THE
"CLEARFIELD REPUBLICAN,"
PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT
CLEARFIELD, PA.
ESTABLISHED IN 1827.

The largest Circulation of any Newspaper in North Central Pennsylvania.

Terms of Subscription.

If paid in advance, or within 3 months....$2 00
If paid after 3 and before 6 months..... 2 50
If paid after the expiration of 6 months... 3 00

Rates of Advertising.

Transient advertisements, per square of 10 lines or less, 3 times or less.....$1 50
For each subsequent insertion..... 50
Administrators' and Executors' notices..... 2 50
Auditors' notices..... 2 50
Cautions and Estrays..... 1 50
Dissolution notices..... 2 00
Professional Cards, 5 lines or less, 1 year..... 5 00
Local notices, per line..... 20

YEARLY ADVERTISEMENTS.

1 square.....$6 00 | ¼ column.....$50 00
2 squares.....15 00 | ½ column..... 70 00
3 squares.....20 00 | 1 column.....120 00

G. B. GOODLANDER,
Publisher.

Cards.

H. W. SMITH,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,
Clearfield, Pa.
1:1:73

J. J. LINGLE,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,
Philipsburg, Centre Co., Pa. ypd
1:18

G. R. & W. BARRETT,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
January 28, 1878.

ISRAEL TEST,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Clearfield, Pa.
Office in the Court House. [Jy11,'67

HENRY BRETH,
(LATE OF U. S.)
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE
FOR BELL TOWNSHIP.
May 8, 1878-1y*

WM. M. McCULLOUGH,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
Office in Masonic building, Second street, opposite the Court House. je26,'78-tf.

W. C. ARNOLD,
LAW & COLLECTION OFFICE,
CURWENSVILLE,
Clearfield County, Penn'a. 75y
c26

S. T. BROCKBANK,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
Office in Opera House. ap 25,'77-1y

JAMES MITCHELL,
DEALER IN
Square Timber & Timber Lands,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
j41'73

S. V. WILSON,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Office one door east of Western Hotel building, opposite Court House.
CLEARFIELD, PA.
sept.5,'77.

FRANK FIELDING,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,
Clearfield, Pa.
Will attend to all business entrusted to him promptly and faithfully. jan1'7

J. F. SNYDER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
Office in Pie's Opera House.
June 26, '75tf.

WALLACE & KREBS,
(Successors to Wallace & Fielding,)
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW,
Clearfield, Pa.
jan1'77

BUCK & GRAHAM,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
All legal business promptly attended to. Office in Graham's Row—rooms formerly occupied by H. B. Swoope. july24, '78-tf.

MURRAY & GORDON,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
Office in Pie's Opera House, second floor. 9:30'74

McENALLY & McCURDY
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW,
Clearfield, Pa.
Legal business attended to promptly with fidelity. Office on Second street, above the First National Bank. jan1:78

A. G. KRAMER,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,
Real Estate and Collection Agent,
CLEARFIELD, PA.,
Will promptly attend to all legal business entrusted to his care.
Office in Pie's Opera House. jan1'76.

J. P. McKENRICK,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
All legal business entrusted to his care will receive prompt attention.
Office opposite Court House, in Masonic Building, second floor. aug14,'78-1y.

JOHN L. CUTTLE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW.
and Real Estate Agent, Clearfield, Pa.
Office on Third street, bet. Cherry & Walnut.
Respectfully offers his services in selling and buying lands in Clearfield and adjoining counties; and with an experience of over twenty years as a surveyor, flatters himself that he can render satisfaction. [Feb. 28,'73:tf.

DR. E. M. SCHEURER,
HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIAN,
Office in residence on First st.
April 24, 1872. Clearfield, Pa.

DR. W. A. MEANS,
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON,
LUTHERSBURG, PA.
Will attend professional calls promptly. aug10'70

DR. T. J. BOYER,
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON,
Office on Market Street, Clearfield, Pa.
Office hours: 8 to 12 a. m., and 1 to 5 p. m.

DR. J. KAY WRIGLEY,
HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIAN,
Office adjoining the residence of James Wrigley, Esq., on Second St., Clearfield, Pa.
July31,'78-tf.

DR. H. B. VAN VALZAH,
CLEARFIELD, PENN'A.
OFFICE IN MASONIC BUILDING.
Office hours—From 12 to 2 P. M.
May 12, 1875.

DR. J. P. BURCHFIELD,
Late Surgeon of the 53d Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers, having returned from the Army, offers his professional services to the citizens of Clearfield county.
Professional calls promptly attended to. Office on Second street, formerly occupied by Dr. Weeds. [apr4,'66-tf

HARRY SNYDER,
BARBER AND HAIRDRESSER.
Shop on Market St., opposite Court House.
A clean towel for every customer.
Also manufacturer of
All Kinds of Articles in Human Hair.
Clearfield, Pa. may 15, '75.

