

THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 48.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O. GOODRICH.

TOWANDA:

Thursday Morning, May 1, 1862.

Selected Poetry.

HOME AND HEAVEN.

BY MRS. L. H. HIGGINS.

If thou hast peace at home,
What boots it though the rabble rout
Uplift their hoarse, discordant shout,
Though the unquiet world should toss
And cast up fustian and dross,
And warring tides each other mock,
And vengeful surges smite the rock—
And men contend with angry mind
If thou in sheltered nook canst find
Sweet peace at home.

If thou hast love at home,
Why need'st thou care through throngs of pride
With sneer of scorn thy course decide?
Assail the fabric of our fame
And ring their changes on thy name?
Thou would'st not to their taste refuse
Such pungent pastime if it chose,
While shunned from the unseemly blast
Thy comforts all are garner'd fast
By love at home.

If there is rest in Heaven,
And so the Unerring Word declares,
Why shrink from labors, grief or cares?
The appointed agencies to try
Thy patience and thy constancy,
For like the illusions of a dream,
Like passing bubbles on a stream,
Shall be their memory and their pain
When thou at last shalt blissful gain
The rest of Heaven.

Communications.

For the Bradford Reporter. Enemies of Sheep.

An English tenant of mine, came to my study door the other day, bearing several white worms in a glass bottle, that he said he had taken from the head of a fine South Down ewe, which, like three or four others, had died very suddenly and strangely. The persons in waiting, discouraged his speaking to me on the subject, advising him to go to the Doctor with his inquiry. "Well, if Mr. W. can't tell what these vermin are, that's killing his sheep, I don't see what the use of his having so many books in his library," said the blunt Yorkshireman, resolutely bent on an investigation. I could not help overhearing the remark, and feeling there was point to it; and so called him in, with a view of seeing what I could make of his prisoners. I have thought, and there has been an unusual fatality this Spring amongst sheep, in this region of country, the fruits of my examination might possibly be interesting, if not useful to your readers;—albeit the subject is not a new one, and I have little to offer besides what I find in books, and what is already known to intelligent sheep-growers.

The worms he produced, I found to be the larvae of the *Gad-fly*, a fly belonging to the numerous order Diptera—the Gad-fly of sheep. This fly makes its appearance in the Northern States of America, between May and July, and is a great source of alarm and annoyance to the flock, in the same way as its near relatives, the *Cestrus* to horses. But it disposes of its eggs in a different manner from that of the Gad-fly, which afflicts horses and cattle—lodging them in the flaps of the sheep's nostrils, where they soon become vivified by the heat and moisture. The larvae, or maggots thus hatched, next make their way into the frontal sinuses, situate between the eyes. These larvae in the course of their progress, give great pain to the animal—crawling upward by means of two small hooks which grow out from the sides of their heads. By means also of these hooks they fasten themselves when they reach their abiding place, and here for months, feed upon the mucus secreted by the lining membrane of the chambers they have chosen. Toward Spring, they have grown to about an inch in length, flattened somewhat, and presenting eleven rings or apparent joints, which the microscope shows to be edged with a few short bristles. When they have become mature as a worm, (usually in March,) they begin to trace their pathway, which again brings agony on the poor animal whose brain they have thus invaded. It stamps its feet, tosses its head about, sneezing violently, and so continuing, until its enemy is expelled at the nostril. After expulsion, the maggot crawls off, finally burying itself in the ground, where it assumes the pupa form, out of which a new fly is hatched, to go the same unwelcome round of life.

Amongst writers on the subject, various, and in some respects opposite opinions are expressed as to the injury these worms inflict on the animal; and the manner in which they produce death. Upon the whole, it would seem, that when a very large number of worms are generated, they produce irritation and inflammation in the head—possibly on the brain, and thus destroy their victim. A very few might not produce this result. Several writers of note on Animal Economy, appear to class this fly amongst the more harmless enemies of sheep; the ancients deemed them bred in the brain—"mudici cerebri latrunculi."

