

The book bindery of Smith & Co., New York City, was destroyed by fire on the 5th.

New Lebanon, a Shaker village in New York, was nearly destroyed by fire on the 6th inst.

The civil rights bill was passed by the house on the 5th. It is thought that it will hardly pass the senate.

A college building worth \$60,000 was destroyed by fire at Racine, Wis., on the 4th inst. The college library and apparatus were totally destroyed.

John Blunt, of Lawrence, Kansas, charged with the murder of Charles Ingersoll, was found guilty of murder in the first degree by the district court on the 6th inst.

The jury on the Beecher-Tilton suit is said to be composed of two Episcopals, one Methodist, one Baptist, one Lutheran, two Roman Catholics, three Presbyterians, and two persons who are not members of any church.

A telegram says Mrs. John Grack, of Kearney Junction, Neb., on the morning of the 6th inst. killed a step-daughter, aged four or five years, by knocking the child down and jumping upon her with her feet, in a fit of anger. The woman tried to poison the child some time ago, but failed.

As a matter of political history it should be recorded that Mr. C. H. Gere, of the Journal, voted for Senator Paddock for that position in the first Legislature. It was a very lone some vote, as it was the only one he received.

He did not do any such a thing. In the legislature he voted for Thayer and Tipton, the nominees of the republican caucus. He may have favored Paddock in the caucuses.

One good thing attending the election of Mr. Paddock to succeed Senator Tipton is the fact that he was not obliged to tie himself up with promises.—Granger.

And that is just what beat Howe and his editorial poolie that trots around smelling after him. That is what beat them so badly. They were looking for a senator that was on the tie, but did not find one of that kind that could be elected.

A bill has passed the senate, says the State Journal, providing for the appointment of short hand reporters for the district courts of the State. This will be somewhat discouraging to litigants, as the pay of such employees will be charged up with the costs. It will make judges and lawyers to the mark on legal points, and in the use of the vernacular, in arguing cases, charging jurors, and rendering judgments.

It must seem strange to most readers to find the Brownville Advertiser endeavoring to give the most unflattering misrepresentations, to injure the reputation and lessen the influence of the members from Nemaha. Those who are familiar with the campaign of last fall will not be surprised, while all may rest assured that the ADVERTISER of the 25th does not express the sentiments of any respectable citizen of Nemaha county.—Granger.

And notwithstanding all this blow we serenely go to work to day and prove that the editor of the Granger lies—wifally and mischievously lies.

We have received the manuscript of an excellent address delivered by W. F. Paris, assisted by O. M. Minick, on the occasion of the installation of the officers of Pleasant Valley Grange. We regret that we have not the space to publish the address.—Granger.

Let the grangers send their addresses to the ADVERTISER for publication. We print our paper all at home, prepare the matter for its columns ourselves, instead of having it done in Chicago, and therefore have room for the publication of all local matters, and always accommodate if of general interest, or of interest to a considerable number of our readers. Because our paper is not named Granger is no reason that we would not do as much for the interest of farmers and laboring men as if it were. A name is often the plausible guise of a lie and a cheat.

That "good bill" for the relief of the destitute frontier settlers, which was so ably championed by Howe, the State Journal and the Granger, was found by the legislature to be not such a very "good bill" after all, but entirely unfit and inadequate to meet the exigencies of the case, and was, therefore, with but little ceremony, killed by indefinite postponement. It was found to be full of errors and constitutional infirmities; yet it was the child of that most correct and tremendously sharp legislator, Church Howe. And the sedate "professor" and constitutional lawyer (?) of the Journal, said it was a "good bill!" "awful" good bill and solemnly administered a kick to the ADVERTISER for pitting into its wise author. Verily, some men are estimated at much more than their real value.

It is really amusing to hear our curstone politicians tell that Church Howe was the most badly beaten man in the Senatorial fight, and that he got wounded in every attempt he made and then beat them raw and severe at that same Howe, because he (as they say) defeated Atkinson, when he had the power to elect him. Now go slow—both stories are true. A man who had no influence could neither elect nor defeat. Which story will you have us believe?—Granger.