CLEARFIELD REPUBLICAN.

GEO. B. GOODLANDER, Editor & Proprietor. PRINCIPLES, NOT MEN. TERMS—$2 per annum in Advance.

VOL. 53—WHOLE NO. 2,609. CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1879. NEW SERIES—VOL. 20, NO. 7

Cards.

JOB PRINTING OF EVERY DESCRIPTION neatly executed at this office

OSCAR MITCHELL,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
Office in the Opera House. oct9, '78-tf.

WILLIAM M. HENRY, JUSTICE OF THE PEACE AND SCRIVENER, LUMBER CITY. Collections made and money promptly paid over. Articles of agreement and deeds of conveyance neatly executed and warranted correct or no charge. 23jy'72

ROLAND D. SWOOPE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Curwensville, Clearfield county, Pa.
oct. 9, '78-tf.

JOHN D. THOMPSON,
Justice of the Peace and Scrivener,
Curwensville, Pa.
Collections made and money promptly paid over. feb27'71tf

JAS. B. GRAHAM,
dealer in
Real Estate, Square Timber, Boards,
SHINGLES, LATH, & PICKETS,
Clearfield, Pa.
9:1873

REUBEN HACKMAN,
House and Sign Painter and Paper Hanger,
Clearfield, Penn'a.
Will execute jobs in his line promptly and in a workmanlike manner. apr4,'67

JOHN A. STADLER,
BAKER, Market St., Clearfield, Pa.
Fresh Bread, Rusk, Rolls, Pies and Cakes on hand or made to order. A general assortment of Confectionaries, Fruits and Nuts in stock.—Ice Cream and Oysters in season. Saloon nearly opposite the Postoffice. Prices moderate.
March 19, '75.

WEAVER & BETTS,
DEALERS IN
Real Estate, Square Timber, Saw Logs,
AND LUMBER OF ALL KINDS.
Office on Second street, in rear of store room of George Weaver & Co. [Jan9, '78-tf.

RICHARD HUGHES,
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE
—FOR—
Decatur Township,
Osceola Mills P. O.
All official business entrusted to him will be promptly attended to. mch26, '76.

J. BLAKE WALTERS,
REAL ESTATE BROKER,
AND DEALER IN
Saw Logs and Lumber,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
Office in Graham's Row. 1:25:71

E. A. BIGLER & CO.,
DEALERS IN
SQUARE TIMBER,
and manufacturers of
ALL KINDS OF SAWED LUMBER,
CLEARFIELD, PENN'A.
8-1872

G. H. HALL,
PRACTICAL PUMP MAKER,
NEAR CLEARFIELD, PENN'A.
Pumps always on hand and made to order on short notice. Pipes bored on reasonable terms. All work warranted to render satisfaction, and delivered if desired. my22:1ypd

THOMAS H. FORCEE,
DEALER IN
GENERAL MERCHANDISE,
GRAHAMTON, Pa.
Also, extensive manufacturer and dealer in Square Timber and Sawed Lumber of all kinds.
Orders solicited and all bills promptly filled. [*jy18'72

Livery Stable.

THE undersigned begs leave to inform the public that he is now fully prepared to accommodate all in the way of furnishing R...ses, Buggies, Saddles and Harness, on the shortest notice and on reasonable terms. Residence on Locust street, between Third and Fourth.
GEO. W. GEARHART
Clearfield, Feb. 4, 1874

S. I. SNYDER,
PRACTICAL WATCHMAKER
AND DEALER IN
Watches, Clocks and Jewelry,
Graham's Row, Market Street,
CLEARFIELD, PA.
All kinds of repairing in my line promptly attended to. April 23, 1874.

Great Western Hotel,
Nos. 1311, 1313 and 1315 Market Street,
(Directly opposite Wanamaker's Grand Depot.)
Philadelphia, Penn'a.
Terms, $2.00 per day.
This Hotel is near the new Public Buildings, near Masonic Temple, U. S. Mint, and Academy of Fine Arts. T. W. TRAUCK, Prop'r.
OPEN ALL NIGHT. jy17,'75-1y

Clearfield Nursery.
ENCOURAGE HOME INDUSTRY.
THE undersigned, having established a Nursery on the Pike, about half way between Clearfield and Curwensville, is prepared to furnish all kinds of FRUIT TREES, (standard and dwarf,) Evergreens, Shrubbery, Grape Vines, Gooseberry, Lawton Blackberry, Strawberry, and Raspberry Vines. Also, Siberian Crab Trees, Quince, and early scarlet Rhubarb, &c. Orders promptly attended to. Address,
J. D. WRIGHT,
sep20-75-y Curwensville, Pa.

