

Lancaster Intelligencer.

FRIDAY EVENING, AUG. 10, 1883.

Bring Out the Truth.

Mr. Dorsey, at his home in New Mexico, confirms to a reporter of the New York Sun the statements lately made in that journal concerning the management of the Republican campaign of 1880. He declares that \$400,000 was spent in buying the vote of Indiana, and that the money was raised by selling in advance the patronage of the government. To C. P. Huntington and Jay Gould the nomination of Stanley Matthews to the supreme bench was specifically promised; and to a syndicate of New York bankers was promised the refunding of the government loan. Dorsey names the man who brought the money to Indiana—T. C. Platt; and the men who paid it out, Mr. Stephenson and Mr. Willon, both now living in New York. The positiveness of Dorsey's statements and his disclosure of the witnesses to their truth, will obtain them credence, notwithstanding the bad character he bears. A justice of the supreme court cannot afford to sit silent under these charges. Gould, Huntington and men like them who do not care for public opinion and may rather feel complimented that they were able to buy a place on the supreme bench and get other desirable things from the government, need not be expected to rise up to challenge Dorsey's statements. Their business is to make money, and so long as that is not interfered with they have no quarrel with anybody. But Stanley Matthews cannot be so indifferent to public opinion. If Dorsey lies he can prove it without trouble; and if he does not seek an occasion to do so, there will be no doubt left in any intelligent mind that Dorsey has spoken the substantial truth. Judge Matthews will surely be investigated by Congress if he does not before the next session vindicate himself. It will never do to have the charge made that a seat on the United States bench was bought without the truth being made known and the outrage, if perpetrated, adequately punished.

A Life Issue.

The New Era declares that the refusal of the Republican majority of the state sinking fund commissioners to withdraw the state money from their favored banks and invest it in interest bearing state or federal bonds is a "political and financial blunder," and predicts that it will be made an issue in the pending campaign. With more flippancy than the subject deserves our Republican contemporary adds that "it is evident that Jew Cassidy has been too smart for our fellows—for while the voice is Stenger's voice the hands are the hands of Cassidy." There is no "smartness" about it. The hands and the voice that are raised in the matter are the hands and the voice of the law, courageously and fearlessly exercised by Democratic officials. The Republicans have been speculating with this money. They have it out among banks, without any profit to the state; the banks have loaned it to their customers and are making money out of it, no doubt to divide the profit among themselves and their political patrons, with a liberal allowance for the campaign corruption fund. They have had several months notice of the Humes law and could have had all the state money gathered in to meet its requirements if they had kept the money at the depositories on call, as the law only gives them the right to do. Instead of that the state treasurer has loaned out the moneys far in excess of the liability of his bondsmen, and in some cases far beyond the capital stock of the depositories. Such mismanagement of an important department is the most vital and deep-reaching issue of the campaign. It has been given greater definiteness and emphasis by the Republican nomination of the present cashier of the treasury for the head of that department. Mr. Lively's nomination is an endorsement of the present system and its continuance. The issue is unmistakable. It forces itself upon public attention. Shall the favored depositories of the Republican ring have the people's money or not?

Dorsey's Deliverance.

The Dorsey story will not down. Every fresh revelation from that source makes the condition of the Republican party worse. True, Dorsey is an accomplice and such testimony must be corroborated, but in this instance all the facts and surroundings of the case substantiate the witness. Mr. Dorsey's tale fits in with all that is known and explains much that has heretofore been obscure. He was the genius of his party organization in its last national contest, the trusted friend of its candidates, praised by Arthur at the New York dinner for having carried Indiana by the judicious use of "soap" and offered by Garfield a place in the cabinet. When therefore he tells how their campaign was conducted and their guilty knowledge of it, their assent to his operations and their offer to reward him for them, he must be an avowed or judgment will be taken against those whom he accuses.

