

Northampton Journal

BY S. J. ROW.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1863.

VOL. 9.—NO. 26.

The Voice of an Old Democrat.

SPEECH OF THE HON. BENJAMIN CHAMPEYS, OF LANCASTER COUNTY.

A joint resolution instructing our Senators in Congress to oppose the passage of a law appropriating twenty millions of dollars to compensate the owners of emancipated slaves in the State of Missouri, offered some days since by Mr. Kaine, of Fayette, being under consideration in the House.

Mr. CHAMPEYS said: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that some other gentleman, better able than myself to discuss this question, has not risen to address the House; but no other gentleman taking the floor, I am rather compelled to speak on this subject, which I think should not pass without discussion.

I have always been opposed, Mr. Speaker, to this sort of legislative revision of the Congress of the United States, except in matters pending there, in which our Republic and Commonwealth was interested. There is now upon the files of this House a series of resolutions not one of them breathing any confidence in the Government—not one of them denouncing rebellion of the South—all of them sympathizing with those who are opposing the arm of the Government; because, sir, I hold that, at this time, opposition to the Government of this country is aiding rebellion. If ever there was a time in the history of any country in which there should be united hearts to sustain this Government, it is at the present moment. It was a wise law of the Athenian Republic that compelled every citizen, when the country was in danger, to avow his sentiments. Those who remained silent were punished equally with those who avowed their sentiments against the Government. It was a wise law and one which I think should commend itself to every loyal heart.

Now, sir, what is the history of this contest?—(I am not going to give it but simply to glance at it,) and particularly in reference to this slavery question? Why, sir, Pennsylvania is now retrograding. Twice when I was in the Legislature some years ago, I voted in favor of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In the year 1826 or 1830, a proposition in favor of that object passed the Senate unanimously, and in this House it was passed with but eight dissenting voices, and the ground on which these eight dissenting voices were given was that the resolution was not imperative upon our Senators and Representatives. And, sir, I recollect the admirable and noble preamble of the act of 1830, drawn by some of the most distinguished men of the county, in which are set forth sentiments of opposition to the institution of slavery, and in which it is declared that we, having gained our own liberties, should consider it our first duty to give freedom to those who have been so much oppressed—to those who have been separated, parents from children, and husbands from wives.

That resolution, at the time when it was passed, received universal commendation. How we have gone back since that time! Why, sir, the establishment of a new State, Western Virginia, in which slavery has been repudiated, has been denounced when every one knows that the soil of that State is worth three dollars where it was worth but one before the abolition of slavery. Wherever the foot of slavery touches any soil, there is necessarily depreciation in everything. It prevents the emigration of freemen to that section. No laboring man who values his personal position desires to make his home in a community in which it is declared that we, having gained our own liberties, should consider it our first duty to give freedom to those who have been so much oppressed—to those who have been separated, parents from children, and husbands from wives.

That resolution, at the time when it was passed, received universal commendation. How we have gone back since that time! Why, sir, the establishment of a new State, Western Virginia, in which slavery has been repudiated, has been denounced when every one knows that the soil of that State is worth three dollars where it was worth but one before the abolition of slavery. Wherever the foot of slavery touches any soil, there is necessarily depreciation in everything. It prevents the emigration of freemen to that section. No laboring man who values his personal position desires to make his home in a community in which it is declared that we, having gained our own liberties, should consider it our first duty to give freedom to those who have been so much oppressed—to those who have been separated, parents from children, and husbands from wives.

Now, sir, what is the policy of our Government? It is a policy designed to make this great country what it ought to be. The Democratic party in former days acknowledge the evils of slavery. A Democratic convention held at Pittsburg in 1849, adopted resolutions which do not now recollect with what number of dissenting voices declaring in favor of free soil in the territories. That was the Democratic doctrine in those days. I recollect as well that an eminent gentleman of our own State, who had occupied the most distinguished position in this country, denounced, in 1820, the Missouri compromise and condemned any attempt to force slavery into the territories. Such was the state of the public mind in former years. But, sir, at this date, after seventy years of consistent action against the institution of slavery and in favor of emancipation, (not with the design of destroying it unconstitutionally, I do not mean that,) it is proposed that we shall now suddenly take a stand in this hall in favor of the institution of slavery. When Missouri is sending up her shouts in favor of emancipation—when she has begun to appreciate the beneficial effects of free institutions—it is proposed to array on the side of slavery, Pennsylvania, a State that gave so noble an utterance on this subject in 1780—a State that placed upon her statute books, by a vote unanimous or nearly so, the declaration that slavery is an institution fraught with evils to the country, and, as we had just emerged from the war of the Revolution, in which we struggled to gain liberty for ourselves, it was our duty before God to give freedom to the oppressed race within our own midst. But, sir, it is now proposed that the Government of the country, when engaged in one of the most beneficial measures it has ever attempted, shall be checked and thwarted by that Legislature whose solemn declaration in 1780 was that the institution of slavery is a curse to the country. How extraordinary!