There is great uncertainty in regard to the inciting cause which leads these larvae to so demean themselves as to cause the death of a sheep; the same as there is about that which makes their cousins, the bots, fatal to horses; both, it would seem, are fatal at times, or under certain circumstances. That the first are frequently lodged in the heads of sheep, and go their destined round of life, without material injury, is just as certain as that the bot of a kindred fly is sometimes matured harmlessly in the stomach of horses.

I would respectfully advise our farmers to call to their aid in investigations of this subject, the Medical profession of the county, and whenever it can be done conveniently, have post mortem examinations made. Sheep are among our most valuable domestic animals, and I think I am not mistaken in the public spirit of our Medical and Surgical practitioners, when

I say, most of them would cheerfully assist in ventilating any useful question of Animal Economy, if invited.

Sometimes sheep which die of the rot, are placed wrongfully to the account of worms in the head. The most common symptom of the presence of such worms, is the raising and crooking of the head and neck; eyes glaring, and a twitching of the eye-lid and ear on the same side; running off suddenly in a circular direction, with occasional spasms, and a slight frothing at the mouth.

As a Remedy, BLACKLOCK, the celebrated sheep-cultivist, advises the employment of tobacco. Take a common clay pipe, and push the stem well up into the nostril of the sheep, having first half filled the bowl with common smoking tobacco. Light it, and then cover the top of the bowl with a thin cloth and blow the smoke into the sheep's head. A violent sneezing follows, in course of which, the worms are often ejected in large numbers. Scotch snuff, administered in the same way, is said to produce the same beneficial result.

As a Preventive, tarring the noses of sheep at shearing time, or a little afterwards, about the time the fly makes its appearance—is the most rational of any thing I have found in the books. A plowed field, or a few farrows running through the sheep-pasture are eagerly sought by the sheep in fly time. They then rub their noses in the earth, and thus, it is thought, expel the intruder from his lodgment. The approach of the fly is easily known by the sudden huddling of the flock, with their noses inward and hidden.

I remember that my father, who was an excellent practical farmer, always tarred the noses of his sheep at, or soon after shearing time, "to prevent taking cold, and also to keep off the fly," as he said, but what fly he meant, I had no idea at the time, nor indeed, up to the day I turned to the books, from which I draw these hasty notes for your columns. He also constantly kept tar within reach of the sheep at the bottom of small board troughs, scattering salt over it, and thus forcing the animals to take up a portion of it with the salt. I dare say this was done with profit, as few finer and healthier flocks were found, than those which roamed his hill sides. I shall tar all my sheep this Spring, for it is plain "an enemy is at their gate."

C. L. W.

TOWANDA, APRIL 24, 1862.

Hon. H. W. Tracy's Speech.

On the repeal of the Act Commuting the Tonnage Duties, in the House of Representatives, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, some two weeks ago, when this subject was under consideration, I intimated to the House that if there should be a gentleman upon this floor who proposed to discuss the act under consideration upon its merits, I should then desire to say a few words before the vote should be taken. Now, sir, I observe by the clock that we have left, not two hours longer before this vote shall be taken. The remarks which I propose to make in the few minutes which are assigned me, shall be mainly in the way of answer to the gentleman, and the one gentleman of all others, who has dared to stand up in this place and maintain that the act which we proposed to repeal, was wise and judicious. How strange it is that but one man in this whole body, now, when we are approaching the consummation, gets up in his place and takes this position. Every other gentleman who opposes this repealing act has taken a position behind some constitutional objection. My friend from the city, (Mr. Abbott,) is the only one who has ventured to defend that act on the ground of its intrinsic merit. It was that gentleman, I remember very well, who had the honor of reading the bill in place. That bill was one which I considered fraught with the gravest mischief; as has been truly said, I considered that bill, and the one which seemed to be coupled with it last winter, as serpents trailing themselves through this hall. Yet this is an act which the gentleman thought then, and thinks now, wise and judicious, and for that reason not to be repealed. Now, sir, if I could be convinced that that act was wise and judicious, I should not vote for its repeal; but until I can be convinced that the act has merit in it, I must, notwithstanding the scruples of gentlemen, and lawyers too, who say that we have not the constitutional power to repeal it—I must act from the light which I have, and the evidences brought before my mind in regard to the constitutionality as well as the wisdom of that measure. Thus advised, I shall cheerfully vote for the repeal; and I am glad to believe that we have reached a point when, so far as this body is concerned, that act shall be repealed.

