

Towanda, Pa., April 14, 1934.

The Indiana House Thursday passed a joint resolution by a vote of 62 to 24, amending the Constitution by giving women the right to vote at state elections.

At midnight on Wednesday of last week the shock of an earthquake was felt at St. Paul's Bay, Quebec. The shock was sufficiently strong to awaken people from sleep.

JOHN G. O'NEIL is spoken of as the probable successor of Colonel SETTLI, Internal Revenue collector of the Sixteenth Pennsylvania District, who has held the position for eighteen years.

MRS. WILLIAM M. EVARTS, ALLEN C. THURMAN and TIMOTHY O. HOWE, United States commissioners to attend the Monetary Conference to be held in Paris on the 19th inst., sailed from New York to Europe on the 5th inst.

The next House of Representatives will be led politically, Republicans, 147; Democrats, 134; Greenback Republicans, 4; Greenback Democrats, 1; Independents, 1; There is one Republican and one Democratic vacancy to fill.

MR. MAHON has only voted with the Democrats in the United States Senate he would be all right in the estimation of Bourbon journals, and "Republican newspapers with Democratic tendencies." That is his office as an effort to break up the Solid South cannot be forgiven.

At Malong New York, Thursday, an immense crowd assembled to welcome the return home of ex-Vice President WHELAN. After being escorted to his residence a formal address was made by A. H. PARMELEE, to which Mr. WHELAN made a reply expressing his thanks for the kindness of the reception.

During the ten months ending January 1, 1933, 35,993,724 pounds of fresh fish were consumed in New York city. The extent to which this class of food is eaten is every year becoming greater. Thanks to the encouragement which the authorities are giving to fish culture, the supply of the better classes of food fishes is increasing to a very encouraging extent.

The New York State Legislature has at length begun a resource for State revenue which is likely to prove extremely valuable. It is to levy a tax on the sale of the famous GETTYSBURG edition, and in a fairly good state of preservation. The amount named seems a high price to pay for a book, yet it is less than the amount which would be needed to realize. Not long ago copies of the same price were sold in London for more than fifteen thousand dollars.

An order was issued by Postmaster General JAMES Thursday, to take effect on the first day of May next, which will recognize the entire railway mail service of the department. The need of a reorganization of this branch of the service was brought to the attention of Postmaster General JAMES soon after he took charge of the department, and the plan to increase the efficiency of the service, which was embodied in the order, just issued, was submitted to him and received his prompt endorsement.

SECRETARY KIRKWOOD has made his selections from the numerous applications which were filed at the Interior Department for the new positions created by the last Congress in the Pension Office. Of the new appointments, eight are to be ex-officio, at a salary of \$2,000 per annum, and the remainder about 125 in number, are for positions as clerks, cryptists and messengers, at salaries ranging from \$720 to \$1,400 per annum. The list shows that selections have been made from among natives of nearly every State in the Union.

The Secretary of War, Mr. CANTON, proposes to order that officers who are assignments to agreeable duty in cities, shall, after a specified number of years, be turned out of their offices and sent to the frontier; while their brother officers, who have endured for years the hardships of Indian campaigning and the monotony of distant garrison life, will be employed in a tour of civil service in civilized regions. This will, if determined upon, create a clutter among those who have been holding comfortable positions for the past ten or twelve years.

That Postmaster General JAMES is the right man in the right place, no one who has made an effort to improve the service will doubt. His design for the establishment of postal savings banks, the plans for which are being prepared, should receive the prompt support of Congress, as they would supply a want long felt in all sections of the country, and particularly at points remote from the larger towns and cities. He has made himself perfectly familiar with the possibilities of the people, and will doubtless arrange a scheme which will be doubly satisfactory.

