

Marshall County Democrat

OFFICIAL PAPER OF THE COUNTY.
D. & P. McDONALD, Editors.

PLYMOUTH, THURSDAY.

JANUARY - - - 27, 1859.

Report of the Committee on
Public Printing:

We have received from J. O. PARKS, Esq., a copy of the report of the House Special Committee on Public Printing, and have carefully perused it, together with the evidence accompanying the report. From some remarks made by the Republican papers of Indianapolis, and echoed by the lesser lights throughout the State, the public were prepared to see developed the most astounding frauds ever held up to the indignant gaze of an outraged people. But after the arduous labors of the Committee have been satisfactorily performed, (to themselves, at least,) we opine that for all the good they have done, they might as well "have not been."

The report shows that in a few instances there may have been slight derelictions of duty, caused by a multiplicity of business in the hands of the officers; but in no case does it exhibit intentional fraud on the part of those furnishing material or doing work for the State. They did not find one error in the State Printer's bills. After quoting the law, which specifies the prices he shall receive for the different kinds of work, they state: "The committee have not been able to ascertain wherein these prices have been at any time exceeded by the Public Printer." The committee censure Prof. Larabee because he did not distribute the Documentary Journals and Agricultural Reports in 1852, and then censure him again because he did distribute them in 1856-7—the law in the latter case being the same as in the former. We should think one real good censure would be sufficient.

The committee was gotten up for political purposes. This can be seen on the face of the report; we need but quote one paragraph to prove it:

"That it is a wrong, [re-printing the Documentary Journals] practiced upon the State, your committee verily believe, and in the absence of any legal mode of redress, enter their unqualified condemnation, not only of the conduct of Prof. Larabee, in giving orders for re-printing the Documentary Journals, but of Mr. Attorney General McDonald for giving an opinion so contrary to the plain intent and meaning of the act."

What is the use of having a Supreme Court, if "special committees," appointed for the purpose of investigating the accounts of the Public Printer, have the right to reverse the decisions of the Attorney General? Or what security have public officers, who comply with the law, that they will not be censured by a special committee, because they do not put the same construction on it that the committee does.

More Swindling.

A friend in Stark county informs us that two brothers, citizens of that county, went to New York a few months ago, intending to continue their journey to California. In order to secure a passage beyond the possibility of failure, they procured tickets, intending to go by the next steamer; but not knowing the price of tickets, they paid fifty dollars more than the regular rates. While the steamer was receiving her load, preparatory to starting, the two showed their tickets to the officers of the vessel, and were informed that they were spurious!—a forgery! Their chagrin and disappointment was the more insufferable from the fact that they had not money enough to continue their journey, but were forced to return home.

When you go New York, or anywhere else, look out for sharpers.

As we do the Sheriff's advertising, we have a pretty good opportunity of knowing something about the manner in which the business is done. So far as our knowledge extends, the requirements of the law are complied with. Mr. Barnard, in his intercourse with us has been "a man of his word." This, considering that he is a Republican, we desire to make a note of.

The State Sentinel learns that the Rev Dr DAILY has placed in the hands of the Trustees of the Indiana University his resignation of the office of President and Professor of mental and moral philosophy and belles lettres in that institution, to take effect when the Board shall accept the same and notify him. The reasons given for this step, we believe, is the unpleasant circumstances which surround him. We regret that any circumstances should have occurred which induce him to vacate a position, for the effective discharge of which he possesses so many eminent qualifications and which he has administered with marked success.

Gov HAMMOND returned home from his southern trip last Thursday, much improved in health, and has resumed his duty as Presiding officer of the Senate.

Look out for next week's Democrat.

THE LEGISLATURE.