The gentleman in starting out with his argument, to prove that this act was wise and judicious, has told us that the Pennsylvania railroad company has always been a firm and reliable friend of the State. He also tells us that the construction of that road has never been detrimental to the receipts or the income from the public works. Now, sir, if I could be convinced, as the gentleman thinks he will be able to convince the whole people of the State, that this act was wise and judicious—that the Pennsylvania railroad company has always been a fast friend of the Commonwealth—that the finances of the State and the income of the public works have never suffered from the operations of that company, then, sir, I confess that these considerations would have much weight in my mind to dissuade me from voting for this repeal. But what evidence has the gentleman given to the House in support of these extraordinary propositions?

In proof of the position that a railroad running the whole distance from Philadelphia to Pittsburg parallel with the public works, carrying the very tonnage that the public works were constructed to carry, would not operate disastrously to the revenue upon those works, the gentleman has read to us an extract from the message of Governor Shunk, and also an extract from the report of the canal commissioners. Well, sir, if the testimony of Gov. Shunk be good authority, and if the report of the canal commissioners be good authority, the statements of those officers must be considered

in connection with the time at which they were made. Those declarations were made when it was not known or expected that this company would ever refuse to pay to the State this small pittance, the tonnage tax—it was when that revenue was steadily coming into the coffers of the State. These declarations were not made when the company had refused to pay this tax, or when an act had been passed releasing them from this taxation. If the non-payment of this tonnage tax had been anticipated no such declarations would have come up here from the Governor or from the canal commissioners.

The gentleman has stated that the Pennsylvania railroad company purchased those public works for double what they were worth. Well now, I had supposed that the Pennsylvania railroad company was a very sharp customer. Every gentleman who has had dealings with that corporation—every man who has sat here as a member of this body, must have learned that that company is a very sharp party with whom to deal. That this corporation should absolutely pay for those public works twice what they were worth, will, I think, strike the minds of most of us as very extraordinary. That company is not in the habit of consuming disposed of such bargains, it is not in general disposed to spend its money in this extravagant way. How does the gentleman propose to prove this? Why, he argues that the Main Line was sold to the Pennsylvania railroad company for an amount vastly more in proportion to the cost of the work than the amount for which the residue of the canals sold. Well, sir, I do not know but that may be true; but it is also true that this improvement constituted an avenue between the two great cities of the State—the eastern and the western city—opened communication from the Atlantic to the great Ohio, which flows into the Gulf of Mexico. It is true, also, that this work constituted a line on which tonnage would be more likely to be carried than it would be on those other canals. But, sir, there are other considerations in connection with this matter. The sale of the Sunbury and Erie railroad company was not conducted in the same manner as the other. The sale to the Sunbury and Erie railroad company was made for a price that was fixed in these bills. The sale to the Sunbury and Erie railroad company was made for three hundred and seventy five thousand dollars less than the amount of which the company sold the works afterward; I will endeavor to show to the House that they afterwards sold it for the lowest price that they could get, and for the poorest pay. They sold for three millions and a half, property, which if put up at public sale, would have brought more than double that amount. How was this done? Why, sir, would not the country be shocked to know that, while the bill was pending in this body—a month before its passage—the Sunbury and Erie railroad company executed contracts with individuals in different parts of the State—for what? For the very purpose of securing votes for the passage of the bill! This accounts for the price at which the work sold. The company absolutely entered into contracts, solemn contracts in writing, in this capital one month before the law was passed through this body, to convey these branches to different parties; and these contracts were made for the very purpose of procuring votes. Is it, then, surprising that these works should bring so small a sum? Is it astonishing? And, sir, worse than all, these infamous bargains, these shameful contracts, thus made one month before the bill passed this body, and for the purpose of obtaining votes to pass here—these contracts were absolutely consummated and were approved by the Governor of this Commonwealth, when bids were put in, (as he himself tells us in his message,) after these infamous sales were made, for a larger sum than that stipulated.—To show the manner in which this transaction was consummated, I read from the message of Gov. Packer—the executive documents of 1859:—