His reiterated story of the shameful corruption of that memorable campaign, and of how cabinet places and a seat on the supreme bench were auctioned off in advance of the election, is a blistering page in our national politics. It is notable that those whom it implicates and who are individually interested in refuting his story are silent before it. Wayne MacVough makes no explanation of the allegation that he knew of and was, in some measure, the dupe of Garfield's treachery to the New York Stalwarts. The rich men of New York who raised and spent the half million dollars that fell on Indiana like a mildew, and the millions more, whose "golden stream" poured over the country like molten lava, are dumb when called upon to explain; and no vindication of the living or dead has yet been made that meets Dorsey's awful charge that "Garfield promised the two greatest monopolists in New York, Jay Gould and C. P. Huntington, that Stanley

Matthews should go at the earliest opportunity upon the supreme bench, and he agreed, if the vacancy occurred before he was inaugurated, that he would see to it that Hayes made the appointment. These interested parties, who seemed anxious to control the supreme bench, promised the Garfield campaign fund \$100,000. They paid their money and they got their man."

Of course the next Democratic Congress must investigate this matter. The supreme court has long been an object of suspicion, but this will intensify distrust of it unless the stain is entirely wiped out. Decent men on the bench who got there by means they need not be ashamed of, will not be comfortable in association with such a scandal.

NICHOLAS L. DUKES left behind him a paper addressed to his friends, in which he declares that he shot Captain Nutt while the latter was trying to draw his pistol and when he believed it was but a question of the death of one of them. He admits that he should not have written the letter to Captain Nutt that he did write, but he does not disclaim the truth of what it said. He points out that he never opened his lips to reflect upon Captain Nutt's daughter, and that the publicity that was given to his confidential disclosures to her father was the work of her own friends. He asks whether he is alone "responsible for this great mountain of woe" and whether there is "no one who should share a portion of the burden;" and declares that "the party who can answer these questions will ever remain silent."

A World reporter has been diligently seeking to obtain from Dorsey's witnesses confirmation or denial of his statements. Those he has found have resolutely declined to speak one way or the other.

Mr. Stephenson, now a bank president and Stalwart politician, is dumb as an oyster. Ex Senator T. C. Platt is equally so. It is to be assumed, therefore, that the statement which made Platt the messenger to bear the \$400,000 to Indiana, and Stephenson, its distributor, would have seized the opportunity to deny it. One statement of Dorsey's is shown to be incorrect. He put James R. Keene, according to the Sun, on the Republican finance committee, whereas Mr. Keene declares himself never to have been a Republican.

We gather from some indiscreet remarks of the Philadelphia Record that it thinks that there cannot be any motive for abolishing the internal revenue save to keep up the rates of the tariff. It seems quite unable to believe that anybody should be in favor of a protective tariff as a proper governmental policy and likewise be in favor of the abolition of internal duties for the same good reason, pure and simple. The Record will not believe in such virtue. Can it not understand it?

CONGRESSMAN BAYNE, a Republican representative from Pittsburg, gives the candidate of his party for state treasurer a lift. He says he believes Mr. Lively is from Pittsburg, but he never heard of him before he was nominated. It is evident that Mr. Bayne is not in the confidence of Mr. Magee.

An esteemed contemporary rather rashly calls the offer of a free scholarship in the state agricultural college "a chance to obtain an education."

COOPER says the apportionment is not of such vital importance as to justify the large expenditure of money daily. No one ever claimed that it was important to Cooper, but to the Democrats of the state, denied their just representation, the subject possesses a consuming interest.

The Cincinnati Enquirer has been canvassing Democratic opinion in Illinois and Indiana on the presidency. Of the 411 Indiana responses—such purporting to reflect the sentiments of the Democrats of the neighborhood from which it was sent—391 were favorable to Tilden and Hendricks, or to Hendricks, while only 20 indicated Mr. McDonald as a first choice. In Illinois the ticket was almost unanimously for "the old time."

STATISTICS relative to the woolen industry in the district of Vermont, Belgium, show that labor obtains a much lower rate of compensation than in this land of the free and home of the striker. The hours are greater in number and the wages less in amount. There the day is generally reckoned at twelve hours, from five o'clock in the morning until seven in the evening, with intervals for meals. The average wages for men a day are 3.50 francs, or 70 cents; while for women it is only 2.50 francs, or 50 cents. It would be interesting to watch the result of an attempt to introduce this scale of wages and these hours of labor into the United States. The imagination lacks power to picture the hubbub that would ensue.