ANDREW HARWICK,
Market Street, Clearfield, Pa.,
MANUFACTURER AND DEALER IN
HARNESS, SADDLES, BRIDLES, COLLARS,
and all kinds of
HORSE FURNISHING GOODS.
A full stock of Saddlers' Hardware, Brushes, Combs, Blankets, Robes, etc., always on hand and for sale at the lowest cash prices. All kinds of repairing promptly attended to.
All kinds of hides taken in exchange for harness and repairing. All kinds of harness leather kept on hand, and for sale at a small profit.
Clearfield, Jan. 19, 1876.

WEST BRANCH
INSURANCE AGENCY.
PENTZ & BROCKBANK, Agents.
(Successors to Murray & Gordon.)
The following first class companies represented:
North British & Mercantile Fire Ins. Co., of England.....$25,000,000
Scottish Commercial Fire Ins. Co., of England.....$10,000,000
North America, of Philadelphia..... 4,700,000
Fire Association, of Philadelphia..... 3,100,000
Watertown Fire, New York, insures farm property only..... 700,000
Mobile Fire Department Ins. Co..... 275,000
Persons in the country wanting insurance, can have it promptly attended to by addressing us in person or by letter. Lowest possible rates in first-class companies. No assessments. Office in Pie's Opera House.
ANDREW PENTZ, Jr.,
S. T. BROCKBANK,
Clearfield, May 1, 1878-1y. Agents.

WAR CLAIMS.

SPEECH OF

Hon. Benjamin H. Hill,

OF GEORGIA

Delivered in the United States Senate, January 27, 1879.

"Magnanimity in Victory is a higher Virtue than Courage in Battle."

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (S. No. 855) for the relief of Warren Mitchell—

Mr. HILL said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I suppose that we had as well meet here as anywhere the question made by this bill. I shall vote against it because I think it ought not to pass. I am not driven to this course by what is called policy, because the gentlemen on the other side are seeking to make political capital out of this and like claims. I am influenced by no such consideration. On the contrary, if I were influenced in this case by the precedents which Republicans have set us in previous Congresses, I should feel constrained to vote for the passage of this bill. I know that by act of Congress the United States Government have paid some very large claims for cotton seized by General Sherman at Savannah; and if the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], as is implied by the question he propounded to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCreery], takes the position that none of the cotton seized by General Sherman at Savannah ought to be paid for by the Government, then the Senator from Massachusetts takes position against the payment of claims that have been allowed by the United States Government and by act of Congress. But I have not investigated to see which way that Senator voted on the question. It would be entertaining and interesting to examine and see how he did vote. One claim for cotton seized at Savannah by General Sherman, amounting to over $500,000, was paid by the votes of a Republican Congress when the House and Senate were both, I believe, about two-thirds Republican.

Mr. CONKLING. What case was that?

Mr. HILL. The case of Lamar. That was a very large claim. It certainly had very little loyalty behind it to push it through. I suppose we must conclude that that case was large enough to go through Congress by its own momentum.

Mr. DAWES. Was not that a judgment of the Court of Claims?

Mr. HILL. I have no recollection that it was. It may have been passed upon by the Court of Claims. I do not remember.

Mr. DAWES. I think it was.

Mr. HILL. Certainly there was nothing in that case which made it better than this and many others either before that Court or before Congress. I do not know how that got through.

Mr. DAWES. I do not affirm that it was, but I will inquire. I think it was.

Mr. HILL. I only say to the Senator from Massachusetts that whether it went through one tribunal or another, I happen to know it went through under Republican auspices. I mention this simply to show that I do not think our friends on the other side should be at this late day exceedingly virtuous on this subject of loyal claims. I have not made the examination. Others profess to have made that examination, and they say not only this claim but claims amounting to a hundred million dollars of like character have been paid by the Republican party during the last ten years. I do not know whether they have or not; I am not a man to delve in this kind of records; but certainly we do know that a very large number have been paid, amounting to very large sums of money. So, if I should follow precedents in this case, the precedents set by gentlemen on the other side, I should feel it my duty to vote for this bill.

I am willing to concede, too, that this gentleman now asking relief at the hands of the Senate is not in the character of a great many others. He is most evidently an honest man from all the evidence I have. I know him but slightly personally; but I have a great many letters from a great many persons in relation to him, and I am satisfied from all the evidence that he is not only an honest man, but that he is incapable of preferring a claim before this body, or any body, that he does not believe to be just and right. I believe all that the Senator from Kentucky has said on that subject is correct. So I do not vote against this claim because I have any suspicion that the gentleman who prefers it is any other than an honest, correct man, and that he sincerely believes his claim ought to be paid.

But, Mr. President, I vote against this bill because, in my judgment, it is what we call *par excellence* a war claim, and I am against the payment of all war claims, whether they be loyal or disloyal, unless it be perhaps some few exceptions in favor of religious, educational, and charitable institutions; and there are very few even of that character that I will except. I vote against their payment upon principle. I have considered this question very carefully, and for a long time, and to-day is the first occasion I have expressed publicly my views upon the subject, because I did not desire to express them until after careful consideration of the question.