"Sales were made by the Sunbury and Erie railroad company, and reported to me under the oath of the president of the different lines, as follows: The upper and lower North Branch canal to the North Branch canal company, for one million six hundred thousand dollars; the West Branch and Susquehanna divisions, to the West Branch and Susquehanna canal company, for five hundred thousand dollars; the Delaware division, to the Delaware Division canal company of Pennsylvania, for one million seven hundred and seventy five thousand dollars; in all the sum of three million eight hundred and seventy five thousand dollars. Upon investigation and inquiry, having become satisfied that these sales were made for fair prices, and upon such terms and to such persons composing the various purchasing associations, as to insure the payment of the purchase money, they were severally approved. "After the contract for the sale of the Delaware division had been entered into and my consent had been verbally given, and seventy-five thousand dollars of the purchase money had been actually paid by the purchaser, upon the fact of the contract, and my assent thereto, I was informed that a higher price had been offered by responsible persons, for the canal.—But, under the circumstance, my opinion was that the offer came too late; and as the railroad company considered itself bound to consummate the agreement by a delivery of the deed and possession of the property to the first purchasers, I could not, in good faith, withhold my assent. The North Branch canal company, subsequent to the purchase of that division, sold that portion of the canal lying between Wilkes Barre and Northumberland, to the Wyoming canal company, for the sum of nine hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars."

The Governor says: "After the contract for the sale of the Delaware division had been entered into, and my consent had been verbally given."

Now, sir, when was that contract entered into? Was that also entered into a month before the bill had passed this body to sell it to the Sunbury and Erie railroad company?—The Governor has failed to tell us. When did he give his assent to it? He has not told us.

Why, sir, if the transaction had not been consummated, what business had the Governor to be pledged verbally? Is this the way that the people's money is cared for? Is this the way that the canals have been disposed of?—Why, sir, for aught that appears here, this contract for that line might have been made as early as the contract for the North Branch canal was made—one month before the bill had passed authorizing the sale of the Sunbury and Erie railroad company.

Now, sir, this may account for the disposition of our canals, and their deterioration even below the proportion for which the main line was sold. Then, how was the contract executed by the Governor in regard to the North Branch? He says that it was sold (and he approved of the sale,) for one million six hundred thousand dollars. Yes, sir, and he could have told you that there were bids presented from just as responsible parties for two million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which he rejected. He could have told you that at the time when he approved of that sale, there were bids presented from just as responsible parties for two millions of dollars, one hundred thousand dollars to be paid in cash, which he rejected. I say that, had he been disposed, he could have embodied those facts in the same message. Now, these facts account very well for the deterioration of our public works; and this is the twin-serpent that was here last winter in company with the other serpent, the tonnage tax, which is now under consideration.

The gentleman from Philadelphia says, in regard to the sale of the main line, that the Pennsylvania railroad company would never have made the purchase, if it had not been with the expectation of getting rid of the tonnage tax—they never would have made the purchase except for the purpose of getting the State of Pennsylvania to surrender a portion of her sovereignty! They intended to make a bargain by which they should be exempted from taxation, or they never would have made the purchase. The purchase, according to the gentleman's statement, was a conspiracy against the sovereignty of the State! That was the object, and, as the gentleman says, the only object, that they endeavored to attain, though I think he must be mistaken on that point; for when the Supreme Court struck out that portion of the bargain, the company were still very willing to make the purchase. The company would doubtless have been well pleased to succeed in getting Pennsylvania, through her representatives, to abandon a portion of her high sovereignty, but failing to do that, they were very willing to take the public works at the price that was set upon them.