THE amount of red tape that must be gone through with in the internal revenue department at Washington, in order to obtain the rebate on the old stamps that have gone out of use, is almost interminable. The stamps are first received at the internal revenue bureau, where they are counted, examined, canceled and the amount of rebate fixed. The amount thus agreed upon then assumes the dignity of a claim, and it is forwarded to the fifth auditor, who, after examining it, sends it to the first controller. The latter officer then directs the warrant dividend to prepare a warrant for the amount of the rebate, which after receiving the approval of the controller, is returned to the commissioner of internal revenue, who finally transmits to the original owner of the stamps a check covering the amount of stamps canceled. Three or four months are consumed in this way before the unfortunate stamp owner obtains the rebate applied for.

THE selection of Hon. J. Proctor Knott to the gubernatorial chair of Kentucky, recalls the famous Duluth speech made by him in the national House of Representatives in 1871. It was occasioned by the

DORSEY'S STORY.

HOW THE PRESIDENT WAS BOUGHT.

OSCAR BURGESS, for an Annotated Copy of the New York Sun, has procured an interview with Mr. Dorsey at his ranch in New Mexico. To the interviewer Mr. Dorsey has reiterated with particularity the substance of previous declarations with reference to the management of Mr. Garfield's presidential campaign. The Sun summarizes Mr. Dorsey's latest declarations as follows:

First. That Sherman was betrayed at Chicago; that the pretended surprise of Garfield's nomination was a sham, and that it was the result of a prearranged plan.

Second. That jealousy and ambition appeared at the very beginning of the canvass, and showed themselves in the organization of the national committee.

Third. That it was at the earnest request of Garfield, Governor Foster and General Arthur that he accepted the place of secretary of the national committee.

Fourth. That the rich bankers of New York were so distrustful that they refused to contribute a cent until a peculiar organization known as a finance committee, composed of these bankers, was formed.

Fifth. He intimates that Garfield, Arthur and all the Republican leaders relied upon money to win the battle, and admits that a very large sum was raised and disbursed by these bankers. It was purely a money campaign.

Sixth. He says positively that Garfield bought the New York Stalwarts' support by a positive promise to appoint Levi P. Morton secretary of the treasury.

Seventh. He reiterates the charge that the position of the New York Stalwarts was reached through a promise of Garfield's to allow a syndicate of them to refund the government bonds.

Eighth. He asserts with great positiveness that a bargain was made between Garfield's representatives and Jay Gould and C. P. Huntington by which Garfield promised to secure the appointment of Stanley Matthews as associate justice of the supreme court, and the two capitalists promised \$100,000 to the Republican campaign fund. He asserts that this money was paid to him in Indiana by Gould and C. P. Huntington, more than half of it to be sent to Ohio to be used by Governor Foster in the campaign there.

Ninth. He asserts that more than \$400,000 was taken to Indiana by a prominent Democratic politician; that this money was used there to carry the day.

Tenth. He asserts that Garfield was most eager to have as much money raised as possible—so eager that he made the blunder of writing the Hubbell letter, signed by his (Dorsey's) name.

Eleventh. He asserts that the vast fund raised, between one and two million dollars, was a corruption fund.

Twelfth. He tells the story of the curious intrigues that led to the putting of James MacVough into Garfield's cabinet, and asserts that it was Garfield's intention to remove them.

Thirteenth. He asserts that Garfield was bulldozed by Blaine and a prominent New York editor into violating his promises to Conkling, and into appointing Robertson secretary of the treasury, without having first notified the New York senators that such was his intention. But this bulldozing took the shape of a threat to publish the details of the Stanley Matthews scandal unless Robertson's appointment was made.

Such is Dorsey's charges. He makes no apologies for such part as he took in all this, but he seems now especially pleased that the books and vouchers that the disbursing agent of the campaign fund has will show that he (Dorsey) and his associates had the money. Dorsey does not directly charge that large sums were used to bribe voters in New York and Kings counties, for he has not absolute personal knowledge of it, but he has no doubt of it, knows that countless sums were spent in these two counties, and he is satisfied that large and wholly unexpected reduction of the Democratic vote, there is no room for any other inference than that the vote of New York was bought by the money of the Wall street bankers.