The Tennessee Legislature in its sudden and violent assault of honesty has passed a bill refunding the repudiated debt of the extinct municipality of Memphis at a discount of 66 2/3 per cent. It proposes, in other words, to pay 33 1/3 cents on the dollar; and to allow four per cent. interest upon the sum thus repaid. Having well-nigh given up hope of ever getting their own, the creditors of Memphis will probably be disposed to regard this arrangement as a very much better than nothing. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

The public authorities in Hancock county, Virginia, have a peculiar way of riding themselves of the paupers for whom maintenance they are responsible. They have an auction at the fashion of auto-bellum days, which is held at stated intervals, and at which the said paupers are knocked down, not to the highest but to the lowest bidder. To be held in service of the year, to be held in service of the year, to be held in service of the year. The object of the bidding is to determine what price shall be paid by the State for the paupers disposed of.

Of course a man who is able-bodied will be taken at a low figure, while it will be necessary to pay a good round sum to get a feeble old woman out of the way. The system described has its conveniences, but it is not one which American citizens will generally approve.

DAVID B. PARKER, Chief of Post-Office Inspector, M. LAUREN, Post-Office Inspector, J. HARRISON, Chief of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, have been appointed by Postmaster-General JAMES as a commission to make a thorough investigation of the organization of the clerical force of the department, taking each bureau consecutively and examining the books, records and duties performed by each person employed, conferring for information with the chiefs of bureaus, who will, however, be consulted by the Postmaster-General on the subject.

MANY metropolitan newspapers are devoting columns of space in describing a projected air line railway from New York to Chicago on the first day of next. English capitalists are to furnish the line, and the distance between the two cities is to be about 185 miles than any other route. The engineers are instructed to avoid grades and curves, and build a line that will be not only straight but level. The bridge over the Allegheny river is to be 300 feet high, which would be the highest bridge in America. Work has already commenced on paper.

WHILE people in this part of the country are enjoying the first blush of spring, the remainder of the State are still digging railroad trains out of the snow banks in some of the Western States. It is pretty late in the season to be doing anything like that, but the winter has gone over into spring to a disagreeable and unusual extent in nearly every part of the country and everything is late. It is now, however, not too much to hope that the snow will melt and the roads will be opened in a few days.

FULLER details of the earthquake at Seis, or Chio, on April 30, indicate that the magnitude of the disaster was underestimated in exaggerated, and it will take its place in history along with the great convulsions of like character at Lisbon and Calabria in the last century. The estimate of killed and wounded has risen from 3,000, the number stated in the first account, to 15,000, and it is reported that 30,000 people on the island are homeless and without food. The suffering, present and prospective, so far exceeds the means at hand for its relief that the world at large is appealed for help in this direful exigency.

Every attempt to belittle the conflict in the Senate will fail, and whoever undertakes to measure it as ordinary political conflicts are measured will find his yardstick inapplicable. To the man who burrows between the scurf skin and true skin of things, and who mistakes the superficial for the cubic contents of things—to such a person the Senate deadlock probably appears a petty squabble for minor positions. But the object of the struggle is majority rule, while the incident is the re-organization of the Senate offices. These are men who can see that it is disgraceful for the Republican Senators to insist on dispensing the patronage of the Senate, but who cannot see that it is equally disgraceful for Democratic Senators to insist on enjoying that patronage. This writing is not addressed to such persons. It is intended for men who enjoy the blessing of two eyes, and a just comprehension of matters in their true relations. The foundation principle of our system is rule by the majority. It does not matter whether it be a majority of one; or a majority of a million. The principle does not admit of a sliding scale. A majority is a majority, and it cannot be more than a majority under any circumstances. Nor can it become less than that by any possible rule of computation. The Republicans, having a majority in the Senate, are once reorganized the committee, etc. The Democrats objected to that, even, but not so strenuously as to delay business. It was only when the Republican majority went still further, as it was bound to do, and proposed to elect officers in harmony with the party in political sentiment, that the Democratic majority resolved to resist majority rule to the bitter end.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