The editor of the Granger, belonging, boy, boots and breeches, to Howe, could not be induced to tell the truth if he would at all serve his master. Therefore he pretends that he has heard some persons at

tribute Atkinson's defeat to Howe. Howe defeat anybody! Preposterous! Why it was a common remark amongst legislators and visitors that Howe was cut and snubbed on every hand and everything he undertook, in the Senatorial fight, and that he was left completely out in the cold. No one ever said that Howe defeated Atkinson or anybody else, except Moore, who is spending his time at the capital living on a deal from the people's treasury, and playing "dirty dog" for Howe in consideration of said deal.

A QUESTION OF VERACITY.

BETWEEN THE GRANGER AND THE ADVERTISER.

Where Does the Lie Belong?

As we are charged with falsehood by the Granger in the following, and knowing that we are not guilty of falsehood and that our neighbors across the way is, in self defense we are impelled to show that we have told the truth, and that the Granger itself is the one that outrages truth unflinchingly and unqualifiedly. Thus readeth the Granger about the difficulty between Tom Majors and Church Howe:

In attempting to give an account of an encounter between Tom Majors and Church Howe when the late vote was about to be taken for U. S. Senator, the ADVERTISER writes:

"Col. Majors and H. C. Lett were standing near the desks of Howe and Hayden—which are in the front of the hall and next to the lobby—and noticing Howe's movements, they spoke of the humiliating spectacle of an old gentleman like Mr. Hayden permitting himself to be run exclusively by Howe. Majors approached Hayden, imploring him to speak up for himself when his name was called, and no longer follow the winks and nods and dictation of Howe. How, noticing Majors whispering to Hayden, and probably hearing what he said, jumped up and asked the ADVERTISER to direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to keep outsiders from crowding on the members. The Col. then, of course, had to get back." etc.

The above account is not true, and the ADVERTISER wishes to have the credit of being able to tell the truth, it will give the name of its informant, that the public may know who is thus utterly regardless of the truth.

It is true that Howe and Hayden sat near the lobby, in the rear of the hall. It is not true that "Col. Majors and H. C. Lett were standing near the desks of Howe and Hayden." Col. Majors was standing near Mr. Hayden's desk, but H. C. Lett was seated near the reporters' desks, at the opposite side of the hall; consequently the conversation concerning Hayden did not take place between Col. Majors and H. C. Lett. Who reported that conversation? Can we have his name? Will Col. Majors or H. C. Lett state that either of them have expressed the opinion that Hayden was "run" exclusively by Howe? We suppose they will not.

Why attempt to drag H. C. Lett into a disgraceful position that he would not willingly accept to save his right name, or even his life? Are these demagogues afraid to stand alone, that they at once at an appearance of respectability by claiming acquaintance with the opposition? Col. Majors did go to Hayden and ask to be permitted to vote for Paddock, but as Mr. Hayden meant to be an independent voter, he would not promise. Besides, Mr. Hayden had assured certain friends several days before the election that he would vote for Paddock, and that he would vote for Paddock, and this assurance was well received by his most intimate friends.

Majors offered to bring Hayden the list to convince him that enough had signed it to procure the election of Paddock. As Mr. H. already understood the situation he simply said "Hayden is willing to let it, Mr. Hayden is not willing to do what he had already decided to do, because he was not willing to give any politician a chance to say to Mr. Paddock, "I influenced Hayden's vote for you."

Mr. H. kept his own counsel, and acted wisely. For this they abuse him. What say the people? Majors then said to Hayden, "How is boasting that he owns you, or words to that effect. How heard this assertion, and promptly told Col. Majors to his face that he was a liar, and called on the Sergeant-at-Arms to keep the lobby back. Mr. How did tell Majors that he would hold him personally responsible, and we understand that Col. Majors replied that he would be personally responsible.

