Bechtal, has got himself into trouble and prison, on the serious charge of malpractice.

HON. SIMON CAMERON was 81 years old on Monday. A large number of his friends and admirers called upon him during the day and extended their warm congratulations.

THE council for Brant and Hummel, two of the Raber murderers, has made application to the Board of Pardons for a commutation of the death sentence to imprisonment for life.

THE Republican members of the Maine Legislature have chosen delegates at large to the Chicago convention, and instructed them to support Senator Blaine. Eugene Hale heads the delegation.

ANDREW HOPKINS, esq., editor of the Washington *Review and Examiner*, and founder of the Harrisburg *Patriot*, died at his residence in Washington, Pa., on Friday morning, aged fifty-five years.

A RUMOR from Port Carbon, in the anthracite coal regions, is to the effect that the Mollie Maguires are busily engaged in reorganizing their society. A little more hemp will have to be stretched for the benefit of these cut-throats.

HON. ED. M'PHERSON has been appointed Secretary of the Republican Congressional Committee, with headquarters at Washington. The selection is a capital one, and his long experience in such labors renders him capable to discharge the duties of the position in an efficient manner.

THE valedictory of Hon. Ed. McPherson, as the editor of the Philadelphia *Press*, appeared in that paper of Saturday last. Mr. McPherson took a position on the paper, as a political writer, in September, 1878, and since January, 1879, he has occupied the position of editor-in-chief.

THE McVeytown *Journal* has just entered upon its eighth volume, and in announcing the fact "Cooney" "does it proud." Under his management the paper has been made quite remunerative, the which we are glad to hear. May it continue to prosper, and by the time it reaches its sixteenth birthday may our friend Conrad retire a millionaire.

CHIEF MILLER has issued a call for his Democratic braves to meet in council in Pittsburgh, on the 18th inst. The Fulton *Democrat* says that "it is an outrage to compel eastern delegates to go to Pittsburgh to please the little Tilden coterie around that city." The chief of cipher alley carries the wampum-belt, and his followers in the tribe do as he orders.

SENATOR CARPENTER made a speech in the Fitz John Porter case, on Saturday, and took strong grounds against his reinstatement in the army, contending that Congress had no power to set aside the finding of a court martial. The speech was an able one, but just before its close Mr. Carpenter spoiled the effect of it by the proposition to re-nominate Gen. Grant. We cant see what Grant's candidacy has to do with the case of Fitz John Porter.

THE hoodlums of San Francisco, under the lead of Kearney, have threatened to burn the property of any person employing Chinese. They have placarded the city saying that they would lay the city in ashes unless their demands were complied with. Gen. McDowell, commander of the army of the Pacific, under orders, has sent several hundred United States troops to San Francisco to be in readiness to quell any riot that these lawless vagabonds may inaugurate. For self protection, against this rabble, the law abiding citizens have organized committees of safety, and if a riot should be precipitated it will be bad for those who are led to acts of lawlessness by the Irish Communist, Denis Kearney. The decent people of San Francisco should offer a price for his head.

A. M. PURDY, of Palmyra, N. Y., sends *postpaid and free* to all applicants his valuable 24-page Catalogue of Fruits and Flowers, giving kinds, descriptions, mode of planting, &c. Every person who has a rod of garden or ground to plant, should have it. He also sends *free* a specimen copy of THE FRUIT RECORDER AND COTTAGE GARDENER, a monthly at $1.00 per year, devoted to fruits and flowers—*it speaks for itself;* while 25 cents will get his *64 page* SMALL FRUIT INSTRUCTOR—a work pronounced by all who have seen it, the *most concise and practical* of any yet printed. Persons sending to him now will get the Catalogue, and the FRUIT RECORDER for 1880, and the SMALL FRUIT INSTRUCTOR, *all post paid* for *only One Dollar*. He accepts postage stamps for odd change.

THE RIOT BILLS TRIALS.

The Riot Bill bribery cases were called for trial in the Dauphin county court, on Monday last, when pleas of guilty were entered, by counsel, in the cases of Wm. H. Kemble, Jesse R. Crawford, Charles B. Salter, and Wm. F. Rumberger. The plea of Wm. H. Kemble included "corrupt solicitation" only, and did not admit the corrupt offering of "any money or thing of value" to any of the persons named in the indictment. Kemble was also under indictment for perjury, but it is thought that his plea of guilty in the other case will avoid a trial for perjury. This turn of the case took every one by surprise, as no one expected that these defendants would acknowledge their guilt, and their trial was looked forward to with great interest by the people throughout the State. Representative Charles E. Wolfe, of Union, who was instrumental in bringing to the surface this rotten transaction, and who is the leader of the House Committee for the prosecution, regards the result as a complete vindication, and justifies his course in instituting the prosecution. His object in these prosecutions was to expose the *modus operandi* of legislation at Harrisburg in these latter years, and by so doing he has accomplished a good work, and in the future the work of the lobbyist will be attended with some danger to his pocket and his personal freedom.