But another very strange idea is stated here. The gentleman says that the repeal of the tonnage duties inures to the benefit of the State. Well, now, I think that the gentleman would be a little surprised, if, when walking along the street, some fellow should stop him and relieve him of his pocket book, and then, when remonstrated with, should turn round and say, "Oh, yes, I did take your pocket book, but I did it only to oblige you; it will all inure to your benefit." This appears to me somewhat the nature of the transaction by which the State has had taken from her treasury, by the Pennsylvania railroad company, three quarters of a million in cash, which ought to be in the sinking fund, and which according to the argument made last year by my friend from Lycoming (for whose legal learning I have the highest respect,) was by construction of law in the sinking fund. The Commonwealth is also relieved of a revenue of from three hundred thousand dollars to four hundred thousand dollars per annum in perpetuity. All this my friend says, is to inure to our benefit—to the benefit of the State. Well, I think the gentleman would be hard to convince in the case of the larceny of his pocket book under the circumstances I have mentioned; and I think the people of Pennsylvania will be hard to convince that to have their treasury depleted in this way is going to inure to their benefit. I think the gentleman will have some difficulty in enlightening the public mind so as to comprehend the manner in which transactions of this sort inure to the public benefit.

The people are perfectly aware—almost every citizen, learned or unlearned, in my portion of the State is aware—that the State of Pennsylvania has expended the vast sum of forty million dollars for public improvements—that money was borrowed for the purpose. They now see themselves relieved of the whole of these public works by the legislation with reference to the Pennsylvania railroad company and the Sunbury and Erie railroad company. They find that all for which their money was expended is gone forever, and that the debt is left as a burden upon the people, to be paid by taxation. Now I would say to the gentleman who has been the strong advocate of both these measures and who has labored here to pass them through this Hall, that I think it would trouble him to convince the people that they are to be benefitted by this proceeding.—When the tax gatherer comes around yearly to collect taxes from the honest yeomanry in my section of the State, I do not believe that they will be able to read the gentleman's speech and say, "we are convinced that this is all for our own good and it is to be for the good of our children in the future—we are convinced that the payment of this heavy tax every year is to inure to our benefit." The people will not be able to understand such a theory. It will puzzle them worse than my friend from Lycoming has been puzzled. They will be utterly unable to understand how such a proceeding is to inure to their benefit.

But the gentleman has undertaken to argue the legal and constitutional question. Now, I know that our legal brethren are rather opposed to laymen, like the gentleman from the city and myself, undertake to grapple with a legal question. Those gentlemen have a sort of professional sensibility about such questions as they do not like to have us meddle with them; they think, perhaps, that such questions belong of right to them. Yet the gentleman from Philadelphia has ventured to engage in this discussion, in its legal constitutional aspect, I hope no gentleman will be offended if I undertake a word of reply.

The gentleman says that the act of 1861 is clearly not unconstitutional, as taking money out of the sinking fund. He looks upon the abstraction of that money as merely a "draw back"—an equitable draw back. But my friend should consider it is such a tremendous draw back! It draws back the whole thing, and settles it perpetually. Such a terrible "draw back" as that, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon. Why, we might draw back all the rest that is in the sinking fund—and then how is the public debt to be paid?—This is carrying the idea of a drawback to a length which I believe this House will not be ready to adopt. Even our legal friends who take refuge behind the constitutional question, without pretending to say that the act in question was wise and judicious, will be a little startled at this idea of a "drawback."