DORSEY'S STORY.

HOW THE PRESIDENT WAS BOUGHT.

OSCAR BURGESS, for an Annotated Copy of the New York Sun, has procured an interview with Mr. Dorsey at his ranch in New Mexico. To the interviewer Mr. Dorsey has reiterated with particularity the substance of previous declarations with reference to the management of Mr. Garfield's presidential campaign. The Sun summarizes Mr. Dorsey's latest declarations as follows:

First. That Sherman was betrayed at Chicago; that the pretended surprise of Garfield's nomination was a sham, and that it was the result of a prearranged plan.

Second. That jealousy and ambition appeared at the very beginning of the canvass, and showed themselves in the organization of the national committee.

Third. That it was at the earnest request of Garfield, Governor Foster and General Arthur that he accepted the place of secretary of the national committee.

Fourth. That the rich bankers of New York were so distrustful that they refused to contribute a cent until a peculiar organization known as a finance committee, composed of these bankers, was formed.

Fifth. He intimates that Garfield, Arthur and all the Republican leaders relied upon money to win the battle, and admits that a very large sum was raised and disbursed by these bankers. It was purely a money campaign.

Sixth. He says positively that Garfield bought the New York Stalwarts' support by a positive promise to appoint Levi P. Morton secretary of the treasury.

Seventh. He reiterates the charge that the position of the New York Stalwarts was reached through a promise of Garfield's to allow a syndicate of them to refund the government bonds.

Eighth. He asserts with great positiveness that a bargain was made between Garfield's representatives and Jay Gould and C. P. Huntington by which Garfield promised to secure the appointment of Stanley Matthews as associate justice of the supreme court, and the two capitalists promised \$100,000 to the Republican campaign fund. He asserts that this money was paid to him in Indiana by Gould and C. P. Huntington, more than half of it to be sent to Ohio to be used by Governor Foster in the campaign there.

Ninth. He asserts that more than \$400,000 was taken to Indiana by a prominent Democratic politician; that this money was used there to carry the day.

Tenth. He asserts that Garfield was most eager to have as much money raised as possible—so eager that he made the blunder of writing the Hubbell letter, signed by his (Dorsey's) name.

Eleventh. He asserts that the vast fund raised, between one and two million dollars, was a corruption fund.

Twelfth. He tells the story of the curious intrigues that led to the putting of James MacVough into Garfield's cabinet, and asserts that it was Garfield's intention to remove them.

Thirteenth. He asserts that Garfield was bulldozed by Blaine and a prominent New York editor into violating his promises to Conkling, and into appointing Robertson secretary of the treasury, without having first notified the New York senators that such was his intention. But this bulldozing took the shape of a threat to publish the details of the Stanley Matthews scandal unless Robertson's appointment was made.

Such is Dorsey's charges. He makes no apologies for such part as he took in all this, but he seems now especially pleased that the books and vouchers that the disbursing agent of the campaign fund has will show that he (Dorsey) and his associates had the money. Dorsey does not directly charge that large sums were used to bribe voters in New York and Kings counties, for he has not absolute personal knowledge of it, but he has no doubt of it, knows that countless sums were spent in these two counties, and he is satisfied that large and wholly unexpected reduction of the Democratic vote, there is no room for any other inference than that the vote of New York was bought by the money of the Wall street bankers.

THE AUDITORS' COURT.

BEGINNING OF A TEDIOUS INQUIRY.

"Squire Frank on the Stand—A Summary of the Proceedings of the Auditors' Court. Wrangle of the Lawyers.

In obedience to the subpoena served upon him by the sheriff, John P. Frank, justice of the peace, of Columbia, appeared with counsel before the county auditors, (who were represented by E. K. Martin, Esq.,) on the 9th inst.