Now, why do I vote against this claim? It is, as I have said, emphatically a war claim; that is, it is a claim for compensation by reason of losses incurred during the war and by act of war. My first reason for not voting for it is that we cannot pay all of this kind of claims. They would bankrupt the Government. It is impossible that the Government should be expected to pay all these claims and claims standing on as good footing as this in every respect. If we cannot pay them all, to undertake to pay some is unjust to the rest; it is an unjust discrimination; and why should it be made?

On this subject of loyalty it is a curious spectacle to witness in the Senate of the United States my excellent friends on the other side who are anxious to prove that this gentleman was disloyal, and therefore vote against this claim, and some gentlemen on this side seem exceedingly anxious to prove that he was loyal and therefore will vote for his claim. I shall not trouble myself to consider that question. The question of loyalty is one that must yet receive its definition in this country. It has never yet received it. The word "loyal" as used by gentlemen on the other side, and the word "loyalty" at all, in my judgment, is not a word applicable in a popular Government. I do dislike, I confess, to hear it. What do you mean by "loyal?" Do you mean by "loyal" a man who was devoted to the union of the States under the Constitution? If you thus define it there are thousands, many thousands, in the South who are and ever have been loyal in the highest sense. It was an easy matter for gentlemen living in Maine and New York and Massachusetts during the terrible ordeal through which we passed to proclaim their devotion to the Union—a very easy matter. Everybody concurred with them. It would have required some courage for my friend here [Mr. Allison] in Iowa to have said that he was not for the Union. And where it was such an easy matter to have professed unbounded devotion to the Union, I do not think that such profession has much merit in it. But further down where the sun was warmer and the feelings were more heated, it required courage when the test was made for a man to say he was devoted to the Union. That man is entitled to some credit, and I do know there are thousands and tens of thousands who, under the most trying ordeal to which human courage was ever subjected, stood up and proclaimed their fidelity to the Union to the last moment. Yes, sir, there were thousands of men throughout the Southern States who were fearlessly defending the preservation of the Union, and resisting the current that was against them, when hundreds and thousands who for years have been loudly blatant in declaring their devotion to the Union where it was safe to do so, would not have dared to open their mouths on that line. Yet these gentlemen up here are *par excellence* loyal, and those gentlemen down there who fought against secession until it became an accomplished fact and submitted to disunion as they would submit to the death of a father, from necessity only, and then in sorrow and sadness of heart, are denounced as disloyal because they did what they could only do in their conscience or fact, go with their own people when they were determined to go and did go—these men are now held up as disloyal, and Senators in this body are exerting their wits and exhausting their patience and industry to find some little circumstance that may taint somebody with disloyalty for the purpose of defeating his rights! As I say, this question of loyalty has yet to receive a definition. It has not yet received a proper definition, and cannot be properly defined until passion shall subside, and sound reason be fully restored.

I know thousand of men who were ready to give everything to prevent the act of secession, who were devoted in their hearts and lives to the preservation of the Union of these States; who felt conscientiously bound under the teachings of their life time and under the circumstances that surrounded them, compelled as they were necessarily, compelled conscientiously, not by duress, compelled by honest convictions as the result of a policy which they did not approve, to go as they did go; and, sir, I know that they were just as devoted to the Union as gentlemen who in a different climate and on more convenient occasions could safely proclaim their loyalty and who are now denouncing them as disloyal. It is all wrong, Mr. President.

This gentleman I dare say was a Union man. I know thousands of Union men in the South who were never guilty of an act of infidelity to the Confederacy and who yet never saw the hour nor the moment that they would not have terminated the war on the basis of honest re-union. They were ready at all times to do it and their sentiments were not concealed, yet they went with their section. Shall we say that this is disloyalty, and that they only were loyal who desired that one section should become the conqueror of another section of a common country? Is that what you mean by loyalty? If you mean by loyalty devotion to the Union, desire to preserve the Union, desire even that the result of the conflict on terms honorable to both should be the preservation of the Union—if that is the meaning of loyalty, there are thousands and millions in the South who were loyal and always were loyal. But if you mean by loyalty a desire that one section of a common country should become the conqueror of another section, it will be a fatality for this country it anybody is loyal. I am not ashamed to stand up here and say that I believed the greatest possible calamity that could happen to this country was for one section to become the conqueror of another section of a common country; and yet the sun has never shone for an hour when in my heart of hearts the highest political ambition I ever had was not to see the American Union under the Constitution preserved, perpetuated, and obeyed forever. And yet, sir, there never was an hour when I would not have laid down my life and my all rather than have seen one section of a common country become the conqueror of another section of that same common country, and I believe that the wise men of this country will yet wake up to the fact that the greatest misfortune that has ever befallen us among our many misfortunes is the fact that a successful party to a sectional war obtained immediate and unchecked control of the whole Government over both sections.