Of what avail were all the struggles and privations of the Revolution, if this Republic is to be severed? And I undertake to say, sir, that every measure within the limits of the

Constitution should be adopted for the purpose of destroying and crushing the southern rebellion. The doctrine of the late (Buchanan) administration—a doctrine which is false to all the teachings of the fathers of the Republic—was that there is no power of the Government to maintain its own integrity. Now, sir, if the gentleman who are in the majority in this House intend, by restoring the Constitution as it is, to revive that construction of it expounded by the late (Buchanan) Executive, our Constitution amounts to nothing. The London Times, in commenting upon the message in which this extraordinary doctrine was announced, declared that no civilized nation in the world would adopt such a doctrine—that England would not permit the remotest colony to attempt to sever itself from her domains without resisting it by coercion to the utmost extent.

Why, sir, our revolution was gained by coercion. The banner of our republic in those early days, had upon it the motto, "Resistance to tyrants." Such was the sentiment of our great chief of the Revolution. He bowed his knee to the God of battles, and he pushed that contest to a successful close, without any violation of private rights—without any interference with the administration of justice—without anything which would soil the fair fame of the Government. Who surrounded him in the struggle? The chivalry of France, the choice youth of Ireland, the patriots of Poland and of Germany. They fought not merely for our Republic; they fought for the great principle involved in the contest between the two nations. They saw in the vista of the future a bright spot amid desert centuries—a place where they could have their thirst quenched at freedom's waters with none to mock them afraid.

Our present Constitution, as every man who has studied it knows, was formed for the express purpose of enabling the General Government to take measures of coercion when its demands were not properly complied with. And during the administration of Washington, that great man set an example in favor of coercion by sending forth an army, at the mere appearance of opposition to the laws in western Pennsylvania. Sir, the whole course of the Government has been to resort to coercion whenever the laws were violated, and whenever a State was invaded. Even during the late (Buchanan) administration it was distinctly announced, in the case of Utah, both by the President and Sec'y of War, that whenever a State or territory is in armed rebellion against the Government, or whenever the laws cannot be executed, it is the bounded duty of the Government to coerce such a State or territory by military force—that there is in the Government an inherent power to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whether we are drifting, I do not wish to maintain in the brief deliberation of a few moments, we can settle the knottiest questions of the Republic. What interest, I ask you, has Pennsylvania in this? The people of that State desire emancipation. And what will the measure cost Pennsylvania? Give over the law on the other side have become very economical. Of the twenty million of dollars proposed to be appropriated for this purpose, what would be Pennsylvania's portion? Perhaps a million—or one million of dollars. What is that amount, sir, when we consider the power, the wealth and the resources of this great Commonwealth? The preamble of that act of 1780 answers the question.

I do not wish to detain this House upon a question of such magnitude as this, because I have not had time to examine it. I desire an opportunity to look at the subject with more care. My heart, sir, is with the President in his glorious efforts to hold out an assisting hand to the States that desire to emancipate their slaves. Who does not know, Mr. Speaker, that in the State of Maryland to day lands which in the same parallel in Pennsylvania are worth one hundred dollars per acre are in Maryland worth but five dollars? And who does not know that if slavery were abolished in the State of Maryland, her lands would rise to an equal value with those of Pennsylvania? Why could this be so? Because with the abolition of slavery, freemen would go there. Wherever slavery is, freemen are degraded. Wherever slavery is, education is restricted, if not prohibited. Men of some distinction have declared, that, if a division of the Union should take place, the destiny of Pennsylvania and New York would be with the South. God deliver us from such a horrible fate! I would rather this day be under the despotism of Russia than under the despotism of men who have no regard for the rights of the poor, and whose whole system is opposed to the education of the masses of the people. Were such a state of things brought about, we should be in a condition of most humiliating degradation, under the overshadowing influence of slavery. This great Commonwealth, with all her immense resources and industrial interests, with all her manufactures, would be put under the ban of free trade. We should be humiliated into submission, to our lords and masters, the slaveholders. We should be forbidden to utter any sentiments adverse to the views of the devotees of the "peculiar institution."