The penalty which the act of Assembly attaches to the offense of corrupt solicitation, to which these defendants have plead guilty, is a fine not exceeding $1,000, and imprisonment not exceeding one year. The minimum punishment is not prescribed.

After the disposition of the above cases, the Commonwealth against Emile J. Petroff was called, and after some delay, caused by the late arrival of Judge Jere Black, counsel of the Commonwealth, a jury was sworn, the case opened by the District Attorney, and the examination proceeded with.

The other cases put down for trial at this term, by request of counsel on both sides, have been postponed, and it is the general belief that they will never come to trial. By agreement the 29th inst. has been fixed upon as the time for the imposition of sentences on Kemble, Rumberger, Salter and Crawford.

The Politiphone.

Congress is still engaged in doing nothing—but drawing pay.

The New York *Tribune* contends that Blaine will have thirty delegates out of the Indiana delegation to Chicago.

Chairman Cessna is making a rigid inquiry into the legal qualifications of the names suggested as Presidential Electors, before making public the official list.

Hon. Ed. M'Pherson has sold his stock in the Philadelphia *Press*, amounting to a one-tenth interest, to the holder of the majority interest, said to be a Pittsburgh iron dealer.

Senator Wm. B Elliott, of Philadelphia, who is a delegate to the Chicago Convention, from the First Pennsylvania district, declares publicly and emphatically that he is against Grant.

The New York *World*, the leading Democratic paper in the Empire State, asserts that Mr. Tilden is paying $50 a head for delegates to the Pennsylvania Democratic Convention.

If Tilden should be nominated at Cincinnati, and it looks as if he had the party well in hand to bring about such a result, the New York *World* will have a very unpalatable dish of "crow" to gulph down.

The German Republicans of Cleveland, to the number of over thirteen hundred, have signed a protest against a third term for Gen Grant. The *Anzeiger*, the German organ of the same city says that if Grant is nominated it will repudiate him

It is said that Tilden has already secured over five hundred rooms at Cincinnati, and his agents are still in search for more. It looks as if Sammy intended to run that convention to suit himself, and he intends to "chalk the hats" of all his followers. And so he should, for he will never miss the amount required to do it from his bar'l.

The Tilden boom had a reverse in Allegheny county, on Saturday last, at the meeting of the Democratic committee—The Tildenites, with Col. Barr, of the *Post*, at their head, wanted but one Convention called, but their proposition was voted down by a decided majority, and instead of one convention there will be ten, one for each Senatorial and Representative district in the county.

JUDGE JERE BLACK is given the credit of preparing the plan and writing the report accompanying it, for a change in the electoral system of choosing President and Vice President. It advocates an election by a pluarlity vote, rather than by a majority, and discusses at great length the history of the present system, and of the different elections held under it. The old system grew out of Federal distrust of the people, says Judge Black, but he forgets to add, says the Harrisburg *Telegraph*, that it worked very well as long as the Democratic party had a majority of votes in the College. When the Democracy were repudiated by the people they went to work to destroy not only the electoral system, but that also of the Government. If the Democratic effort to improve the electoral system was honest, it would deserve respect, but it is only another shape in which they desire to defeat the will of the people in using the elective franchise

THE National Greenback Convention met at St. Louis on Friday last. The associated press telegram says that the convention adopted resolutions similar to last year. Stephen B Dillage, of New Hampshire, was nominated for president by a small majority and B. J. Chambers, of Texas, for vice president, although a telegram had been received from the former stating that he would not accept a nomination in opposition to the nominee of the Chicago convention. Motions putting in nomination John C. Fremont and Solon Chase were not seconded. The national executive committee was announced and the convention adjourned to meet in Chicago on June 9. There was great confusion and W. H. B. Lanton, editor of the *West Tennessee Whig*, with five other editors, withdrew, amidst cries of "get out."

