The Centre Democrat.

SHUGERT & FORSTER, Editors. "EQUAL AND EXACT JUSTICE TO ALL MEN, OF WHATEVER STATE OR PERSUASION, RELIGIOUS OR POLITICAL."—Jefferson. TERMS: $1.50 per Annum, in Advance.

VOL. 3. BELLEFONTE, PA., THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1881. NO. 26.

The Centre Democrat.

Terms $1.50 per Annum, in Advance.

S. T. SHUGERT and R. H. FORSTER, Editors.

Thursday Morning, June 30, 1881.

THE wheat crop in some counties of the State are reported as very promising, and farmers are contracting with dealers at a dollar per bushel. In this county the crop will probably be considerably below the usual average.

HAMILTON DISSTON, of Philadelphia, it is said, has closed a contract for a four million tract of land in Florida. This undoubtedly makes him the largest land owner in the world, and is perhaps the largest body of land ever purchased by a private individual.

POST MASTER GENERAL JAMES and Attorney General MACVEAGH'S grip upon the Star-route thieves is still firmly held, and, unlike Windom of the Treasury Department, they show no signs of weakening. The thunder and threats of Brady's Star-route organs do not seem to terrify them.

THE dead-lock of the New York Legislature in the election of Senators still continues without any sign of reaching a satisfactory result to any of the aspirants. It is altogether probable it will adjourn without making a choice, leaving the election to the next legislature.

THE tobacco producing States are classed by the census report, as Kentucky first, Virginia second, and Pennsylvania third. This is comparatively a new industry in Pennsylvania, increasing annually, and if the increase continues, as in the last two years, will soon be the leading tobacco producing State. Whether this is an evidence of advancing prosperity or a retrogade, will be disputed by many.

JOHN WELCH, late Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the court of St. James, has been elevated to the distinguished position of President of a Republican Division association in Philadelphia, composed principally of negroes. This distinction to Mr. Welch was doubtless to show appreciation of the valuable service he rendered by furnishing funds to buy the State of Indiana in the interest of the Republican party last fall.

A LARGE committee of Mahone Readjusters are at Washington awaiting the return of the President from Long Branch, for a general talk over Virginia politics. They hope to convince him that it would be sound political policy to sink the Republican organization in Virginia and make it a mere out-rider to Boss Mahone and his repudiation nondescripts. Perhaps they may succeed. No telling what may happen as a sequel to Republican stupidity in this Mahone business.

IT would be interesting reading if State Treasurer Butler, or some one familiar with the facts, would state how many *spurious* names the rooster Senators and Representatives of Philadelphia placed upon the pay roll as employes of the State, and what amount was thus fraudulently paid. It is generally credited that such names were placed upon the rolls and pay drawn while there was no such persons on duty to represent the service for which payments were made. That this kind of fraud upon the Commonwealth has been perpetrated for years, admit of little, if any doubt. We have seen it over and over again charged, and recently repeated in the Philadelphia *Times*, but why the guilty scoundrels are not exposed and prosecuted is the mystery that needs explanation. Have these thefts escaped the notice of the State officials, or are they conveniently oblivious "to ways that are dark" when manipulated by partisan associates?

THE *School Journal* makes a remarkable statement when it declares that the election of school superintendents in various parts of the State was distinguished by bribery, and that the average price of the vote of a director was $50. If this be true, it is about time to abolish the office of superintendents, or at least to curtail the salaries which have been gradually growing up and attracting the cupidity of the venal, who are ever on the alert to occupy paying offices. If our schools, like our politics, are to become subjects of barter and intrigue, the outlook is indeed discouraging. Better leave the education of our children in the hands of the directors without pay, except in the consciousness of a faithful discharge of duty, than in the hands of a corrupt superintendency who can pay $50 a vote for the office. In this county, we are happy to say, no such disgusting appliances are introduced in the choice of superintendents. The directors are composed of our best citizens who act conscientiously in the choice of superintendents of a high standard of excellence both for efficiency in the work assigned them, and for their superior character and moral standing in the community. Such were our late superintendents, and such is the present.