What would be the effect of the division of this Union? Why, sir, the Emperor of Russia (who appears to understand our institutions a little better than some of our own people here) said very recently to Bayard Taylor, "I never want to witness the severance of your great Republic. I have always been its friend. The first severance would lead to another and another; you would be broken into fragments; you would present to the world the spectacle of a ruined nation." This is the truth which should be realized by every man in the north; and if it were realized in its full force, this rebellion would be speedily and completely crushed.

For the reasons which I have suggested, I think that the resolution now under consideration should be voted down. I think that the vote rejecting it would be greeted with approval by every benevolent and loyal heart in the country.

A letter bearing the following address, was received at the Post-Office, Port-Patrick: "From Ireland to the Post-Office, Port-Patrick: Will you kindly forward to the Boys' Sister that lodged with you that played the Fiddle from Ireland. To be left at the Corner House till called for."

Love is the most intelligible when it is unable to express itself in words.

Democracy and the Soldiers' Vote.

DEBATE IN THE PENNSYLVANIA SENATE.

Who is the Friend of the Volunteer?

Below we present the full proceedings of the Senate of Wednesday, February 11th, on a resolution introduced by Mr. Johnson, the talented Senator from the Lehigh district, providing for an amendment to the Constitution which will allow the men who are fighting for their country to exercise the right of suffrage in the tented field. It will be observed from the full proceedings, that while the Democrats in that body did not dare to oppose the provision openly, every strategy was used to defeat the object of the same. Let every man who believes that the soldier possesses rights as a citizen, notwithstanding he fights for his country, read this discussion carefully. It will prove to the country conclusively that the Democratic leaders are opposed to soldiers voting. The Democratic Supreme Court has unjustly deprived the soldier of his vote by its decision, and these men of lesser grade are carrying out the principle. The discussion in the Senate on this subject, is as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON. I move that the Senate proceed to consider bill [Sen. No. 101] entitled "A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, extending the right of suffrage to citizens in actual military service."

The motion was agreed to, when the bill was read as follows: "Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in General Assembly met, That the following amendment be proposed to the Constitution of the Commonwealth, in accordance with the provisions of the tenth article thereof: There shall be an additional section to be designated section four, as follows:

SECTION 4. Whenever any of the qualified electors of this Commonwealth shall be in any actual military service, under a requisition from the President of the United States or by the authority of this Commonwealth, such electors may exercise the right of suffrage in all elections by the citizens, under such regulations as shall be prescribed by law, as fully as if they were present at their usual place of election.

The bill was read a third time, and coming before the Senate, it was passed. The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Hiestand and Mr. Nichols, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Bucher, Clymer, Connell, Donovan, Fuller, Glaz, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lambertson, Lowry, McCandless, McSherry, Mott, Nichols, Penney, Reilly, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Smith, Stark, Stein, Stutzman, Turrell, Wallace, White, Wilson and Lawrence. Speaker—33.

NAYS—None. So the bill was passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Wilson moved that the vote just taken be reconsidered for the purpose of amending the bill. The motion was agreed to; and the bill being again before the Senate on its final passage.

Mr. Wilson moved that the Senate resolve itself into committee of the whole for the purpose of special amendment of the bill by inserting the words "are or" after the words "such regulations as" near the conclusion of the section.

Mr. Clymer. I would like to have the opinion of the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary? (Mr. Penney,) whether in an amendment to the Constitution it would be proper to adopt any legislative enactments that may have heretofore existed—whether it is not obligatory that the enactment of minor details of the general provision set forth in the amendment should be made in conformity with that amendment and therefore made subsequently. In the present case, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tioga would have the effect of adopting as legal and constitutional an enactment at present upon our statute book. I simply desire to have an expression of opinion on this subject. I would like to refer to laws existing at the time of the adoption of that provision, certainly, but at least so far as some of the provisions are concerned. I am not prepared to express an opinion as to the propriety of the amendment. The question is one of importance and is entitled to some consideration.

Mr. Wilson. I had not previously reflected upon this subject, but upon hearing the bill read by the clerk, it occurred to me that the adoption of the amendment which I have proposed would be most appropriate. It will have the effect of regulating the manner of holding elections in the army without an additional provision being rendered necessary for that purpose.