Second Open Letter to R. Milton Speer

SIR:—In my letter published two weeks ago, I called on the Democracy of the county to bear witness that you had, in your personal organ, made on me a most "shameful, wanton and ungrateful attack," and that solely because I had not voted for you for School Director at an election which you said had "no political significance." Notwithstanding you own and control the paper, and its heading reads, "S. E. FLEMING & Co., PUBLISHERS. S. E. FLEMING, EDITOR," and you, in your own person, represent Fleming & Co., "with all the rights and appurtenances," as we lawyers say "thereunto belonging," you take refuge behind your nominal editor and claim that you did not write the article attacking me, and that you did not see it until it appeared in print. The language of the article, however, is yours. You repeated almost the identical language contained in it, to a group of your special admirers, in a store in this town, before it appeared in the *Monitor*. Besides, whoever knew of a column and a half editorial appearing in your newspaper, that had not been written or supervised by you? With your man in buckram I have nothing to do. I am too old a sportsman to waste my ammunition on a *tom-tit*. It is you, sir, both as owner and publisher of the newspaper, and author of the article in question, I hold responsible.

Born of a race of Democrats who have been somewhat conspicuous in the history of the Democratic party of this State, I came to this county in 1847, and in every campaign since, as the people of this county well know, I have devoted my time, energies and best talents for the success of the Democratic party and its principles. I believe that the perpetuity of our free institutions depends wholly upon the success of the Democratic party and the maintenance of its principles. I have been no office seeker. I have always considered it a duty, as well as a privilege, to work for the success of the Democratic party, and with the blessing of God, I will continue to fight its battles as long as I am vouchsafed health and strength to do so. In 1870 I was nominated by my party and elected to the Senate of Pennsylvania. For this honor I feel very grateful. I was in the Senate three years, and I thought that my conduct there was acceptable and had been generally approved by my constituents, and I still think so. I defy you to specify and point out a stain on my official record, or a *job* that I ever voted for while in the Senate. It is a very easy matter for you to say in your newspaper that I supported "all the *jobs*, big or little," but words, with you, are very cheap, and until you specify some *job* I supported, you must stand in the pillory, convicted of defamation, and of willfully intending to blacken the character of your neighbor. And just here I will remind you that you say that my "record was so notoriously bad that when I "opposed a bill in the Senate dividing the "State into legislative districts, Col. A. "K. McClure, editor of the Philadelphia "*Times*, who was then a member of that "body, made the retort 'that it wasn't "worth while for Mr. Petrikin to oppose "any bill districting the State, because no "district could be made strong enough to "elect him.'" I have you still in the pillory. Stand up, as I intend to convict you of wilfull and deliberate falsehood. I was qualified as a Senator in January, 1871, and my term expired at the close of the session of 1873. The only bill that was entertained or passed for dividing the State into legislative districts, whilst I was in the Senate, was during the session of 1871. The bill passed, making Centre, Huntingdon, Mifflin and Juniata counties a Senatorial District, and met with no objection from me, because it gave us a decidedly Democratic district. The bill was sent to the Governor for his signature on the 25th of April, 1871 and afterwards became a law. Col. McClure was not then a Senator. He did not take his seat in the Senate until the 27th day of March, 1872, after a contest with Harry Gray, who had been returned as Senator to fill the unexpired term of George Connell, who was the Senator from that district when the Legislative apportionment of 1871 became a law, and who died after the close of the session. During the time, therefore, that I was in the Senate with Col McClure, no Legislative apportionment bill was entertained, and he could not have made the "retort" you falsely put into his mouth. When you take up your pen again to coin a deliberate falsehood, be careful that the records cannot be found to refute it. Have I not convicted you of willful falsehood? That I have will, I believe, to use a favorite expression of your own, be "the honest conviction of every unbiased mind." You stand condemned, and I will leave your punishment with the Democracy of the county who you attempted to deceive and mislead. My justification of my Senatorial career is spread upon the Legislative Journal and the records of the Senate, and I again defy you to turn to the record and point out a single instance in which I advocated a job, betrayed my constituents, or left a stain on my official life. With the single exception of the time when Mr. Stenger was a candidate for Congress, and when, on account of my active efforts to nominate you against him, and because of my political association with you, I was accused of voting against Mr. Stenger, my fealty and devotion to the Democratic party and its principles have never been impeached. No one knew this better than yourself. When your father and your brother, each in their turn, were candidates on the Democratic ticket for Sheriff, I gave them an ardent support. In 1870, I nominated you for Congress, and my efforts in your behalf contributed largely to your election. In 1872 I again assisted in your nomination. In 1874 you were again a candidate, and I did my utmost to secure your re nomination and election. At the Conference at Newport, you were defeated and Mr. Stenger was nominated. Have you forgotten what transpired in your room at Newport, when you received the news of your defeat, when, raising your hand, you said to the persons there present, "Gentlemen, I am defeated," and turning to me, continued, "but I will never, no, "never, so help me God, forget the devotion of Major Petrikin to me, and I did "not deserve it." If you have forgotten this, there are living witnesses who will testify to it. I did all I could to nominate you, but your back-pay record was too strong a dose for the average Democratic stomach, and you came home from the Conference breathing vengeance on Stenger, and you labored secretly during the whole campaign to defeat him. Being your warm friend, and disappointed in the failure to nominate you, I also came home from the Conference in a bad humor, and if in that campaign I did not give Mr. Stenger that active support I should have done, I am sorry that the friendship I then had for you should have so far misled me. I hope my conduct since has atoned for my misguided action. I say this is the only blot in my political fealty to my party. I have always since regretted it, and have on all occasions asked my party, as I now publicly do, to forgive me. Have you ever said you regretted or asked to be forgiven for it? I charged in my letter two weeks ago, that you had bought the *Monitor* with your back pay received in Congress, for the express purpose of defeating Stenger's election, and to this you put in no denial, although since that you have published two issues of your paper. You have never denied it, cannot deny it, and it would, I suppose, be beneath your dignity to ask the Democracy to forgive you—and that, because knowing you as I do, you imagine you are their master, and they are your servants. You read law and received your legal education in the office of my partner and myself. We never charged you a cent for your tuition. Soon after your admission to practice law, I assisted you in securing an election as Assistant Clerk in the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania. You were a candidate for District Attorney, and I did all I could to elect you. I have already stated what I did to nominate and elect you to Congress the several terms you were a candidate. I never, from the time you first came to Huntingdon, have so much as laid a political straw in your path.