THE Phialadelphia *Press* is having a lively tilt with Congressman Beltzhoover, of Carlisle. The *Press* charged Mr. Beltzhoover with lobbying on the floor of the House on the night of the adjournment of the Legislature against the speculative Life Insurance bill. Mr. Beltzhoover denied it. But the *Press* returns and reiterates the charge. Mr. Beltzhoover after giving the letters of a number of members in refutation, closes a communication to the *Press* thus:

> When you charged me in your paper with lobbying against the insurance bill, and re-iterated the charge after my denial, you lied willfully, maliciously and deliberately. You lied like every common mountebank lies in plying his trade to make a personal, petty, selfish point. To verify this I challenge you to sue me for libel, and I hereby expressly waive all technicalities as to whether calling you a liar in this unambiguous language would be libelous. If you convict me of libel in calling you a willful, malicious and vulgar liar I will resign my seat in Congress. If you do not sue, or, sueing, fail to convict, you should step down and out of one of the most honorable and responsible callings among men.
>
> Very truly, etc.,
>
> F. E. BELTZHOOVER.

DAVID MOUAT, a fugitive from justice, one of Philadelphia's useful Republican ring roosters, prominent as an ex-member of the Legislature, ex-councilman, delegate to the Chicago convention and one of John Welch's committee to fix Indiana last fall, returned the other day after many months absence, and renewed his bail. He was indicted for ballot-box stuffing and absconded to avoid trial and party exposure. It appears he had a rough experience as a fugitive, his pals failing to furnish the means he had a right to expect of them, and so returned to face the consequences of his wrong-doing. He has learned the lesson "that the way of the transgressor is hard."

DAVENPORT on the stand at Albany acknowledges that he offered a District Marshalship to a Senator for a vote in favor of the Administration candidate for Senator. But he claims that he was playing a confidence game and had no authority from the President to trade the office for a vote. Perhaps not, but then who would believe Davenport.

JOHNNY DAVENPORT, too! It seems this unmitigated hypocrite, who for many years has defrauded scores of citizens in New York out of the right of suffrage by affecting the role of guardian over the polls of that State, under Federal appointment, has got into the Albany bribery case, to represent the Administration in the purchase of Senators.

That Foolish Veto Again.

The second objection the Governor makes to the judicial apportionment bill is that it provides that the Additional Law Judge of the 12th district shall become the President Judge of the county of Lebanon, which is made a separate district. He says "grave legal difficulties surround that proposition." What these "grave legal difficulties" are he has not seen fit to state. Does he mean to deny to the legislature the power of assigning any Judge to which ever of two or more districts may be made out of the old district in which he was elected? By the apportionment of 1874 there were four double districts—that is, districts composed of more than one county and having each two law judges, viz: the 4th, 12th, 17th and 25th. The twelfth district consisted of Dauphin and Lebanon. If in dividing this district one of the Judges cannot be assigned to Lebanon the same difficulty would arise in making single districts out of the other three double districts. But there are peculiar facts existing in reference to the twelfth district that makes such an objection come with less reason or grace than the same objection would in reference to the other districts. The act providing an Additional Law Judge for the 12th district, provided that he should reside in *Lebanon county*. With this provision in the act Judge Henderson accepted the appointment from Governor Hartranft and afterwards took the nomination from the Republican party of Dauphin and Lebanon counties and was elected. It is true we believe that he has only nominally made his place of residence in Lebanon; his real residence being in Harrisburg. He naturally would prefer to remain at the Capital of the State and become the President Judge of Dauphin county upon the retirement of Judge Pearson, which in all human probability, owing to his advanced age will take place next January. As Judge Henderson is a good Judge, the bar of Dauphin county no doubt prefer to retain him than to run the risk of a new man. Possibly it would have been wise for the legislature to have allowed him to remain, for the present, as the Additional Law Judge of Dauphin county, and provided for the election of a President Judge of Lebanon. But surely their failure to do this was not a valid *constitutional* objection to the bill. Judge Henderson himself had no right to complain, when he accepted the office under a law which required him to reside in that county. The individual preference of a judge as to the district, which in a judicial apportionment, shall be made for him, is surely not absolutely binding upon the legislature, and if that august body should not always acquiesce in these judicial preferences, it is not a sufficient reason for the executive interposing a veto and thus thwarting a plain requirment of the constitution as to the time when the judicial apportionment shall be made.