Mr. Clymer. While I still entertain a doubt upon the question which I propounded to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it appears to me that another query which has suggested itself to my mind as to the effect of the amendment would be appropriate at this time. We are all aware that citizens of our State in actual military service participated in the election of 1861, and that that election was conducted in the army under the supposition that the laws then in force entitled soldiers beyond the limits of the State to exercise the right of suffrage. We know by the result that the laws then existing were inefficient for the purposes to which it was sought to apply them, and that the holding of the election occasioned fraud, confusion and difficulty. The subject has occupied the attention of our Supreme Court and of our courts of common pleas, almost every county of the State having had some difficulty with regard to it. Now, sir, if the existing laws upon the statute book are so imperfect as to render the holding of an election almost useless so far as concerns its proper results, I think it would be a piece of folly for the Senate, by a constitutional amendment, to re-enact and revive the laws which have led to so much confusion and difficulty heretofore. This subject is one that is not confined to any of the parties represented upon this floor. Both of the political parties of the State have possibly had cause to complain of the frauds committed under the laws as they stand. There were no safeguards thrown around the ballot-box dur-

ing those elections in the army; there were no modes pointed out in which they should be conducted; indeed it was almost impossible to say who was authorized under the law to conduct the elections. I think it would be unwise and injudicious for this Legislature to submit to the people of the State an amendment of the Constitution which will, if adopted, revive laws which have led to such confusion. While I am heartily in favor of the general tenor of this amendment; while I should support it here and support it elsewhere, yet for the reasons I have stated I shall refuse to vote in favor of going into committee of the whole for special amendment as indicated.

Mr. Lowry. I will vote to go into committee of the whole for the purpose of special amendment, and for the simple reason that by the proposition of the Senator from Tioga we will retain these laws for the government of the elections upon our statute books until better ones are substituted in their place. If this proposition is not carried we will have, as I understand it, an amendment of our Constitution allowing our soldiers to vote without any provision whatever as to the manner of their voting. Now, sir, I am in favor of the law as it now stands. Give us the law as it is on our statute book until the Senator from Berks shall give us something better.

The question recurring on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Donovan and Mr. Johnson, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Connell, Donovan, Fuller, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lowry, McCandless, McSherry, Mott, Nichols, Penney, Reilly, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Smith, Stark, Stein, Stutzman, Turrell, Wallace, White, Wilson and Lawrence. Speaker—21.

NAYS—None. So the bill was passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Wallace desired to submit an amendment, but as the Senate had gone into committee of the whole for the purpose of special amendment, the bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. Wallace. My object in rising when the bill was before the committee, was to propose an amendment, the substance of which was that none but citizens of this Commonwealth should conduct elections in the army. As the proposed amendment to the Constitution stands now, a person not a citizen of this Commonwealth may conduct the election. That is my view of it. I therefore ask the unanimous consent of the Senate for the adoption of the following amendment: To insert at the end of the bill the words, "Provided, That none but citizens of this Commonwealth shall act as officers of the election."

Mr. Hiestand. It strikes me that that provision would be more appropriate if incorporated in the law regulating elections. It will be out of place in an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. Wallace. The objection of the gentleman from Lancaster is met by a reference to the law, which in no part provides that such persons are to be citizens of the Commonwealth. Objection being made to the amendment.

Mr. Wallace moved that the Senate resolve itself into committee of the whole for the purpose of amendment, as indicated.

Mr. Wallace. It seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Clearfield had better be made to the law rather than the Constitution. We are perhaps going too far into particulars when we undertake to define in the Constitution the special manner of holding elections. The provision of the bill is a general one, authorizing the holding of elections in the army, and I think that the present proposition is one which enters too far into detail.

Mr. Penney. I would not have suggested the amendment had the proposition of the Senator from Tioga been adopted. As the matter stands at present, we are in the position of passing an amendment to the Constitution which authorizes the elections, while at the same time the law does not provide that those elections shall be conducted by citizens or voters of the Commonwealth. Suppose that we pass this Constitutional amendment, before the passage of an act making provision for the elections, and that an election is held. Under the Constitution, an election can then be held by other persons than voters of this State. It was for this purpose of meeting that possible case that I propose the amendment. I suggested it merely because the previous amendment seemed to necessitate such a provision.