But it is not true. MAHON was not elected by the Democrats of Virginia, but in spite of them. He was elected as the foe of Bourbonism, and he was expected to vote independently of caucus discipline. The Democrats had no claim upon him. That he was a Democrat, or that he is a Democrat, is of no moment whatever. He proposes to fight a solid South, and the Republicans are bound to assist him. It is a good cause, and Mr. MAHON'S views of Virginia politics have no bearing upon the matter. He is no more a repudiator than the men who assail him. The Readjusters, of whom he is the leader, are just as honest as the Funders whom he opposes. The difference between them is that the Funders refuse to pay either principal or interest of the debt of Virginia, and the Readjusters propose to pay two thirds of the principal and the interest as it falls due. Neither is right from the Republican standpoint, but the honesty belongs to the Readjusters, not to the Funders. The Senate will not fund or readjust the debt of Virginia. It proposes to help MAHON break up the solid South. That is right. Every good citizen should encourage the Republican Senators to go on and break down false counting and corruption of the ballot in the South. The country is with them.

WHILE people in this part of the country are enjoying the first blush of spring, the remainder of the State are still digging railroad trains out of the snow banks in some of the Western States. It is pretty late in the season to be doing anything like that, but the winter has gone over into spring to a disagreeable and unusual extent in nearly every part of the country and everything is late. It is now, however, not too much to hope that the snow will melt and the roads will be opened in a few days.

FULLER details of the earthquake at Seis, or Chio, on April 30, indicate that the magnitude of the disaster was underestimated in exaggerated, and it will take its place in history along with the great convulsions of like character at Lisbon and Calabria in the last century. The estimate of killed and wounded has risen from 3,000, the number stated in the first account, to 15,000, and it is reported that 30,000 people on the island are homeless and without food. The suffering, present and prospective, so far exceeds the means at hand for its relief that the world at large is appealed for help in this direful exigency.

Every attempt to belittle the conflict in the Senate will fail, and whoever undertakes to measure it as ordinary political conflicts are measured will find his yardstick inapplicable. To the man who burrows between the scurf skin and true skin of things, and who mistakes the superficial for the cubic contents of things—to such a person the Senate deadlock probably appears a petty squabble for minor positions. But the object of the struggle is majority rule, while the incident is the re-organization of the Senate offices. These are men who can see that it is disgraceful for the Republican Senators to insist on dispensing the patronage of the Senate, but who cannot see that it is equally disgraceful for Democratic Senators to insist on enjoying that patronage. This writing is not addressed to such persons. It is intended for men who enjoy the blessing of two eyes, and a just comprehension of matters in their true relations. The foundation principle of our system is rule by the majority. It does not matter whether it be a majority of one; or a majority of a million. The principle does not admit of a sliding scale. A majority is a majority, and it cannot be more than a majority under any circumstances. Nor can it become less than that by any possible rule of computation. The Republicans, having a majority in the Senate, are once reorganized the committee, etc. The Democrats objected to that, even, but not so strenuously as to delay business. It was only when the Republican majority went still further, as it was bound to do, and proposed to elect officers in harmony with the party in political sentiment, that the Democratic majority resolved to resist majority rule to the bitter end.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

HARRISBURG LETTER

Special Correspondence of THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

HARRISBURG, April 9, 1934.—The session of the House on the evening of Monday the 14th inst., did not amount to much in the way of practical results. In fact, few of the bills that were introduced at this session, though they might as well be abandoned. On this evening two bills were passed second reading, which may be noticed, one supplementary to the common school law, allowing cities and boroughs having five thousand inhabitants to have a superintendent, etc., the other to prevent, frauds in the primary elections of the Democratic party in Westmoreland county.

The idea of preventing fraud in Westmoreland, or any other county, by an ordinary legislative enactment, will strike the average mind as a joke of rather huge proportions. After the introduction of several bills, the offering of a resolution of adjournment was made. Mr. McCACHAN called the previous question and was properly seconded. The House adjourned on the 15th inst., and the latter subsequently withdrawn, the House adjourned. Immediately upon adjournment, David H. Lane, of Philadelphia, addressed the members of the House giving reasons why the Readjuster bill should not be passed, the use of the hall having previously been granted him for that purpose.