We did not intend to notice this matter in any way, and notice it now only to expose a falsehood. Our opponents are confining the fight of "all men" to the same old story. The voters of Nemaha county can make their own comments. Many readers of the Granger after reading the above lengthy article, and the numerous most positive statements as well as hints and innuendoes, concerning ourselves, Mr. Lett and Mr. Majors, no doubt have come to the conclusion that Mr. Moore has us in the worst kind of limbo—that he literally annihilates us, but we will see. Self-assurance, arrogance and conceit are apparent throughout the entire article, and would scarcely be excusable with the whole truth on the side of the writer, but being destitute of truth, except where he agrees with us, his pompous egotism is, or ought to be, insulting to his readers, and convinces us that he takes greater pride in perversion of the truth for Church Howe than in telling the truth for "truth's sake."

"The above account is not true," says Howe's private secretary, "and if the ADVERTISER wishes to have the credit of being able to tell the truth it will give the name of its informant, that the public may know who is thus utterly regardless of the truth."

Mr. Moore assumes to tell us how we may have the credit of being able to tell the truth! A truculent lie-spitter, flogging the coat tails of his master, a man whose name goes before the readers of his paper weekly

a standing lie, a deception and a cheat—professing, as he does, to be an Independent Granger, when in reality he is nothing but a willing tool in the hands of any party, person, or thing that will give him bread and butter to keep his little soul and body together—coolly instructing us how we may have the credit of telling the truth.

How may we have this credit, which is invaluable to us? Why, by giving the name of our informant. Well, suppose we do not choose to name our informant, we could rest content on a question of veracity between ourselves and Mr. Moore without any further assurance to our readers than our word. But, in order to completely get and flatten out Mr. Moore's long story, we will accommodate him, and give the name of our "informant"—or rather our informant. Their names are H. C. Lett and Thos. J. Majors. Does Mr. Moore still insist that these gentlemen are "utterly regardless of truth?"

Mr. Lett was our first informant. When the late vote for Senator was about to be taken, we, sitting on the steps of the speaker's stand, saw a jury between Mr. Majors and Howe at the other end of the hall, but of course as the conversation between the two gentlemen was in whispers, we did not hear it. Afterwards, on the cars, the same evening, while returning home in company with Mr. Lett and Mr. Carson, we remembered having seen Mr. Lett standing close to Majors and Howe when they quarreled in the House that day, and asked him: "What was the matter between them and Tom Majors to-day?" Mr. Lett then told us the story about the encounter, what was said, and what was about, and we, from that conversation, wrote the article—"Nearly a Fight Between Majors and Howe."

Since the article appeared in our paper, and since the above from the Granger appeared, we have seen and talked with Mr. Majors and Mr. Lett. Majors says our article was in nearly every particular correct. The only thing he remembered that was not exact was in the number of minutes that Howe gave him to get ready to be "responsible." We said five, when Howe was so magnanimous as to give him ten minutes. Majors agrees with us that our article is the true statement of the affair between himself and Howe, and that the Granger's story is a string of lies from beginning to end. With regard to Mr. Lett, we have no doubt but that he will say our statement was in the main correct—that he was just where we said he was in Representative Hall, when the encounter between Majors and Howe occurred, and that he was not "seated near the reporter's desks," at that time, and that the conversations reported by us as occurring between himself and Majors and between Majors and Howe are true in matter and effect. We do not pretend to have used the precise words which Mr. Lett used when he informed us regarding the matter. Those who desire to do so can ask Lett and Majors or either of them regarding the truthfulness of what we say.

The Granger says above in one place that Majors did not accuse Hayden of being led by Howe, but lower down says Majors did say "Howe is boasting that he owns you and can do as he pleases with you." This all goes to show, from the Granger's own admissions, that our report was true, while we may not have given the exact words used.

Now, in conclusion, without going through the Granger article quoted above, and making mince-work of us as we could if we were disposed to so occupy our time and space, we reassert and re-affirm our former statement and our informants are Col. Majors and Hon. H. C. Lett. We ask again, dare Church Howe's poll-lifer say that our informants are "utterly regardless of truth?"