Mr. Hiestand. In reply to the Senator I will say that in the event of a ratification of the amendment, the Legislature should not provide a remedy for the case which he has suggested, then I think it is better to extend to the soldiers the right to vote, even if the elections are conducted by persons who are not citizens of this Commonwealth. It is of course for the Legislature to provide a means for regulating the elections, but if they do not do that, I say that the soldiers should not therefore be deprived of the rights of freemen. That is my view of the subject. When the right of suffrage by our citizens on the question at issue, I would not stand upon mere technicalities as to who shall conduct the exercises. Whether the person holding the election is a citizen of New York or of any other State, is a matter of minor importance.

Mr. Fuller. The chief difficulty in my mind in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Clearfield is that it destroys the effect of the amendment which has just been adopted. By the present law of the Commonwealth the army officers are authorized to hold elections. Many of these officers are not citizens of this Commonwealth, so that by the adoption of this amendment, in many instances, elections would not be held at all.

Mr. Wilson.—I think that the proposed amendment entirely nullifies the object of the amendment offered by myself. The law now prescribes that certain persons shall hold elections in the army. The pending amendment, if adopted, would perhaps allow one company to vote, while another, whose captain is perhaps a citizen of the State of New York or some State other than Pennsylvania, would be prohibited from voting. If the laws regulating elections are not sufficiently explicit, then this amendment could be made at the proper time. When that time arrives I shall cheerfully vote for such a provision.

Mr. Bound. It strikes me that the whole difficulty in this case can be obviated, if it is the desire of the Senate to enact a law of that kind, by simply passing a bill amendatory of the law of 1812, which bill then became a part of the law regulating elections.

The question being on the motion of Mr. Wallace.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Wallace and Mr. Nichols, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Clymer, Donovan, Glaz, Kinsey, Lambertson, McSherry, Mott, Reilly, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—13.

NAYS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Connell, Fuller, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Lowry, McCandless, Nichols, Penney, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Stutzman, Turrell, White, Wilson and Lawrence, Speaker—20.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The question recurring on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Donovan and Mr. Johnson, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Bucher, Clymer, Connell, Donovan, Fuller, Glaz, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lambertson, Lowry, McCandless, McSherry, Mott, Nichols, Penney, Reilly, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Smith, Stark, Stein, Stutzman, Turrell, Wallace, White, Wilson and Lawrence. Speaker—33.

NAYS—None. So the bill was passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Bound. It strikes me that the whole difficulty in this case can be obviated, if it is the desire of the Senate to enact a law of that kind, by simply passing a bill amendatory of the law of 1812, which bill then became a part of the law regulating elections.

The question being on the motion of Mr. Wallace.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Wallace and Mr. Nichols, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Clymer, Donovan, Glaz, Kinsey, Lambertson, McSherry, Mott, Reilly, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—13.

NAYS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Connell, Fuller, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Lowry, McCandless, Nichols, Penney, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Stutzman, Turrell, White, Wilson and Lawrence, Speaker—20.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The question recurring on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Donovan and Mr. Johnson, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Bucher, Clymer, Connell, Donovan, Fuller, Glaz, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lambertson, Lowry, McCandless, McSherry, Mott, Nichols, Penney, Reilly, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Smith, Stark, Stein, Stutzman, Turrell, Wallace, White, Wilson and Lawrence. Speaker—33.

NAYS—None. So the bill was passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Bound. It strikes me that the whole difficulty in this case can be obviated, if it is the desire of the Senate to enact a law of that kind, by simply passing a bill amendatory of the law of 1812, which bill then became a part of the law regulating elections.

The question being on the motion of Mr. Wallace.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Wallace and Mr. Nichols, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Clymer, Donovan, Glaz, Kinsey, Lambertson, McSherry, Mott, Reilly, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—13.

NAYS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Connell, Fuller, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Lowry, McCandless, Nichols, Penney, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Stutzman, Turrell, White, Wilson and Lawrence, Speaker—20.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The question recurring on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Donovan and Mr. Johnson, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Bucher, Clymer, Connell, Donovan, Fuller, Glaz, Graham, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lambertson, Lowry, McCandless, McSherry, Mott, Nichols, Penney, Reilly, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Smith, Stark, Stein, Stutzman, Turrell, Wallace, White, Wilson and Lawrence. Speaker—33.

NAYS—None. So the bill was passed by a unanimous vote.

given us characteristic of the business: Capt. Rice chartered the steamer Cecil to the Government through Hall at \$75 per day, although he had offered to Hall to charter her for \$50 per day. Hall inserted in the charter party the sum of \$80, saying to Rice, "you can give me the extra \$5." Rice refused to countenance this. Hall, the Committee say, "either annulled the character or satisfied Capt. Rice that he had done so, for the purpose of getting the boat into the hands of some one who would pay the usual black mail."