But the gentleman has referred frequently, in his speech, to the Supreme Court. Now, I have grown almost as tired of hearing my friends here refer so frequently to the Supreme Court, as I was the other day when my very excellent friend from Lycoming, (Mr. Armstrong,) referred so often to the Governor.—It does seem to me a little out of place for us, grave legislators, sitting here to do our duty as we have sworn before high heaven, to be all the time talking about what the Supreme Court will do. Why, gentlemen, I never have thought about the Supreme Court, except when you have brought it to my mind, any more than I had about the Governor. I was perfectly indifferent in regard to the action of the Supreme Court. That body, I doubt not, will do its duty; and I trust in heaven that we shall do ours. I shall do my duty here without the least reference to the Supreme Court. I shall judge this measure upon its expediency, upon its wisdom, upon its constitutionality, without the least consideration whether my course may please or displease the Supreme Court. I am a little surprised that gentlemen are so fastidious and timid in regard to some apprehended opinion of the Supreme Court. I know that, while many gentlemen here are constantly expressing their reference for that tribunal, my friend from Allegheny, (Mr. Williams,) leans a little in the other direction, and when he refers to the Supreme Court in his peculiar style, some gentlemen get very uneasy; but I must say that where he has referred to that court once, other gentlemen on the opposite side of the question have referred to it a dozen times. Now, it does seem to me that it would be more becoming the dignity of this body if we would come forward like legislators, like statesmen, and determine for ourselves what is wise, what is judicious, what is constitutional, avoiding all these side issues. I have no fears with regard to the Supreme Court. I do not intend to trespass upon their functions, and I hope that they are not disposed to trespass upon ours.

I have been a little surprised at the sensibility manifested by my friend from Huntingdon, (Mr. Scott.) That gentleman, (who, they tell me, is a very able lawyer, and who has so zealously endeavored to keep the Supreme Court and the fear of it continually before our eyes,) was startled and horror-stricken at the remarks of my friend from Allegheny, (Mr. Shannon,) to which I propose to refer. Had he been pleading as a lawyer for his client, he could scarcely have manifested more sensibility and excitement. I am no lawyer; I have no client except the people who sent me here; and, God sparing me, I intend to serve them faithfully; they are all the client that I have or desire.

Having had the terror of the Supreme Court held before our eyes during this whole discussion, my friend, (Mr. Shannon,) innocently, as I thought, said that he would like to have the opinion of this body on this question, and that he had no objection that that opinion should go before the Supreme Court when that tribunal should be called upon to determine this question. This very innocent language so horrified my friend from Huntingdon, (Mr. Scott,) that he not only shook with excitement, but he said that such language reminded him of the enraged Hebrews; and what Hebrews? Why, sir, that band of men that cried aloud for the crucifixion of our Saviour! Why, sir, I see nothing so alarming in the suggestion that the opinion of the people, as expressed through their representatives in this hall, should, if it has merit and truthfulness in it, be considered and weighed by that high and honorable tribunal, the Supreme Court.—I see nothing startling in such language. It did not remind me—nor do I think that when my friend from Huntingdon, gets the excitement off it will remind him of those who cried out in that evil hour for the crucifixion of our Saviour.

But my time is fast drawing to a close; and before I conclude I desire to say a word further in reply to the remarks of my friend from Philadelphia, (Mr. Anson.) He says that his measure in relation to the Sunbury and Erie railroad—this twin serpent, this lean snake, as I have characterized it, has already gone before the Supreme Court; and what judgment do you think he says the Supreme Court have passed upon it? He says that the Supreme Court have pronounced that measure eminently wise and proper. This opinion seems to gratify that gentleman exceedingly. Now, I appeal to my learned friend whether it is a judicious course on the part of the Supreme Court to indulge in such expressions of opinion with reference to the prudence and expediency of our acts of legislation. Are they authorized to sit in judgment to tell us when our determinations are wise and when they are foolish? I had supposed that that tribunal authorized only to inquire whether our acts are constitutional and to give them proper judicial construction. I had supposed that we had left to us at least the prerogative of determining whether measures submitted to us are wise and expedient. Has it come to this, that our acts are to be submitted to the judgment of the Supreme Court to test their wisdom and expediency, and are only to be deemed wise when that tribunal shall so declare them?

Now, sir, I think such expressions on the part of the Supreme Court are very unbecoming and unwise. I hope the time will never come when, before we can know whether our laws are judicious and wise, we must obtain the opinion of that body; for as I have said, it is a body that I have not thought anything about only as I have been reminded of it so often on the one side and on the other during this debate.