This is about the 22nd day of the regular session of the Legislature, and but little business of interest to the people of the State has been transacted. Innumerable bills, amendments and resolutions have been offered, but nothing of importance has become law. A great portion of the time has been taken up in discussing the newspaper question; whether it would be better to take one copy of the Legislative Sentinel, or two copies, or none; how many copies of the Journal, the Citizen, the Locomotive, the American, the Valksblatt, &c. That question we believe, has finally been disposed of. Two or three of the strong minded women of the State appeared in the Legislative Hall last Thursday, and one of them read a petition signed by one thousand persons, mostly inhabitants of Wayne County, praying for certain rights in regard to property, and concluding by asking such a change in the Constitution of the State as would give the right of suffrage to women. Two or three speeches were made and the Convention was declared adjourned by the presiding officer and the Senators returned to their chamber. The Sentinel, in commenting upon the proceedings says: "had the ladies retired when the business for which they came was accomplished, the scenes which followed would not have transpired.

THE CLASS-MEETING.

The Senate having retired from the Hall and Mr Speaker Gordon having resumed the chair, the House should have been the House again. The ladies, however, having possession of the floor, knew their rights, and knowing dared and did maintain them. From the seats where grave heads have for years bent in thought, bright eyes sent forth bewildering darts, glowing cheeks blushed in loveliness, and red, rich lips smiled bewitchingly. In such a sea of all that is lovely and enchanting, business was not to be thought of—that rigid systematic business that legislation demands—and accordingly, after several ineffectual efforts to do something, a member gallantly moved that the House adjourn and that the meeting resolve itself into a love-feast. The motion was carried by acclamation—the speaker's hammer fell, and the feast of reason and the flow of soul began." After a number of speeches from members of the House, a motion to adjourn was carried.

Mr Griffin presented a petition from sundry citizens of Lake County praying for an appropriation out of the swamp Land Fund sufficient to connect the Calumet River with the Grand Calumet, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

By Mr O'DELL, [No 103] authorizing County Boards to hear and determine complaints against plank, gravel, turnpike or McAdamized roads.

By Mr MILLER, [No 104] in relation to abandoned plank, McAdamized or chartered roads.

By Mr WAGNER, [No 105] prescribing the forms to be used in criminal cases.

By Mr HUFFREN, [No 106] providing for the relief of purchasers of real estate at Sheriff's sales under executions issued on judgments against services on recognizances, where such had been taken after the Revised States of 1852 took effect.

Mr Shell submitted a resolution inquiring into the expediency of abolishing the Township Library system, and recommending the tax levied for the support of said system to be added to the common school tax.

Sundry resolutions were offered, new propositions made, and at 10 o'clock, in joint convention, elected a President and Board of Sinking Fund Commissioners, as follows:

For President of the Board, Ebenezer Dumont; for Commissioners, P. M. Parks, John F. Carr, Beatty F. McClelland and Joseph A. Bemusdafer.

The afternoon session was taken up entirely discussing the petition from the ladies, as above noted.

In the Senate several resolutions were offered, among which was one

requiring the Committee on the Courts to report a bill repealing Common Pleas Courts and embodying the principle of the Serrogate system, by giving the Clerks of the Circuit Courts jurisdiction of all private business not litigated, in vacation.

The State Sentinel (from which we condense our reports) of the 21st has not been received.

SENATE, Jan 21.—We are unable to see anything of importance in the proceedings of the Senate to-day. A memorial from the Society of Friends residing in parts of Indiana, Ohio and Iowa, held at Richmond, praying for the repeal of that portion of our laws which denies to colored persons the right to testify as witnesses, &c.

By the Committee on Education, [No 114] to authorize the State Board of Education to purchase and place in county and township libraries bound copies of the Indiana School Journal.

Mr CONNER offered a resolution of inquiry in relation to the management of the Bank of the State of Indiana, which was laid upon the table.

Mr. McCLEAN, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Brown's bill, (S 29) to exempt personal property from sale on execution, recommending its indefinite postponement.

The report was concurred in, and the bill ordered to be engrossed for the third reading.

Mr. McCLEAN, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13, 1852, and proving for opening decrees in the cases therein specified, with an amendment, and recommended its passage.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. MARCH, from the same committee, reported back Mr. Conner's bill, (S 1) to amend the 6th, 7th, 12th, 19th and 20th sections of the Divorce law, approved May 13,