With all this devotion to your personal and political fortunes, I am charged by you, for the first time, in a public newspaper, and that your own paper, with want of fealty to my party, and made the subject of a wicked and unprovoked attack. And why? Because you, being a candidate for School Director, nominated on a Fusion ticket, composed of Democrats and Greenbackers, I would not support you. Angels and ministers of Grace defend us!!! Is that the Shibboleth of the Democracy? If an elector has not voted for you for School Director, is he guilty of damnable heresy, and with a refinement of cruelty unparalelled, must he be read out of the party and consigned to the tender mercies of W. H. Woods and W. M. Williamson? This is the test you have made in your newspaper, and it was upon this pretext, whatever other selfish or malicious motive may have lurked behind it, that you singled out Mr. McNeil and myself and made us the target for your malice

Now, sir, in the support of *Fusion tickets*, how stands your record? In 1869 the Woods wing of the Republican party obtained the control of the County Convention and nominated the Republican County ticket with Williamson for Treasurer, Fouse for Prothonotary, Lamberson for County Commissioner, and Richardson for Director of the Poor. The Democrats in County Convention, agreed to fuse with the Scott Republicans, upon the following ticket: Treasurer, Cloyd, a one armed soldier; Prothonotary, McNeil; County Commissioner, Jackson; Poor Director, James Smith. Every man on the ticket a Democrat but Cloyd, and consequently, it should have received a united Democratic support. True, however, to your selfish instincts, because Williamson, if elected Treasurer, would have deposited the County funds in the Union Bank, in which you are a Stockholder, you used the most strenuous efforts to defeat Cloyd and elect Williamson. To accomplish your purpose, you wrote letters to prominent Democrats, enclosing the Democratic ticket with Williamson's name on as Treasurer, with a five dollar bill, and saying, "where you "cannot get a Democrat to vote for Williamson let him vote a BLANK for Treasurer; under no consideration let his vote "be cast for Cloyd." Notwithstanding your efforts, you lost your money, and your candidate for Treasurer was defeated, and Cloyd and the whole Fusion ticket were elected by handsome majorities. Had I been the owner of a newspaper, and charged you with a want of fealty to your party for your opposition to part of this ticket, nominated by your party, and had said that your conduct was cowardly, no one sooner than yourself would have complained that it was a hard measure to meet out to you. Yet, because on a fusion ticket, nominated by yourself, I did not vote for you for School Director, you have, in your newspaper, vented your malice on my unoffending head.

To this attack I replied in a Republican newspaper, because the only newspaper in the county, professing to be Democratic, was owned and controlled by you In that letter I said, "I have been compelled to say this much. Considering "the unprovoked attack you made on me, "you could hardly expect I would have "said less. Upon how you shall deport "yourself in the future, will largely depend whether I shall ever publicly say "more"

Again you renew the attack in the two last issues of your newspaper, in language of which you, if there is such a word as shame in your vocabulary, should be ashamed. You do not, as every well thinking man would say you should have done, apologize for the wrong you attempted to do me, but you say we stand "by every word in the article, and have no "apology to make." Neither do you attempt to justify your conduct, but for the benefit of your three hundred subscribers, you then entertain them with slang and Billingsgate, such as only "an extraordinary Quarter Sessions lawyer from the mountains," as one of your Congressional Colleagues once called you, only could do.