George B. Moore, editor of the Granger, holds the very important position, at the capital, of Secretary of the Grasshopper Committee. Church Howe is chairman of that committee, and wanting his man Friday with him, he, instead of paying his expenses himself, had his man Friday appointed secretary of the committee, so that the State would have to pay him. Five dollars would be a high price for doing all the writing that a secretary's duties would require for that committee, and therefore this immaculate specimen of a reform editor has ample time to sit around the capital and write editorial lies whooping it up for Howe at \$3 a day. The chairman of a committee who has had more to say about economical legislation than any other man, perhaps, in the legislature, ought, we think, to do what little writing is required by the committee, himself. But then there is no writing to do but to draw up a bill, and that is not the business of a secretary, and it is, therefore, a plain swindle on the people. \$120 for "my man Moore"—as Howe calls him—for forty days—and no work.

In the course of Gen. Butler's closing speech the other day, on the civil rights bill, he caused to be read a petition to the Missouri legislature in which a white man asked that seven different children, by six different colored women, be legitimized. The reading of the names was greeted with bursts of laughter. Mr. Butler had a letter read, received by him from a colored man in Richmond, in which he declared that colored children twelve years old, and even under, were outraged in that and other States, by white men and boys, and no redress could be obtained in court.

Many believe that an act for the removal of the capital will be passed by the present legislature. We are satisfied that the removers are largely in the majority, and the only thing that may prevent it will be a failure to agree upon a plan of removal or a place.

Omaha has the smallest pop.

LEGISLATIVE NEWS.

The correspondent of the Omaha Republican says the House has voted to hold Stout to his contract to complete the penitentiary. It was understood that said gentleman desired to abandon his contract, but the legislature concluded that as he had performed the first portion of the work, he must complete the job.

A petition, signed by F. E. Johnson and others, of this county, against Howe's bill for the extension of the time for the payment of taxes, was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Fisher. The following preamble and resolutions, endorsing Grant and Sheridan in the Louisiana matter, was introduced in the House by Mr. Wright of Pawnee:

WHEREAS, It appears that in the organization of the Legislature of Louisiana a minority of the members of the House have made the pretext of holding credentials to seats in said House, in a violent and revolutionary manner, pretended to elect a temporary speaker before the completion of a roll of members, and to vacate the seats of certain members holding credentials, and to admit certain parties who contested such seats preliminarily to a regular organization; and

WHEREAS, When their disorderly proceedings were about to culminate in riot and bloodshed, the pretended speaker of the house, aforesaid, called in the aid of the United States military forces to preserve order, and

WHEREAS, The action of the commission of the federal troops in sitting upon the retirement from the house of all outsiders, and all claiming to be members but not holding certificates until a legal organization of the said legislative body could be formed, has been made the pretext of holding ungranted and unjust assault upon President Grant and General Sheridan, who have, as in duty bound, assumed and endorsed the action of Gen. DeTroiaud and sundry State legislatures and sundry members of congress, and a portion of the political party, therefore be it

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, That we heartily endorse the position of the president and the course of General Sheridan in assuming the responsibility of securing to the State of Louisiana a republican form of government, by their prompt suppression of an attempt to dissolve the same by a minority of its members, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each of the presiding officers of the two houses of congress.

Judge Wright, a member of the House from Pawnee, has introduced a bill authorizing county clerks, under certain conditions, to sell school lands at private sale. The idea is a good one, and a proper act of that kind ought to pass.

Mr. Fisher, in the Senate, presented a petition from C. Slagle and others of St. Dora and Aspinwall precincts, Nemaha county, asking for a suspension of the herd law in those precincts.

In the Senate a bill for the amendment of "Warren's" criminal code has been reported and its passage recommended by the committee on criminal code.

The appointment of Wm. Woodhull as Warden of the penitentiary has been confirmed.

In the Senate on the 5th, the following bills were passed:

To amend certain sections of criminal code.

To amend sections 5, 6, and 7 of chapter 14 of general statutes.

Joint resolution relative to the removal of Red Cloud and Spotted Tail Indian Agencies.

Regulating appeals from justices and probate courts.

Repealing registry law in certain cities of the second class.

To correct clerical errors in the publication of general statutes.

Amending an act to quiet title to real estate in Beatrice.

To amend section 516 of civil right code.

IN THE HOUSE.

Recommended by committee, a joint resolution memorializing Congress, asking that Ft. Kearney Reservation be donated to the State by the General Government for the purpose of building an Asylum for the Blind. Passed.