So this talk about loyalty and disloyalty has no weight whatever with me in this case. I vote against this bill from higher and different considerations altogether. I say that if the evidences of loyalty in this case are to be accepted as satisfactory, and if that definition of loyalty which I believe is the only proper one is to obtain, then there are thousands of men who have been wronged, reduced to poverty, utter poverty, in the South, who, "in times that tried men's souls," gave higher evidence of devotion to the Union than has been given by equal thousands who are so ready to denounce them as rebels. It is very well for gentlemen who have never been put to the test, it is very well for gentlemen who have never had their courage tried, very well for gentlemen who have never been where it required courage to defend the right as they believed it, very well for gentlemen who could get up in the North and say they were for the Union and receive the undivided plaudits of every listener, very well for gentlemen of that sort to talk about their devotion to the Union and their loyalty, but I tell them their devotion and loyalty has never been tested.

Sir, I have seen men since I have been in the American Congress who have been, on all occasions, parading their devotion to the Union and using every occasion to denounce Southern men as disloyal, who, in my heart of hearts I believe, if they had lived in the South, would have rivaled William L. Yancy in their devotion to secession. They have the same temperament, the same disposition, the same character of mind, and they would go on whichever side was popular, whether in the North or in the South, perhaps honestly so. The gentleman to whom I have alluded was honest in his convictions. A gentleman of naturally extreme temperament and extreme ways of thinking will take an extreme position in one climate or the other. The people of this country ought to wake up to the conviction that the late war was an honest war; it was a war based upon honest differences. The people of the South had been taught to believe in what was called the sovereignty of the States, but the first people who talked about secession were the people of New England. The North believed one way, the South believed the other. The North was opposed to slavery, the South was in favor of it; but yet the South did not bring the slaves to this country. It was an honest difference of opinion on the powers of government and the rights of property, and each man who was faithful to his own side ought to command the respect of every man on each side and on both sides. I like courage that is exhibited in defense of honest convictions, whether those convictions be right or wrong. I do not like that courage that is *loudest* when it is *safest*. *Human courage under all circumstances is a thing for human admiration.* We are told in classic verse that the very gods look upon it with favor, and I admit that those gallant men of the North, Democrats and Republicans alike, who met and slew the Hotspur of secession in the day of his vaunted power and strength were the right royal heirs of a truly regal heroism. *But these men who, thirteen years after this Hotspur has been dead, are forever exhibiting their Falstaffian courage by sticking their TONGUE-SWORDS in the thighs of this dead Hotspur for no purpose but to claim undeserved rewards and honors from a deluded people, are not entitled to the respect of either gods or men.* I do not say that anybody is doing it here, but this perpetual talk about loyalty and disloyalty, this perpetual talk about rebels, is all wrong. It does not come from a magnanimous spirit. *Magnanimity in victory is a higher virtue than courage in battle. It is of the very essence of Divinity itself.* And why cannot the American people, North and South, wake up to realize the fact that four million, or eight million if you choose to call them so, of people in the South honestly differed on questions of political duty and allegiance with a larger number, twenty millions or more, in the North, and unfortunately went to war on the subject? The war is over; the Union is restored; it is time that we should leave the passions of the war where I propose to leave its losses—behind.

But, Mr. President, I have been betrayed into saying a great deal that I did not intend to say. I merely intended to give my reasons briefly why I cannot vote for this or any other like bill. I will proceed to give another reason. To pay some of these bills and not all of them, is not only unjust in fact but unjust in its effects. Those who are not paid and are equally deserving have to be taxed in order to compensate those who are paid. Now, there are tens of thousands of people in the South who lost everything in the war, who were devoted to the Union as far as sentiment could make them devoted, and who were faithless to the Union only in obedience to circumstances they could not control and a power they could not resist. They lost everything. Are you to tax them in order to pay my friend from Kentucky? Why, sir, throughout the South there are thousands upon thousands of soldiers who went to the war and who lost everything, lost their arms, lost their legs, lost their health; many of them lost their lives. They can never get anything for their losses; they will never ask anything for their losses. Nobody in this Hall on either side of it would pretend to pay one of those men or their widows and orphans for their losses. The maimed Southern soldier will never come here and ask for a pension; his widow and orphans will never ask for a pension. They accept their losses as the penalty of failure, as brave men ought. Am I to tax these people, these wounded and limping soldiers, their destitute widows and orphans in the South, a great many of whom have nothing but their land, and many have not that—am I to tax them for the purpose of paying these claimants that come here and say they must be paid because they are loyal, and when my loyal friends on the other side will not believe they were loyal at that? It is not right.