Mr. Frank was sworn. He was shown the bill of costs in the case of Manhart et al., and asked if it was his bill of costs in said case; he answered that it was. He was asked if he received the complaints and oaths in that case. Mr. Atlee objected, but the witness was allowed to answer, which he did affirmatively, adding that the clerk of quarter sessions had the complaints and oaths in that case. Mr. Atlee objected, which he did affirmatively, adding that the clerk of quarter sessions had the complaints and oaths in that case.

Mr. Martin stated that but one complaint was charged for and two warrants were issued.

Mr. Brown said that two warrants were issued, and if the magistrate charged for only one, the county was indebted to him for the other. Witness answered that he had issued two warrants, and had issued subpoenas for twenty witnesses, administered sixteen oaths and examined sixteen witnesses. He produced his docket and read the names of the witnesses; he had had two examinations; the accused being heard separately; April 18th and April 20th, 1881; he committed them for trial on the 20th of April; Mr. Frank said he took three recognizances in these cases. Mr. Martin asked to explain how he took them. Mr. Frank explained that he took one of the recognizances, and committed the prisoners for trial because they could not get bail in Columbia, but on reaching Lancaster they went before Alderman Barr, and took the other two recognizances. In his bill he charged for the three recognizances and paid Alderman Barr \$1 for those taken by him. When he presented his bill after the trial the clerk of quarter sessions said that the two defendants having been tried together, one of the recognizances should be struck off, and he made no objection; this accounts for there being only three instead of four recognizances. In answer to a question by Mr. Martin, witness said the recognizances taken by him were for a hearing and not for trial. Alderman Barr, who was present at the appearance at court. Witness charged for two commitments; but when the prisoners reached Lancaster they were released on bail by Alderman Barr. Witness charged for the two returns to court but the clerk of quarter sessions allowed him for only one.

Mr. Atlee said that the position of "Squire Frank" was that the bills having been adjudicated by the clerk of court was an end of the matter, and the auditors had no authority to inquire into it. In answer to a question witness said he had sworn twenty witnesses but returned to court only those whom he thought to be necessary.

In the case of Louis Conner, libel, witness charged for two recognizances, and returned to court only one. Mr. Atlee asked the auditors if they intended to go through all the bills on the table before them, and said if they were going to do so Mr. Frank's counsel would refuse to go further in the examination.

Mr. Brown said that counsel were permitting the auditors as a matter of grace to ask questions they had no right to ask; that these bills had been regularly taxed by the clerk of court, and the county commissioners themselves could not have refused to pay them, and the auditors had no right to investigate them.

A few other bills were examined and a few clerical errors, amounting to about 30 cents, were discovered. Mr. Eaby, clerk of the court, acknowledged the errors to be his, and made no objection to the correction of errors of Mr. Frank in making out the bills.

Several of "Squire Frank's" bills for dismissed cases were produced, and he made explanation of a few disputed items of costs.

In the case of John McClain, charged with drunken and disorderly conduct, Frederick Struck appears as prosecutor, and Henry Struck as a witness. "Squire Frank" was asked if he committed McClain on the testimony of these witnesses. He answered that he did not. He was asked if he had any other questions he wished to ask. He answered that he had none.

A great deal of time was consumed in desultory controversy among counsel, and finally the board adjourned until one o'clock p. m.

At 1 o'clock the board reassembled and continued the hearing. Alderman Barr's bill of costs was the next item on the table, and the entries in his docket, and bills note of such of them as they deemed to be irregular. They then adjourned until Tuesday morning, when "Squire Frank" will again appear before them.

DE WICKENSHAM AT OCEAN GROVE. In Favor of National Aid for Education, that not the Nation's Burden Scheme.

At the meeting for national educational purposes at Ocean Grove yesterday Dr. Wickersham, this city, made a plea for national aid to education in which after reviewing the educational operations of countries in the old world he said:

"In respect to popular education the principle of local self government is a vital one in a republic, and should be guarded with the utmost care. No work of such a general policy, aid to popular education from the national treasury, fearing that it would be accompanied here, as elsewhere, by a centralizing tendency. Such a policy has strong advocates in Connecticut, and I have recently adopted as a plank in its platform a proposition to distribute surplus revenues in the national treasury for the purpose of education. For one, I doubt the wisdom of this action. It may be favor from unthinking people, from those especially among whom there is, as Lord Castlereagh styled it, an ignorant impatience of money would in the end weaken our system of popular education."