The Committee say steamers which cost \$65,258 were chartered at \$947 per day, or at a rate of \$345.656 per annum, equal to 2894 per cent., on the investment. An old iron boat, which had been condemned even for harbor service, was chartered at \$60 per day for the Government, though unable to do service enough to pay for the fuel she consumed. One vessel brought a profit of 2220 per cent at the rate of \$100 per day. The barge Delaware, valued at \$2500, which has been expended \$7 per day, was chartered by Mr. Tucker for the Government at \$70 per day. Her net receipts were at the rate of \$22,995 per annum. "Capt. Hodges and Mr. Tucker thought she was the cheapest thing they chartered." Ten steamers and two barges were chartered of a Mr. Coblenz, a Prussian. All the vessels bought by Coblenz were under charter to the Government when purchased, the charters having been generally effected by Mr. Hall, and he receiving five per cent. commission on earnings, and many of them were owned by Hall before passing into Coblenz's possession. Hall swears that he paid Loper \$13,000 at one time "for getting business for him."

We have given but a few samples of these abominable transactions, but enough to cause a feeling of sadness in the mind of the reader. The committee say, they "are overwhelmed with astonishment and sorrow by the revelations which have been made in the cold. The recommendations are faithfully carried out, so the degree of justice may yet be awarded to the government and to these parties."

MASSACHUSETTS OUT IN THE COLD.

Upon this subject the Springfield Republic has the following suggestive paragraph: One of our high state officials lately received a letter from the committee on education in the Missouri legislature, to the effect that as Missouri was to become a free state by the action of its present legislature, and that not through the mere good pleasure of the legislature itself, but because the people demanded it, the next thing to be provided for was a system of popular education. And as the engraving of the Massachusetts system upon the newly made free state offered the readiest as well as the best means of securing the object desired, all of our educational reports and such general information as could be furnished otherwise, were solicited. To our mind this looks marvellously like a realization of that darling dream of the copperheads—leaving Massachusetts out in the cold. The presumption is that when Missouri shall have become a free state, with the zeal and enthusiasm of a new convert to the true faith, she will find herself in infinitely closer sympathy with our old Commonwealth than with the half converted and doubtfully-inclined free states more immediately upon her borders. The copperheads of Indiana and Illinois will probably wake up some of these fine mornings to find an uncomfortable fire in their rooms."

The following is said to have passed in a school down east:

"What is the most northern town in the States?"

"The North Pole."

"Who is it inhabited by?"

"By the Poles, sir."

"That's right. Now what is the meaning of the word atop?"

"I don't know, sir."

"What do I do when I bend over thus?"

"You scratches your arins, sir."

"What is the meaning of the word carve?"

"I don't know, sir."

"What does your father do when he sits down at the table?"

"He axes for the brandy bottle."

"I don't mean that. Well, then, what does your mother do when you sit down at the table?"

"She says she will wring our necks if we spill any grease on the floor."

A country school teacher, preparing for an exhibition of his school, selected a class of pupils and wrote down the questions which he would put to them on examination day. The day came, and so did the young hopefuls, all but one. The pupils took their places as had been arranged, and all went glibly on till the question came for the absentee, which the teacher asked:

"In what do you believe?"

"Napoleon Bonaparte."

"You believe in the Holy Catholic Church; do you not?"

"No," said the boy, amid roars of laughter, "the boy who believed in the Church didn't come to school to-day; he is at home sick abed."

A "DEMORALIZED" SOLDIER.—The New York Tribune tells a story of a stout, athletic Zouave, who, running away from the battle at Fredericksburg, was checked by a Lieutenant with a drawn sword. Said the latter "Stop sir! Go back to your regiment, you infernal coward, you are not wounded." "For Heaven's sake let me pass," implored the fugitive, "I know I'm not wounded, but I'm tearfully demoralized."

Some stultids bantering a fat companion, remarked that, if all flesh was grass, he must be a load of hay. "I suspect I am," said he, "from the way you assess nibble at me."

"Ist boy."—"Ah, we've got a new horse, and you have 'nt."

"2d boy."—"Say, I don't care, my daddy was drafted, and yours was 'nt."

An Irish attorney says no printer should publish a death unless apprised of the fact by the deceased.

A man may be called poverty-stricken when knocked down by a beggar.

The sunset clouds are the visible song of the day that is dead.

"Daily Evening Mail"—A lover calling on his sweetheart.

Nearly every evil has its compensation.