The fact of the business is that the war which we have had in many respects cannot be judged by the rules which have been established for ordinary wars. It was a peculiar war, a war of a sectional character. It was a war between citizens of the same country unfortunately divided by sectional lines. You cannot repair the losses of the war. You could not do it if you were to undertake to do it, and, in my judgment, the sooner our people in the South are taught not to be looking here to Government for the reparation of their losses, the sooner they are taught that the only means by which they can repair their losses is to go to work like honest men and do it by frugality and industry and time, the better it will be for them, the better it will be for the country. The tens of thousands throughout the South who are best entitled to pay, viewed from any stand-point, who are the most deserving, who made the greatest sacrifices, who are in the most need, can never get one dollar of compensation, and will never ask one dollar of compensation; and I protest against taxing them to pay a few others who have the ability to come here and worry Congress into granting them compensation. Let the losses of the war go, and if people want to avoid losses by wars in future let them be taught to avoid having wars at all. That is the best way.

I think, sir, all parties ought to take this position. It is a little painful to me to see gentlemen of one party seeking to make political capital out of cases of this kind, and the other side protesting that it is not right. Why not agree to take one common position, that these war losses cannot be paid? The Government is not able to pay them; the Government ought not to pay them, in view of their peculiar character and the circumstances of the war, and the sooner the people are taught that, the better, and let these constant irritations about the payment of war losses cease. As I said, I might make a few exceptions in favor of religious, educational, or charitable institutions, but I should make very few of that sort. Where the property destroyed was of such a character as to be of great public importance and great public benefit, not only to one section of the country, but to all sections of the country, I should think it would be legitimate and proper as a public benefit to pay that kind of loss. There are, I think, perhaps a few cases of that kind, but put them altogether, so far as my knowledge extends, they would not exceed half a million of dollars.

Mr. President, perhaps I ought not to take the time of the Senate, but I will give my idea of the character of these war claims, loyal and disloyal, by an illustration from real incidents. I will give you, first, the character of a claim that will not be paid, and it is a type of many millions. Early in the month of September, 1865, it became necessary for me, in the discharge of a professional engagement, to travel one hundred miles in the immediate track of Sherman's march throgh Georgia. One day, about two o'clock in the afternoon, I became exceedingly hungry. I said to the youth who was driving the horse: "You must stop at the first favorable opportunity and let me get something to eat." I shall never forget the expression of the young man. "Ah!" says he, "mister, I don't reckon you will find anything you will consider fit to eat in this part of the country; Sherman has been along here." "Well," I said, "but the people in this part of the country live on something, do they not?" "Oh, yes, but I don't hardly know how it is they live; they seem to live, though." "Well," I said, "I can live one day on what they live on constantly, I am pretty sure, and therefore we will stop at the most favorable chance apparent." It was not long before we came to a very good-looking frame dwelling, two stories high, a dwelling of a character very well known in the South, containing six rooms, well built, and indicating in former times a country family well-to-do in the world. The fencing was all gone. The chimneys were standing on the outside, showing that the outhouses had been burned, but there stood the main dwelling; and I said to the young man: "Stop here, and I will see if I can get something to eat;" and I went in. I was met at the door by a very excellent looking lady, modest, but evidently refined and educated, as she turned out to be—a country lady of great hospitality, but with evidence of poverty all around her, and she looked prematurely old. She said to me when I made known my purpose of stopping, "Why, my dear sir, I would be glad to give you anything that I could, but I have nothing that you will have I suppose, nothing that I feel inclined to offer you." "Anything that you have," I said, "will suit me, because I am exceedingly hungry." She said, "I can prepare for you nothing but some potatoes and some eggs, but I have nothing in which to cook the potatoes except the embers; we are in the habit of roasting them in the ashes. I have nothing in which to cook the eggs except the ashes or a broken skillet. I have not a whole piece of furniture or a whole kitchen impliment on the premises; everything is broken." She handed me a seat. She said: "I have handed you the best seat I have, and the back of that is broken as you see." "Why is all this?" "Why," she said, "Sherman's army passed along here and did all this." Well, I told her that I would take the potatoes and eggs, and she put them in the ashes accordingly, and while they were roasting I said to her: "Will you please give me an account of your experience and trials when Sherman's army passed along here?" She said she would. I cannot give it all to the Senate, but certainly it was one of the most interesting narratives I ever listened to in my life.

The lady was one who had married about eight years before the war began. She was well raised and graduated at a female college in Georgia. She and her husband settled that place and built that house; they had about one thousand acres of land, thirty slaves, and all needed personality, and were entirely out of debt, and perfectly happy. They had three children born to them, the oldest at the time of my visit being only twelve years old.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President, I desire to ask whether Warren Mitchell got any of that woman's eggs and potatoes or not. We are trying his case now, not hers.