You call me "a dirty creature." Did you write that in your sober senses? I have heard you orally apply such epithets to Hon. Wm. A. Wallace after your defeat for the nomination for Congress at Newport. I have heard you call Hon. John Scott "a dirty hound." You have, for the purpose of acquitting a culprit you were defending, in your speech to the jury defamed the character and motives of the pastor of the church of which you profess to be a member, and in the same speech, to the same jury, in like manner, defamed the character of the Episcopal clergyman of this town. You have used like epithets before, and I suppose "as an extraordinary Quarter Sessions lawyer," you are privileged to use them again. But this is the first time, I believe, I have known you to put such epithets in writing and apply them to me or anyone else. You, however, have a newspaper of your own, and are privileged to do so, if you wish.

There is no argument in epithets, and I do not intend to use them. If I did, I might say that when after you had been sworn in the Tyhurst libel case, I heard some one say you were very "inexact" in your testimony. That when you tried your case against Greenberg, that I heard Greenberg say that your testimony in the case was flat perjury. That at the last court, when, after you left the stand as a witness in the Green Eby case, Ex. Sheriff Neely confronted you with a written receipt, and denounced you as having sworn to a down right positive lie. I might say that when you testified in the Tyhurst Walls libel case, "that you were not at home at the time of the Inquisition of Lunacy," that you had hardly left the stand before a respectable gentleman of this town, and a brother of one of the jurors, said "that is not true, because Speer told me when the Inquisition of Lunacy was sitting, that he was interested in the decision of the jury, and asked me to intercede with my brother and have him decide in his (your) favor."

The truthfulness of these charges you can settle with the gentlemen who made them. I do not endorse them, but produce them to show how easily they can be made, and how, even *your* spotless character and name, may be sullied. I shall not bandy epithets with you, or use slang. I consider them only the weapons of uncultured persons, and for want of argument used by them when worsted in a controversy.

Having applied to me the epithet of "dirty creature," you proceed to call me "bankrupt," say I am "despised," "broken," "ruined," &c., and indulge in other choice language to show how scholarly and gentlemanly you can be when occasion demands it. You then intimate that for years you had endeavored to save me from some unmentioned fate, and then cap the climax of your littleness by saying, "before "Bruce Petrikin wastes any more time "heaping denunciation on the *Monitor* and "its editor, we would suggest that he "pay the $10.80 subscription which he "owes us" And is it possible that you intended this slang and billingsgate as an answer to my letter? You had traduced and abused me in your own newspaper for not voting for you for School Director, and when I reply in my own justification to your unprovoked and malicious attack, is this the way you answer me? And you, to twice a representative in Congress from this district!!! Don't you think you should hide your head in shame? If I was my misfortune, by reason of endorsements for friends and relatives, to have met with financial embarrassment, do you think it is manly on your part to flaunt it in my face in the columns of your newspaper, and say of me that I am a bankrupt? Had I been as close fisted, avaricious and grasping as you have been, and had I set my face, and steeled my heart to those who, in their hour of need, sought my aid, I might to-day have been the possessor of ten times more than ever you in your great wealth, possess. You are a very wealthy man You are a very Croesus or Jew! You must be worth the magnificent sum of twenty thousand dollars!! You are one of the magnates of the land! Vanderbilt, Astor and Jay Gould, are as paupers in your presence! But being so exceedingly wealthy, you should not have taunted and jibed your poor neighbors with being bankrupt and publish in your paper that I owed you $10.80 for subscription, which I paid before the last issue of your newspaper, and which you had not the decency to acknowledge. You had never asked me to pay this $10.80, nor was I aware that I owed it. I had paid many bills for advertising and paper books on presentation, and supposed my subscription was included. I learned through the columns of your newspaper, for the first time, that I owed you $10.80, and I promptly called and paid it. Now, candidly, do you think, if you had owed me $10.80, or any other sum that I would have published the fact in a public newspaper? Contemplate, for an instant, your language and your conduct Great God! can any finite mind encompass the length, breadth and depth of your meanness?

And what, sir, do you mean when you say that you endeavored to save me from my fate? What fate? And when did you endeavor to save me? If, by this, you pretend to assert that at any time or under any circumstances, you ever did me a political or pecuniary favor, I have only to say that your mendacity is only equalled by your meanness. I never craved any political or financial favors from you. I don't owe you one farthing, and never did, excepting all the time the now historical $10.80. The obligation is all on the other side as I have shown above. I have been the main prop and stay of your political fortunes. It is not amazing, however, that you should have made such a preposterous and impudent claim, because I think no one will now be astonished at your boldness, mendacity or malice. When and how did you ever save me or any one else? Let the record you have made for yourself in the cases of James Walls, Jacob Hoffman, Henry Greenberg, James C. Smiley, and others, answer. Your whole pathway is strewn with the wrecked fortunes of men who, trusting you, you have betrayed and deceived. It would be refreshing news, indeed, to learn that you had ever saved any one.