Since I last occupied the floor on this subject, I have listened, as I always listen, with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction to my friend from Lycoming. He tells us that he voted against the passage of this act last winter, that he thought it unwise, and that he had doubts of its constitutionality. Yes he comes in here now, and when we talk of repealing that act, he says, "you cannot do it; it cannot be done." I am surprised at the position which the gentleman occupies. He says that, though a majority of this Legislature should be bought, should absolutely be corrupted with money, yet we cannot undo the act induced by these corrupt influences. He has read as an authority from the Supreme Court, in which that court has said, if I understand him correctly, that it would be unseemly on the part of the court to inquire into our conduct here. Now, I do not know but that it would be unseemly and indelicate for a tribunal of that sort to undertake such an inquiry.—But, sir, that is not what we propose to do. The gentleman proposes to submit this matter to the consideration of the Supreme Court; but I do not, my friend from Allegheny does not, and the men who act with us do not propose to submit any such question to that tribunal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would inquire of the gentleman what he does propose. When this repealing act shall have been passed, will it not then be competent for the Supreme Court to pass upon it?

Mr. TRACY. I propose to let the court act within their proper sphere in this case as in all others. I do not propose to trespass upon their functions. If parties having an interest in the matter desire to submit this act to the court, they may of course submit it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then you propose that this question shall be submitted to the Supreme Court?

Mr. TRACY. I do not propose to submit it to the Supreme Court; but the parties interested may submit it, as they do in other cases—I have no objection.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I only desire to understand from the gentleman whether his idea is that this question can be decided without a reference to the Supreme Court.

Mr. TRACY. I propose that we shall decide it here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, sir, so I understood; that is, the gentleman proposes that the Legislature shall decide upon the constitutionality of the law?

Mr. TRACY. I do—indeed I do.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. So I understood.

Mr. TRACY. If other parties, individuals or corporations, have an interest in this question, and desire to carry it before that body, I shall not interpose any objection. They have a right, under our Constitution and laws, to do so. The gentleman's amendment proposes that we shall carry the question to the Supreme Court—that we shall order the Attorney General to carry it there. Now, I do not propose to make any such order; I am not disposed to give any such direction.

Again, the gentleman says that a majority of this body have been corrupted, we cannot inquire into the corruption. The Supreme Court have said that they would not inquire into it. Then, sir, who is to inquire into it? Why, the gentleman says, the people may elect other and better representatives. When those representatives come here, what are they to do? Have they any more enlarged powers than we? Can they inquire? No, sir, they would still constitute the same Legislature.—Then, sir, if we and our successors and the Supreme Court, are powerless in regard to this matter, we have a state of gloom even more dark and appalling than that presented by my friend from Huntingdon, (Mr. Scott,) because he inclined to the opinion that the courts might inquire. But if the Supreme Court cannot inquire into the corruption which may have induced legislation, and if we are prohibited from inquiring into it, and if our successors will have no more authority and power than we have, then, sir, the institutions of this State are enveloped in a pall of gloom of which I had not before conceived. If this reasoning be true, to what helpless condition we are reduced! A great, a crying evil exists which the courts are incompetent to reach. We, too, are powerless to apply any remedy; and if we go home to give place to our successors, they, when they come here, are equally powerless! That sort of reasoning does not satisfy me; that sort of reasoning, I am well assured, will never satisfy the people of Bradford county for Pennsylvania.

A MAN SWEPT OVER GENESSEE FALLS.—On Wednesday morning, about 6 o'clock, a man by the name of Francis McKean, the proprietor of the Canada House, on Front street, committed suicide by jumping into the river between the Gas Works and Brown's Race.—His brother saw him start for the river, and diving his intention started after him, but was too late to avert the catastrophe. The unfortunate man, the moment he struck the water was beyond the reach of human aid.—The body of the man continued on the top of the water as it swept under the railroad bridge, and remained in sight until it reached the brink of the falls, when it passed from view to the seething and boiling cauldron below. McKean is said to have been laboring under an attack of delirium tremens for several days prior to his successful attempt at self destruction. He leaves a wife and four children.—*Rochester Democrat.*

The right thing in the wrong place is a love-letter written on a mourning sheet of paper.