Mr. HILL. I will come to Warren Mitchell's case. I will show you how it applies to Warren Mitchell's case, but I shall do it in my own way.

It turned out that her husband went into the Confederate army and lost his life in one of the battles in Virginia. His remains were brought home and buried in sight of where we were sitting. About a year after her husband was killed in Virginia in the Confederate army, Sherman's army passed through Georgia, and all her slaves except one, her cook, called Aunt Millie, left. This aunt Millie was raised with this lady, and nursed her in her infancy and was given to her by her father; and she said she would never leave her under any circumstances, and she remained with her. But to make a long story short, everything they had was taken. All the stock, all the provisions were taken away. Everything that could not be carried away was killed or broken or burned, except one cow, two banks of potatoes, and one small crib of corn. The cow was saved by Aunt Millie claiming it as her own, which she did for the purpose of saving it. The corn-crib was saved in this way; the lady sat in her house with her three children and saw everything being burned; seeing the torch about to be applied to the last corn-crib she summoned courage and went out with her babe in her arms and her two little children by her side and said to the officer who seemed to have charge of the sport: "Sir, have you a family at home?" The officer said he had a wife and two children. "What would you think," said she, "if a Southern army should pass through your country and take the last mouthful of bread your wife and children had?" The officer was a man. He lifted his hat most gallantly and then said to his squad, "Don't fire that crib," and said to the squad in the garden, "Don't disturb further those potatoes," and that is the way the lady saved the crib of corn and banks of potatoes. In the mean time the squad had gone into the house, pulled down all the pictures, defaced the walls, broke all the furniture, broke everything she had in the shape of kitchen utensils, and carried off all her silverware and cutlery. The last she saw they were pulling the covering from the grave of her husband, and supposing they were going to take his body off, she fainted away. But Aunt Millie stopped them by telling them "for God's sake not to make war on the dead," and they left. This is a literal fact. That woman had raised a patch of one acre of potatoes and one small field of corn, working with her own hands and aided by this good woman Aunt Millie, and her three little children, and they had lived on that scant allowance from the time Sherman's army passed by until I met her.

Now, that woman will never come here to have her losses repaired; she will never come here with a claim before Congress and ask for compensation. And now I will give you another claim. A few weeks after I took my seat as a member of the House in the Forty-fourth Congress, I received a card one day by a messenger who said that a lady desired to see me in the Speaker's reception room. I went in. She was exceedingly well dressed. She had velvet and diamonds and laces all over her, and the first speech she made to me was to express the great gratification of all Georgians that I had been elected to Congress, "for now," she said, "all Georgians will get their rights." She soon made known the *animus* of that speech, for in the next sentence she said she had a claim before Congress which she desired me to support, and she knew I would support it because she was a Georgia lady, born and raised in Georgia, and she knew I would support her claim. "Well, who are you? If you were born and raised in Georgia, why are you here in the condition I see you?" "Oh," she said, "when Sherman's army passed through Georgia they destroyed my property, but," she added, "I married one of the Federal officers, [laughter] and came North."

Mr. HOAR. She took her revenge in that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir. She married a Federal officer. The first woman I mentioned lost her husband in the Confederate army, and therefore is disloyal. The second woman married an officer in the Union army and therefore is loyal! Well, her statement was true because she produced a very complimentary and flattering letter from General Sherman. *Evidently the letter was genuine and not dictated by a woman.* [No Jenks in that.—ED. REP.] But I will say in justice to General Sherman that I am satisfied he gave that letter more on account of the woman's husband, who was a Federal officer, than on account of her claim. I assume and believe he did.

But I asked this lady "what is your claim for?" "Why," she said, "for personal property destroyed by Sherman's army." "How much is your claim for?" "Eight hundred thousand dollars," she said, whereupon I became bewildered. Eight hundred thousand dollars of personal property of one person destroyed by the war! Yes, she said, it was well proven, proven by the very officers and men who destroyed it, who set fire to it, and she named quite a number of Republicans in the House who she said had promised to vote for her bill; but they had told her it was very important for her to get a Democrat, and best of all a Southern Democrat, to introduce it. Therefore she came to me as a Democrat and a Southern Democrat from her own State—her dear Georgia—to introduce her bill. She said the Republicans assured her that if she would get a little re-enforcement from the South and from the Democratic party her bill would certainly become a law. I said to the lady, "It will be very difficult to make me believe that the whole country ever at one time had eight hundred thousand dollars' worth of personal property." But she said "It is all proven, it is all right, and the Republicans are ready to vote for it." I do not say they were; I can only tell you what the woman said, and as she is loyal you ought to accept her as a good witness. [Laughter.]