At the Monday evening session of the Senate, bills on first reading only were considered, when the following among others, were thus disposed of:—  
House bill to relieve building and loan associations, passed second reading.  
Senate bill fixing the salaries of members of the Legislature at \$1,000 for a regular session and \$1,500 for a special session, passed second reading.  
Senate bill providing for the removal of inmates from hospitals injured by fire.

The first business of any importance attending the session of the House took place Monday morning, the 15th inst., was the consideration of a resolution for the adjournment of the House until the 22nd. After several members had spoken their little piece the resolution was reported by the Ways and Means Committee, by a vote of yeas 100, and nays 60. The following bills were introduced:—  
Senate bill to regulate the collection of taxes on real estate.  
Senate bill to regulate the collection of taxes on personal property.  
Senate bill to regulate the collection of taxes on corporations.

The following synopsis of a law just passed by the Legislature will be of interest to the public in this city: "That after the passage of this act proprietors of hotels, boarding and lodging houses, in addition to the remedies now provided by law, shall have the right to attach wages due or owing to such persons as may be indebted to them for boarding not exceeding the amount of four weeks, and any sum so may be attached, and shall all be paid to the defendant until the judgment to had for such amount as may be due upon such attachment shall be satisfied, and justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction of attachment in all cases for such purposes."

The New York Tribune has been publishing page by page the details of the rebellion gathered from the papers of participants on the rebel side. Wednesday last JUDAH P. BENJAMIN, Holston's Secretary of State, dated November 18, 1864, was published. It relates to the efforts made to cripple the Union cause by keeping up a fire in the rear, the embargo of which was to be formed from Canada. The article is a reprint of a letter from HOLSTON to the Hon. J. P. BENJAMIN, dated November 18, 1864. It is intended for men who enjoy the blessing of two eyes, and a just comprehension of matters in their true relations. The foundation principle of our system is rule by the majority. It does not matter whether it be a majority of one; or a majority of a million. The principle does not admit of a sliding scale. A majority is a majority, and it cannot be more than a majority under any circumstances. Nor can it become less than that by any possible rule of computation. The Republicans, having a majority in the Senate, are once reorganized the committee, etc. The Democrats objected to that, even, but not so strenuously as to delay business. It was only when the Republican majority went still further, as it was bound to do, and proposed to elect officers in harmony with the party in political sentiment, that the Democratic majority resolved to resist majority rule to the bitter end.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

Why do the Democrats resist the election of Republican officers? They had conceded reorganization of the Senate Committees in the interest of the majority. They recognized the right of the majority to control legislation when they did that? Then why do they resist the full administration of that right? Can any candid person doubt why they resist? Is it not because the patronage of the Senate involves the disbursement of a good many thousand dollars, which cash the Democrats desire to go into the pockets of their party friends? Does even the most case hardened Democrat doubt that this is the true reason for the action of Democratic Senators? If the Democrats had even a majority of one, and the Senate officers Republicans, does any member suppose that they would not insist on putting out the Republicans and putting in Democrats? The action of the Democrats two years ago is a sufficient answer to that question. They did reorganize the Senate office then, and they had the undoubted right to do it. They dismissed Union soldiers and filled their places with Copperheads and bummers. They made the son of a Senator who was expelled from the Senate for treasonable acts in 1861 their Sergeant-at-Arms. They brought forward men totally unfit for responsible positions and put them in the places of men of probity and large experience. They had their own way, and though it was not a doubt right, as the majority party is, it was a right which they had by undoubted right. And yet the proposal proposes to do little credit to the State that makes it.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE

TO BE HAD AT THE COURT HOUSE, ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1934. All persons interested in the contemplated railroad from Bradford to Harrisburg, or in any other project, are most earnestly requested to be present at the meeting to be held at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the proposed railroad and to receive the views of the public thereon. The meeting will be held in the Court House, on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. All persons interested in the proposed railroad are requested to be present at the meeting.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

DESIDERABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a very desirable investment.

REVIEWED NEW TESTAMENT. The following is a list of property for sale at the Court House on Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 10 o'clock. The property is situated in the town of Harrisburg, and consists of several lots of land. The property is being sold at a very low price, and is a