I have already written a long letter. I said in my former letter, I regretted that you, by your conduct, had compelled me to write that one. You made the attack on me and my self-respect compelled me to answer it. To the Democratic party of the county, both you and I are unimportant factors, and the grand old party will live, and its men and measures will continue to control the destiny of this country when you and I are in our graves. Had you not resumed the attack on me in the last two issues of your paper, I would not have written this letter. I have endeavored to repel your fresh assaults. There is but one other subject to which I will refer, and then, unless you otherwise will it, I will drop a controversy, which you commenced, and which must be distasteful to Democrats, and pleasing only to Republicans. For the opening of the controversy you are alone to blame.

The subject to which I refer is the "back pay" to which I referred as taken by you, and with which you purchased the *Monitor*. You kindly remind me that you accepted "just what the law gave you and not one cent more," and that you "voted *against* the bill providing for an increase of salaries of members of Congress, but when it *became a law* you accepted the increase." The italics are your own. Now what are the facts? You did vote *against* it. You have heretofore led your friends to believe that you had spoken against it on the floor of the house. That, however, is a mistake, as no such speech can anywhere be found in the records of Congress, and you do not now claim that you did anything but vote against the bill. Your name is recorded on the first passage of the bill against it. The history of that vote, however, has never been written. At least three of your Democratic colleagues in Congress say that if your vote had been needed to carry the bill, that you would have voted for it. That on the calling of the yeas and nays, you sat, pencil in hand, closely watching the vote, and when your negative vote would not change the result, you voted *no*. If that is the correct history of your vote, it completely robs you of any credit in voting against the bill. But suppose we give you the benefit of the doubt and say that you were conscientiously opposed to the bill and so voted. Your opposition, then, could only be founded on the belief that you had not earned the money, and that, therefore, it would be robbery on your part to put your hand into the Treasury and take $5,000 of the money wrung by taxes from the hard earnings of the people, that did not belong to you. You must have held to this opinion, or you would have voted *yea*. But the record shows you voted *nay*, and then took the money. Had you voted *yea* and then took it, you might have persuaded somebody that you were moved by honest and proper purposes, and that the money properly belonged to you. But by voting against the bill and the receipting for the money, you wrote your own condemnation. Was there any law, human or divine, that compelled you to take that $5,000 out of the Treasury? Were you coerced to do so? Did any of the soldiers of the Republic arrest you and bring you before the Treasurer of the United States and try to compel you to take this money? If they had, you could have answered, "I will not take it, I voted against the bill, and it is wrong to rob the people." But it seems you did not act in this way. You did take it. Not so, however, did your townsman, Hon. John Scott, who voted against the bill, and returned the money into the Treasury, notwithstanding it "*became a law*." I use your italics again. Not so did forty six honest, conscientious members of the same House of Representatives, and twenty six Senators, who had voted against the bill. They refused to touch the money. They argued that it would be robbery to take it. That they would be in the position of a man who had received stolen goods. In other words, it would be "ill gotten gain." Avarice, your demon, seems to have been hurrying you on to your own destruction, and regardless of conscience, in defiance of all morality and justice, and in the teeth of public sentiment, you clutched the $5,000, stuck it into your pocket and started for the mountains of Pennsylvania.

What is the next chapter in this business? When you get home you found your conduct generally condemned. A Convention of the Democracy of Pennsylvania met at Wilkesbarre on the 27th of August 1873. On a substitution from Dr Bigelow, you went to that convention determined to brave the indignation that had been aroused against you and those who took the back pay, and insisted on the Convention electing you President of the Convention, for the purpose of endorsing your back pay record. The Committee, by a majority of one vote, selected you as President of the Convention, but when your name was reported to the Convention a scene was enacted such as never before occurred in any Democratic Convention in this State. It had always been the usage of the political conventions to endorse the report of the committee to name permanent officers, and if there was to be a contest it was always fought out before the committee met or during its deliberations. Not so, however, in your case, as the very mention of your name as President, raised a storm of indignation in the convention and Mr. Glatz, of York, interrupted the reading of the report. (I quote from the printed proceedings): 'And moved a non "concurrence of the convention in the report of the committee so far as read giving "as his reason that Speer had, as a member of Congress, *taken* back pay." You, in vain, attempted to stem the torrent, and said you hoped you would not be stabbed in the house of your friends. I quote again from the printed proceedings: "Messrs "C W. Carrigan and J. Lawrence Getz "spoke in behalf of Mr Speer. The latter gentleman upheld the back-pay bill "and was hissed from the floor. The "sense of the Convention was almost "unanimously against Mr. Speer being "the permanent Chairman. In a short "speech he withdrew his name and moved "that the name of Dr. Andrew Nebinger "be substituted. This was carried and Dr. "Nebinger took the chair." The convention then proceeded to nominate James R. Ludlow for Judge of the Supreme Court, and F M. Hutchison for State Treasurer, and then the Committee on Resolutions reported a series of resolutions, and amongst them the following:

Resolved, That we condemn without reserve the act of Congress granting additional salaries and back-pay grabs as unjust and unjustifiable, and demand its immediate and unconditional repeal, and we denounce every member of Congress, whether Republican or Democrat, who supported the law, *or received the money* procured thereby, and we especially denounce the conduct of President Grant in using the influence of his high position for its passage, and whose official signature made it a law.

That is good Democratic doctrine, and I suppose you will not object to it going into Democratic households. It may do good. The printed report reads, "the resolutions were adopted unanimously." You were a member of that Convention and must have voted for the resolution and your own condemnation, otherwise the report could not have been adopted *unanimously*. This is the record you have made for yourself. When I said, therefore, that the $5,000 was "ill gotten gain," I was only repeating what the assembled representatives of the Democracy of Pennsylvania, and yourself of the number, had unanimously resolved. I will not now or ever call your attention to what the public press at the time said of your conduct, unless by your conduct in the future you shall compel me to do so. I have endeavored to prove what I said in my former letter, that you are sordid, selfish and ungrateful, and in conclusion will warn you that when, in imitation of your illustrious prototype, you erect a gallows to hang Mordecai, have a care you are not suspended from it yourself

R. BRUCE PETRIKIN.

New To-Day.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE HUNTINGDON COUNTY ALMS HOUSE, from December 4, 1878, to December 2, 1879, inclusive:

DR.

To balance in hands of Treasurer at last settlement, January 1, 1879	$ 1912 20	
To amount paid to the Alms House Treasurer by County Commissioners	11000 00	
To amount of insurance received on Alms House and furniture	5331 17	
To amount paid by the Steward in Hagey case	40 00	
Do. in Hettie Gray case	112 50	
To amount received by the Steward from Mifflin county	105 00	
Do. from Blair county	81 05	
To amount paid by Simpson & Armitage on the Hance Campbell judgment	183 59	
		$18765 51

CR.

By amount paid on orders during the year 1879	$16814 80	
By balance in hands of Treasurer	1950 71	
		$18765 51

EXPENDITURES.

FOR FARM.

CR.

By labor on farm	$ 286 66	
" difference in trading horses	97 00	
" two head of cattle	26 75	
" burning lime	22 26	
" cloverseed, plaster and seed potatoes	45 10	
" repairs	24 61	
" smithing and wagon repairs	48 43	
		$ 550 81

FOR PROVISIONS.

By 5,070 pounds of beef furnished house	$ 260 55	
" 5,809 pounds pork do do	291 07	
" 433 " bacon do do	26 98	
" summer meat	112 63	
" apples, cider, vinegar and potatoes	29 60	
		$ 720 83

FOR MERCHANDISE, HARDWARE AND CLOTHING.

By Henry & Co., and others merchandise, clothing and hardware furnished house	$ 1231 40	
		$ 1231 40

FOR OUT-DOOR EXPENSES.

By relief furnished 230 cases, continuous during the year	$ 3650 22	
" relief furnish 176 cases, less than a year	698 82	
" physicians, for medical services	580 28	
" coffins and funeral expenses	248 97	
" John Griffith, for one month out-door services	22 10	
" Michael Stair, 12 months out-door services	111 64	
" A. B. Miller, 11 months out-door services	152 83	
" James Harper, 12 months out-door services	8 00	
		$ 5472 86

FOR REMOVALS.

By Justices, for relief orders issued	$ 134 45	
" constables, for removing paupers	28 81	
		$ 163 26

FOR MISCELLANEOUS AND INCIDENTALS.