THE AUDITORS' COURT.

BEGINNING OF A TEDIOUS INQUIRY.

"Squire Frank on the Stand—A Summary of the Proceedings of the Auditors' Court. Wrangle of the Lawyers.

In obedience to the subpoena served upon him by the sheriff, John P. Frank, justice of the peace, of Columbia, appeared with counsel before the county auditors, (who were represented by E. K. Martin, Esq.,) on the 9th inst.

Mr. Frank was sworn. He was shown the bill of costs in the case of Manhart et al., and asked if it was his bill of costs in said case; he answered that it was. He was asked if he received the complaints and oaths in that case. Mr. Atlee objected, but the witness was allowed to answer, which he did affirmatively, adding that the clerk of quarter sessions had the complaints and oaths in that case.

Mr. Martin stated that but one complaint was charged for and two warrants were issued.

Mr. Brown said that two warrants were issued, and if the magistrate charged for only one, the county was indebted to him for the other. Witness answered that he had issued two warrants, and had issued subpoenas for twenty witnesses, administered sixteen oaths and examined sixteen witnesses. He produced his docket and read the names of the witnesses; he had had two examinations; the accused being heard separately; April 18th and April 20th, 1881; he committed them for trial on the 20th of April; Mr. Frank said he took three recognizances in these cases. Mr. Martin asked to explain how he took them. Mr. Frank explained that he took one of the recognizances, and committed the prisoners for trial because they could not get bail in Columbia, but on reaching Lancaster they went before Alderman Barr, and took the other two recognizances. In his bill he charged for the three recognizances and paid Alderman Barr \$1 for those taken by him. When he presented his bill after the trial the clerk of quarter sessions said that the two defendants having been tried together, one of the recognizances should be struck off, and he made no objection; this accounts for there being only three instead of four recognizances. In answer to a question by Mr. Martin, witness said the recognizances taken by him were for a hearing and not for trial. Alderman Barr, who was present at the appearance at court. Witness charged for two commitments; but when the prisoners reached Lancaster they were released on bail by Alderman Barr. Witness charged for the two returns to court but the clerk of quarter sessions allowed him for only one.

Mr. Atlee said that the position of "Squire Frank" was that the bills having been adjudicated by the clerk of court was an end of the matter, and the auditors had no authority to inquire into it. In answer to a question witness said he had sworn twenty witnesses but returned to court only those whom he thought to be necessary.

In the case of Louis Conner, libel, witness charged for two recognizances, and returned to court only one. Mr. Atlee asked the auditors if they intended to go through all the bills on the table before them, and said if they were going to do so Mr. Frank's counsel would refuse to go further in the examination.

Mr. Brown said that counsel were permitting the auditors as a matter of grace to ask questions they had no right to ask; that these bills had been regularly taxed by the clerk of court, and the county commissioners themselves could not have refused to pay them, and the auditors had no right to investigate them.

A few other bills were examined and a few clerical errors, amounting to about 30 cents, were discovered. Mr. Eaby, clerk of the court, acknowledged the errors to be his, and made no objection to the correction of errors of Mr. Frank in making out the bills.

Several of "Squire Frank's" bills for dismissed cases were produced, and he made explanation of a few disputed items of costs.

In the case of John McClain, charged with drunken and disorderly conduct, Frederick Struck appears as prosecutor, and Henry Struck as a witness. "Squire Frank" was asked if he committed McClain on the testimony of these witnesses. He answered that he did not. He was asked if he had any other questions he wished to ask. He answered that he had none.

A great deal of time was consumed in desultory controversy among counsel, and finally the board adjourned until one o'clock p. m.

At 1 o'clock the board reassembled and continued the hearing. Alderman Barr's bill of costs was the next item on the table, and the entries in his docket, and bills note of such of them as they deemed to be irregular. They then adjourned until Tuesday morning, when "Squire Frank" will again appear before them.