Seeing that her entreaties could do no good, she finally said to me that I had to vote for her bill; that she had a great many friends among the newspaper men, and she sometimes wrote for the newspapers herself; and, looking at me with all the air of command and of one having authority, she said, "Mr. Hill, if you don't vote for my bill you will never go to the Senate." Thereupon, I made the lady a bow, gave her flat refusal to have anything to do with her or her bill, and left.

Those are specimens of the character of what you call Southern claims. This first claim will never come here; the second and cases like it will always be here; and I saw this same claim of $800,000 for the woman who became loyal by marriage and for whom Republicans were ready to vote—I saw the same claim paraded through the Northern press in the campaign of 1876 as evidence that if the Southern Democrats ever did get here in power and the Democratic party had the majority, they would take everything there was in the Treasury. Now, should I vote to tax that woman who fed me on the eggs and potatoes to pay this woman in velvet, laces, and diamonds? But this claim, says my friend from Kentucky, is not Mitchell's claim, to come to the honest truth of it? I have not an unkind feeling for Mr. Mitchell; I admit he is a good man; but does not everybody in the Senate know that it is a speculative claim? Is it not a mere speculative claim? The woman I spoke of in Georgia lost her living, the living of herself and her little children, and she does not come here to ask you for a dollar. Here is a gentleman, a good gentleman, who went by permission of the military authorities into the South during the war and bought a large amount of cotton by which he hoped to realize a fortune, as you all know. He took the chances of war in his speculation, and the chances were against him. Shall we tax that woman who fed me on the eggs and potatoes and tax the little land that she and her children are working for the purpose of paying these speculative losses of Mr. Mitchell? Would it be right? Would it be just? I will not do it.

All over the South there are hundreds and thousands of people, limping, weak, poor, impoverished by the war, laboring as best they can for a bare sustenance, asking Congress for nothing, not looking to the Government for compensation for their losses, and here and there is some man who has lost something, who has lost some property, or failed to make what he hoped for in some speculative venture, coming here and asking Congress to pay losses. I for one shall not do it. I am against these bills, therefore, upon principle. I do not need any constitutional amendment to make me vote against them. There will be a great many hard cases, I concede. War is nothing but an ordeal of hard cases. I do not know anything produced by war except hard cases. You cannot repair all those hard cases. Mr. Mitchell has a hard case; but his case is not harder than thousands of others who lost like property or other property, and who were just as loyal as he was. You cannot repair these losses. Let it go forth, therefore, that we take the position distinctly and emphatically that this talk of paying Southern war claims must end. Teach it to our people, and to all the people, let all this political excitement on the subject end.

Mr. President, I am the humblest man in the Democratic party. That party, after eighteen years of absence, I trust and believe, is about to return full-fledged to power. I think it will have possession of every department of this Government. It certainly will have it if we convince the people North and South that we deserve to have it; for evidently the people are well satisfied that the Republican party does not deserve to be continued in power, and the only question with the people is whether the Democratic party does deserve to be intrusted with power. If I had control of the party, as I have not, and shall never have, if my voice were worth anything, there are four things I would have the Democratic party to proclaim to the world in most convincing terms and adhere to with unflinching fidelity. I would have the party to say:

1. We will not pay war losses, loyal or disloyal, unless we make a few exceptions of religious, educational, and charitable institutions, and very few of these.

2. We will vote no more of the public money and no more of the public credit, and no more of the public lands to build up or enrich mammoth monopolies in the shape of railroad corporations.

3. We will in good faith pay every dollar of the public debt, principal and interest, in good money of the standard value.

4. We will restore the Constitution to the country and honesty and economy to its administration, confining the general Government to its limited, delegated sovereign powers to promote the local welfare of the people.

Do these four things, and, in my judgment, the child is not born who will witness the termination of Democratic administration in this country, and the tongue has not been gifted with language that can express the prosperity which will follow to all our people in every section of our country.

SHOULD PARENTS SCOLD.—It has neither reason, religion, common sense, nor experience to recommend it. While there are reasons, many and weighty, to justify its total abolition. It sours the temper of the children; so that one thorough scolding prepares the way for two or three more. It sours your temper, provided it is sweet, which is a question if you are prone to scold; and thus the more you scold, the more you will have to scold, and because you have become crosser, and your children likewise.

Scolding alienates the hearts of your children. Depend upon it, they cannot love you as well after you have berated them, as they did before. You may approach them with firmness and decision, you may punish with severity adequate to the nature of their offences, and they will feel the justice of your conduct and love you notwithstanding all. But they hate scolding. It stirs up the bad blood, while it discloses your weakness, and lowers you in their esteem. Especially at night, when they are about to retire, their hearts should be melted and moulded with voices of kindness, that they may go to their slumbers with thoughts of love stealing around their souls, and whispering peace.

A COLORED CONFLICT.—The Atlanta (Georgia) *Constitution*, says: "An eternal warfare seems to rage between the country negro and the town darkey. This was illustrated at the passenger depot yes