The Governor's third objection to the bill is that it is unnecessarily increased the number of Judges, and especially in allowing an Additional Law Judge to each of the counties of Erie and Crawford. Of the increase in these two districts he says: "as independant propositions it is believed they would neither be demanded by the people in the districts nor receive legislative sanction." In a former part of his message the Governor says: "The present bill designates each county of the State over 40,000 in population, as a separate county district, and so far, beyond all question, *conforms to the constitution*, and its addition of law judges, in some of these districts, *is also an exercise of valid power*." The only law judges added by this bill in these separate districts were those in Erie and Crawford. Although the Governor admits that this was a valid exercise of power, and though the legislature is made the sole judge as to whether these separate districts require more than one law judge, he gives this act as one of his reasons for preventing the bill becoming a law. The insincerity of Governor Hoyt in this part of his message is manifest when we remember a few facts. Crawford county has a population of 68,604; Erie, 74,681, while Northampton has 70,316, less than two thousand more than Crawford and more than *four thousand* less than Erie, and yet the legislature at its last session passed a special act giving Northampton county an Additional Law Judge, which act Governor Hoyt approved and promptly appointed General Reeder one of the pets of the Republican party to the new judgeship thus created. Now if it was so clear that Northampton county with a population of but 70,316 needed an Additional Law Judge that it was necessary to rush through a special act for that purpose, it cannot be so clear that Crawford and Erie with their population do not need more judicial help that the Governor should make the increase a reason for vetoing a general apportionment bill required by the constitution. Whenever a county constituting a separate district increases in population and business to that extent that one law judge cannot do all the business as rapidly as it should be done there is no remedy but to give such a county an Additional Law Judge—the district cannot be decreased in size as may be done with a district composed of several small counties. In every instance where such increase is necessary, the work for two Judges will be light at first. No county from having only work sufficient for one Judge, ever increased at once to having *full work* for two Judges. By the constitution the legislature is made the sole judge of the necessity for such increase.

But the Governor objects generally to the increase of judges provided for by the bill. As an argument against it he states that the number of judges in Pennsylvania exceeds the whole number of judges in all the Federal Courts of the United States, and that the salaries paid judges in Pennsylvania exceed the salaries paid all the judges in the Federal Government by more than $100,000 per annum. It would have been equally true, equally sensible and pertinent, if he had said that the number of judges in the little county of Philadelphia exceeded the number of judges in the great territory of Ethiopia, and that the salaries paid in Philadelphia far exceeded the amount of judicial salaries paid in Ethiopia. The Federal courts have jurisdiction over but a few questions, and a few kind of cases; while the State courts have to deal with all questions, both criminal and civil. The number of causes tried annually in the courts of Pennsylvania no doubt far exceed the whole number of cases tried in all the federal courts. The Governor says that when this legislature met there were seventy-seven law judges in Pennsylvania and that this bill makes eighty-six, an increase of nine. This is not honest or candid. There was an increase of *two*—the additional law judge in Northampton and a second Orphans' Court judge in Allegheny, made by special acts which the Governor approved before the passage of this bill, so the actual increase made by this bill was only seven instead of nine. The new constitution having made a population of 40,000 inhabitants the basis of a judicial district, if the apportionment does not give more judges than one to every 40,000 it cannot be said to violate even the *spirit* of the constitution. By the census of 1880 the population of Pennsylvania is 4,282,786, would give one hundred and seven judges allowing one for every 40,000 or *twenty-one more* than was provided for by the bill vetoed. By this bill a judge was given for every 49,799, while under the census of 1870 when our population was only 3,520,951, the seventy-seven judges gave one for every 45,726. So that instead of their being an unreasonable increase in the number of judges there was no increase in proportion to the increase of population. Under the provisions of this bill each judge on an average would have done the business for more than *four thousand* more people than a judge did under the census of 1870. By an express provision of the constitution of 1873, Philadelphia was given *twelve* Common Pleas judges besides her separate Orphans' Court judges, and Allegheny county *six* Common Pleas judges and a separate Orphans' Court judge. The legislature fixed the number of Orphans' Court judges in Philadelphia at *three*, thus making fifteen law judges in a county, which by the census of 1870 contained only 674,022 population or one judge for every 44,348 inhabitants. This was not the work of any *rooster* in the legislature, but the work of the Constitutional convention, the ablest body of men ever convened in the State; and this work was ratified by the largest majority ever given at an election in Pennsylvania. The same authority fixed the lowest number of judges the legislature could provide for Allegheny county at *seven*, when she had a population of only 262,204, or one judge for every 37,457 inhabitants. Now Allegheny has *eight* law judges with a population of 355,769, or one judge for every 44,471 inhabitants, and Philadelphia has a judge for every 56,263 inhabitants. No complaints have been made by the Governor or the newspapers that either Philadelphia or Allegheny have more judges than are necessary to do the work; while, on the other hand, their judges have been for seven years all drawing from one to two thousand dollars per year from the State Treasury more than the country judges, and the excuse given is that they have such heavy work to perform. If we consider the conveniences for attending to the business of courts existing in large cities, or thickly settled communities, the saving of time in the parties, witnesses and jurors, having no great distances to travel, we will see that both of these counties of Philadelphia and Allegheny have a much greater judicial force in proportion to the population than the bill vetoed gave to the State at large. In most of the counties in the State Monday forenoon and Saturday afternoon of each week is totally lost, by it being necessary for parties, witnesses, jurors, and sometimes the judges, to occupy them in traveling to and from the court. None of this loss of time need to occur in the large cities.