DE WICKENSHAM AT OCEAN GROVE. In Favor of National Aid for Education, that not the Nation's Burden Scheme.

At the meeting for national educational purposes at Ocean Grove yesterday Dr. Wickersham, this city, made a plea for national aid to education in which after reviewing the educational operations of countries in the old world he said:

"In respect to popular education the principle of local self government is a vital one in a republic, and should be guarded with the utmost care. No work of such a general policy, aid to popular education from the national treasury, fearing that it would be accompanied here, as elsewhere, by a centralizing tendency. Such a policy has strong advocates in Connecticut, and I have recently adopted as a plank in its platform a proposition to distribute surplus revenues in the national treasury for the purpose of education. For one, I doubt the wisdom of this action. It may be favor from unthinking people, from those especially among whom there is, as Lord Castlereagh styled it, an ignorant impatience of money would in the end weaken our system of popular education."

THE AUDITORS' COURT.

BEGINNING OF A TEDIOUS INQUIRY.

"Squire Frank on the Stand—A Summary of the Proceedings of the Auditors' Court. Wrangle of the Lawyers.

In obedience to the subpoena served upon him by the sheriff, John P. Frank, justice of the peace, of Columbia, appeared with counsel before the county auditors, (who were represented by E. K. Martin, Esq.,) on the 9th inst.

Mr. Frank was sworn. He was shown the bill of costs in the case of Manhart et al., and asked if it was his bill of costs in said case; he answered that it was. He was asked if he received the complaints and oaths in that case. Mr. Atlee objected, but the witness was allowed to answer, which he did affirmatively, adding that the clerk of quarter sessions had the complaints and oaths in that case.

Mr. Martin stated that but one complaint was charged for and two warrants were issued.

Mr. Brown said that two warrants were issued, and if the magistrate charged for only one, the county was indebted to him for the other. Witness answered that he had issued two warrants, and had issued subpoenas for twenty witnesses, administered sixteen oaths and examined sixteen witnesses. He produced his docket and read the names of the witnesses; he had had two examinations; the accused being heard separately; April 18th and April 20th, 1881; he committed them for trial on the 20th of April; Mr. Frank said he took three recognizances in these cases. Mr. Martin asked to explain how he took them. Mr. Frank explained that he took one of the recognizances, and committed the prisoners for trial because they could not get bail in Columbia, but on reaching Lancaster they went before Alderman Barr, and took the other two recognizances. In his bill he charged for the three recognizances and paid Alderman Barr \$1 for those taken by him. When he presented his bill after the trial the clerk of quarter sessions said that the two defendants having been tried together, one of the recognizances should be struck off, and he made no objection; this accounts for there being only three instead of four recognizances. In answer to a question by Mr. Martin, witness said the recognizances taken by him were for a hearing and not for trial. Alderman Barr, who was present at the appearance at court. Witness charged for two commitments; but when the prisoners reached Lancaster they were released on bail by Alderman Barr. Witness charged for the two returns to court but the clerk of quarter sessions allowed him for only one.

Mr. Atlee said that the position of "Squire Frank" was that the bills having been adjudicated by the clerk of court was an end of the matter, and the auditors had no authority to inquire into it. In answer to a question witness said he had sworn twenty witnesses but returned to court only those whom he thought to be necessary.

In the case of Louis Conner, libel, witness charged for two recognizances, and returned to court only one. Mr. Atlee asked the auditors if they intended to go through all the bills on the table before them, and said if they were going to do so Mr. Frank's counsel would refuse to go further in the examination.

Mr. Brown said that counsel were permitting the auditors as a matter of grace to ask questions they had no right to ask; that these bills had been regularly taxed by the clerk of court, and the county commissioners themselves could not have refused to pay them, and the auditors had no right to investigate them.

A few other bills were examined and a few clerical errors, amounting to about 30 cents, were discovered. Mr. Eaby, clerk of the court, acknowledged the errors to be his, and made no objection to the correction of errors of Mr. Frank in making out the bills.