By percentage on $11,869 22 at 3 per cent. paid to Alms House Treasurer for 1878	$ 356 07	
" Sheriff Irvin, for keeping four insane four months	291 64	
" Lowry Jacobs, for keeping four insane one day	6 00	
" JOURNAL, *Globe* and *Monitor* for publishing statements, etc	151 35	
" Al. Tyhurst, for order book	17 00	
" insurance on Alms House property	111 25	
" cash paid overseers of Valley township, Armstrong county, for relief and funeral expenses of Thomas Johnson, four months' relief for year 1875	137 12	
" coal	92 79	
" coffins	38 90	
" cobbling	39 57	
" cooking and labor in house	232 71	
" tin, stoneware and repairing	17 15	
" butchering and woodchopping	30 90	
" recording deed, and adjusting weights and measures	4 16	
" weaving carpet, and ashes	5 67	
" drugs	2 00	
" fine paid Canal Co., for driving on tow-path	7 34	
" George W. Whittaker, for report to Board of Public Charities, and annual statements, and settling with Auditors, 1878	27 00	
" James Harper, attending settlement with Auditors, and assisting with reports	23 80	
		$1 592 39

SALARIES.

By Michael Stair, for services as Director 12 mos	$ 67 20	
" James Harper, for services as Director for 12 months	57 60	
" A. B. Miller, for services as Director for 12 months	144 00	
" G. Ashman Miller, services as Treasurer, 1879	275 00	
" Dr. R. Baird, services at house one month	8 37	
" Dr. W. P. M'Nite, services at house 11 months	91 63	
" Geo. W. Whittaker, clerk 12 months	100 00	
" J. R. Simpson, Esq, attorney for Directors 12 months	30 00	
" Jackson Harmon, Steward for amt. of his account	719 96	
		$ 1493 76

FOR RE-BUILDING AND FURNISH ALMSHOUSE, AND BUILDING OUT-HOSPITAL.

By Henry Snare & Co., for re-building Almshouse, per contract	$ 4125 00	
" Henry Snare & Co., for work not included in contract	195 00	
" Henry Snare & Co., for oil paint, lath, glass and lumber	29 80	
" U. B. Lewis, for repairing water tank and pipes	54 40	
" furnishing Almshouse	601 68	
" Jackson Harmon, superintending work on re-building	75 00	
" James Harper, assistant superintendent	47 20	
" Beyer, Guyer & Co., for building hospital	265 80	
" B. Wolf, for lumber	24 38	
" M. Swoope, for mason w'k at hospital	10 40	
" labor at hospital, and shingles	13 81	
" Beyer, Guyer & Co., for plans and specifications of Almshouse	20 00	
" J. R. Simpson, Esq., attorney fees	32 00	
" G. W. Whittaker, services as Clerk	10 00	
" Lindsey & Co., publishing proposals	3 00	
" J. L. M'Ivane, Esq., for viewing Almshouse	11 64	
" Samuel McVitty, esq. do	8 40	
" J. C. Smiley, do do	4 60	
" Michael Stair, Director, for services	22 30	
" James Harper, do	31 61	
" A. B. Miller, do., do	52 00	
" E. Eyler, rent of house for seven months	31 50	
		$ 5669 51

RECAPITULATION.

Aggregate of orders issued for 1879, for general expenses	$11225 31
Rebuilding Almshouse and furnishing same, and building Hospital	$ 5669 51
	$16894 82
Amount of orders paid for '79, as shown by Treasurer's statement, as above	$16814 80
Outstanding orders unpaid	80 02
	$16894 82

WE, the undersigned, Auditors of the county of Huntingdon, do hereby certify that we have examined the orders, vouchers, accounts, etc., of the Directors of the Poor of said county, and their Treasurer, and find the same to be correct, as above stated.

Witness our hands at Huntingdon, this 15th day of January, A. D. 1880.

JOHN LOGAN, J. H. DAVIS, E. PLUMMER, } Aud tors.

STEWARD'S STATEMENT.—JACKSON HARMON, Steward, in account with the Huntingdon County Almshouse, from December 4th, 1878, to December 2d, 1879, inclusive:

DR.

To amount drawn from Treasurer, on orders	$719 96

CR.

By cash paid for postal cards and postage stamps	$ 13 89	
By cash paid for traveling expenses	148 51	
By cash paid for car fare of paupers	14 40	
By cash paid for freight on goods	43 67	
Allowance—Salary of Steward	450 00	
" —Matron	50 00	
		$719 96

ARTICLES MANUFACTURED.

71 women's dresses, 11 pairs of pants, 27 sheets, 47 chemise, 24 aprons, 35 skirts, 25 sacques, 27 bonnets, 23 pillows, 27 pairs stockings, 23 bedticks, 23 pillow-slips, 33 towels, 15 bolsters, 9 shrouds, 21 handkerchiefs, 2 nightgowns, 17 pairs drawers, 51 shirts and 7 caps.

PRODUCE OF FARM.

589 bushels wheat, 384 bushels oats, 1415 bushels corn, [in ear,] 7 bushels cloverseed, 13 bushels rye, 620 bushels potatoes, 18 bushels beans, 75 bushels tomatoes,