The legal business of nearly every county in the State is now so far behind as to be a bar to the speedy administration of justice. The whole number of Judges provided for in the bill would not have been sufficient to do all the judicial work there is for them to do in the next ten years, and to do it promptly as it ought to be done. In many instances no doubt, the Judges do not work as they should work, but it is not because there is no work to do, but because they are indisposed to do it. If necessary let the legislature enact coercive measures to compel this work to be done speedily and promptly.

The Philadelphia *Times*, in the issue containing the Governor's veto, makes two significant admissions, viz: that its own persistent statements of the provisions of the bill were false, and that the reasons for the veto were not those given by the Governor. Why that and the other newspapers in and out of Philadelphia have so persistently misrepresented the provisions of the bill, especially as to the increase of Judges, it is difficult to tell. The real objection of the Governor undoubtedly was that it came too near carrying out the provisions of the new constitution to which all the machine politicians of the Republican party are opposed, and the further fact, that the bill made *four* new *Democratic* districts, viz: Cambria, Clarion, Clearfield and Green. It is alleged by many that the Republican managers intended from the beginning to disregard the provisions of the constitution requiring a judicial apportionment to be made this year—that as a part of this programme the bill was kept back until the end of the session, and then vetoed after the legislature adjourned. If Hoyt is sincere in his pretended respect for the constitution, let him *at once* call the legislature together to make the apportionment which the constitution commands to be made *now*.

THE LEGISLATURE, at its last session, provided for funding ten millions of the State debt, and authorized the Governor and Commissioners of the Sinking Fund to borrow money at a rate of interest not exceeding four per cent. But bids are to be received at three, three and a-half and four per cent. The act also directs that "the bids which are for the best interests of the Commonwealth *shall* be received." The bonds are to run thirty-one years. With the present rivalry for investments, no difficulty should be experienced in funding at the lowest rate of interest named. It will certainly be to the "best interest of the Commonwealth" to do so, and if the liberal discretion given to the Governor and Commissioners of the Sinking Fund is wisely exercised the burdens of the Commonwealth may be materially relieved. Three per cent. investments are laying around loose. Let our State have the full advantage of the glutted market, by the prompt and judicious action of her public authorities.

HE IS NOT A CANDIDATE.—A few months ago the most fulsome adulation was lavished upon General Grant. He could not move from the door-step of his hotel, unless surrounded by crowds of flaterers. They made an idol of him though he was merely a spawn of Republican expediency—a captured political nondescript whom they endowed with the semblance of statesmanship. But how is it now? He was defeated for the third term nomination, and at once the enthusiasm and ardor of the rabble that surrounded him began to cool. He now returns from a junketting trip to Mexico, and his return is scarcely noticed. The mob of cringing sycophants have dispersed, and thus admonished of the hollowness of flattery, the General resumes some of the common sense he was supposed to possess in other days, and now announces that he will not be a candidate for President in 1884.

THE indiscreet, if not cowardly, back-down of Secretary Windom, leaves the contingent fund of the Treasury Department open to the prying curiosity of a committee of Congress. The investigation ordered by the Secretary, uncovered too much, to stop suddenly when interesting developments were about coming into view. The appalling appearance of the majestic Queen of the Treasury which so stunned Mr. Windom, will not be likely to affect a Congressional committee.

THE Collector of Internal Revenue at San Francisco, who has recently been superceded, is unable to settle his account, owing to large defalcations of his subordinates. Theft in the Internal Revenue, theft in the Treasury, theft in the Postoffice, theft in the Department of Justice, theft everywhere seems to have been the ruling order in the late Administration. And how could it be otherwise, when the Presidential office itself was a theft—when the whole Administration for four years was a larceny?

THE Secretary of the Treasury seems to have suddenly abandoned the search after frauds in his department, about which so much fuss was made by the administration newspapers. Why is this? Is it because it was discovered that too many prominent Republican statesmem were involved to warrant an exposure? Mr. Windom should answer.