Several of "Squire Frank's" bills for dismissed cases were produced, and he made explanation of a few disputed items of costs.

In the case of John McClain, charged with drunken and disorderly conduct, Frederick Struck appears as prosecutor, and Henry Struck as a witness. "Squire Frank" was asked if he committed McClain on the testimony of these witnesses. He answered that he did not. He was asked if he had any other questions he wished to ask. He answered that he had none.

A great deal of time was consumed in desultory controversy among counsel, and finally the board adjourned until one o'clock p. m.

At 1 o'clock the board reassembled and continued the hearing. Alderman Barr's bill of costs was the next item on the table, and the entries in his docket, and bills note of such of them as they deemed to be irregular. They then adjourned until Tuesday morning, when "Squire Frank" will again appear before them.

DE WICKENSHAM AT OCEAN GROVE. In Favor of National Aid for Education, that not the Nation's Burden Scheme.

At the meeting for national educational purposes at Ocean Grove yesterday Dr. Wickersham, this city, made a plea for national aid to education in which after reviewing the educational operations of countries in the old world he said:

"In respect to popular education the principle of local self government is a vital one in a republic, and should be guarded with the utmost care. No work of such a general policy, aid to popular education from the national treasury, fearing that it would be accompanied here, as elsewhere, by a centralizing tendency. Such a policy has strong advocates in Connecticut, and I have recently adopted as a plank in its platform a proposition to distribute surplus revenues in the national treasury for the purpose of education. For one, I doubt the wisdom of this action. It may be favor from unthinking people, from those especially among whom there is, as Lord Castlereagh styled it, an ignorant impatience of money would in the end weaken our system of popular education."

tree, &c., was arrested at his home on Locust street, at an early hour this morning. He is held for a hearing before Alderman McConomy.

BASEBALL. Keaton's Ironsides 1. Yesterday afternoon the Ironsides and Easton clubs met for the first time on the grounds of the former in this city. The audience numbered at least 600 and a fine game was witnessed, the home club being again defeated by a score of 5 to 1. Easton team is strong and it had been expected that they would win easily and betting was largely in their favor from the time they were first announced. As soon as they came on the field yesterday afternoon the game was easy to see that they were fine players. The Ironsides presented the same team they had on Tuesday with the exception of one man, Winters, late of the Danannon club played centre field; but he did not have an opportunity of showing what he was capable of doing. The visitors put on the game in one inning by bunting their hits and putting the balls where they were safe.

Game was called at 3:15 with Chester Cummings as umpire. Zeoher lost the ball and he opened at the bat for the Ironsides, going out at first. Hofford tried to make first base. The visitors put on the game in one inning by bunting their hits and putting the balls where they were safe. Game was called at 3:15 with Chester Cummings as umpire. Zeoher lost the ball and he opened at the bat for the Ironsides, going out at first. Hofford tried to make first base. The visitors put on the game in one inning by bunting their hits and putting the balls where they were safe.

In the second inning, Winters went out on a fly to Green. Schiller's ball was fumbled by Spence, and he reached first easily, stealing second and scored the first run on the failure of second baseman to catch a ball thrown him. Kelly took his base on balls and stole second. Foster went out on a fly to King, who had a good hit, which the right fielder could not get in time, and he made second. Kelly ran on this ball and was declared out at first, by the umpire, although he was on his base before the ball reached it. The Eastons were quickly retired without scoring.

In the third inning, Hofford and Sixsmith went out at first on short balls and Zeoher on a foul fly. Hanna, of the Eastons, was retired by Zeoher's good stop. Rittenhouse made a good bat to right field which enabled him to make first easily. This was followed by another good stop. Hanna, of the Eastons, was retired by Zeoher's good stop. Rittenhouse made a good bat to right field which enabled him to make first easily. This was followed by another good stop. Hanna, of the Eastons, was retired by Zeoher's good stop. Rittenhouse made a good bat to right field which enabled him to make first easily. This was followed by another good stop. Hanna, of the Eastons, was retired by Zeoher's good stop. Rittenhouse made a good bat to right field which enabled him to make first easily. This was followed by another good stop. Hanna, of the