An act to amend the dog law was presented by committee and its passage recommended.

An act to provide short hand reporter for Supreme court. Passed.

An act in regard to estate of Henry Hooper, deceased. Passed.

Mr. Fisher, from committee on agriculture, reported back H R 83, to prohibit the catching of game and fish in certain cases, recommending its passage.

Also, H R 83, to guard against accidents from tumbling rods, recommending its passage.

A bill passed for the improvement of the channel of the Missouri river.

Also an act to amend an act for the enumeration of population, and registration of births and deaths.

Also to provide for a stay of execution and orders of sale.

Also to amend 575 of criminal code.

Also concerning hotel keepers and guests.

Also an act to guard against accidents from tumbling rods.

FROM LINCOLN.

DEAR ADVERTISER:

Your estimate of the Nemaha Independent Legislators is unquestionably correct. I desire a brief word with your readers regarding some of Howe's doings here this winter.

Church Howe's paid organ is without doubt discharging its duty to its owner. Three dollars a day paid by the State, for clerk of a committee for which there is less use than a tool has for a tail, is a nice situation, and enables the Editor to serve as Mr. Howe's private secretary, and devote himself to writing up his master.

I have no disposition to "throw rocks" at Mr. Howe or any one else. In every effort he may make as one of our Representatives, to promote the interest of his immediate constituency or of the State at large, he ought to receive our hearty co-operation. But when he openly boasts that he ignores his county constituency, and labors only for personal grandeur, and as he does, I claim the privilege of just criticism. Will the editor of the Granger answer me one or two straight questions?

What is the use of the clerkship he is filling, costing the State three dollars per day? What labor does he perform in that capacity? Has he ever scratched a pen in the discharge of legitimate duties in that capacity? Are not his duties exclusively as the private secretary of the Hon. gentleman from Nemaha—mailing his papers, and copying the host of impracticable bills with which the House is flooded, not one of which has, or will become a law?

What measure has Mr. Howe introduced that has met the approbation of the Legislature and become a law? Will the private secretary point to one single instance? Will he show at the close of the session one single object secured by Mr. Howe, for the people of Nemaha or any other portion of the State? Is it not universally known and conceded that Howe to-day is the most unpopular and obnoxious member of the Legislature, and that his espousal is death to any measure?

At to Howe owing and running Hayden, the deponent sayeth not. That Howe so claims, and constantly asserts, none will deny. I will write you soon again from the

CAPITOL.

KINDNESS.

An Essay Read by William Bagley, Master of Rising Star Grange No. 307, Friday Evening, Feb. 5.

Fellow-Patrons: I have selected at this time as a proper subject upon which to make a few remarks, that of kindness.

The law of kindness, which is one of the expressions of love, is also one of the most important and far-reaching of all the influences that can be brought to bear upon conscious beings. Politeness is generally conceded to be essential to the happiness of all.

Nothing becomes a man or woman in any position in our world as that of kindness. In all our intercourse with our fellow-beings, especially those under us in any way, gentleness, and affectionate words, are the most essential. This said that a soft answer turneth away wrath; and surely kind words and actions will bind us together more strongly than oaths of allegiance, or any compulsory power that may be applied, no matter how rigid; and indeed I sometimes think the more rigid the less effectual. When men and woman learn this important lesson we shall have no more wars, no more discord and strife, no more revolutions and rebellions in governments. Then strife and discord will be laid aside, and all will be true and kind to each other. Feelings of bitterness will then be laid aside, and in their place liberty, equality and fraternity will reign triumphant. The question might be asked—what is liberty? We answer, to do that which is right, and never to infringe on the rights of others. Kindness is essential to the happiness of all created beings. Sympathy and love will deal gently with the weaknesses common to humanity, and these will enable us to overcome these more effectually than in any other way.

The true expression of love is one of kindness and a willingness to yield to that which is not wrong, or a violation of principle; this disposition once fixed in the minds of all, there will be no demand for a sacrifice of principle; but on the other hand a constant care will be felt to avoid everything that would in any way disturb or annoy our fellow beings. Then, fellow-patrons, let each one of us resolve to maintain those principles in their purity; and if we do not fully succeed, let us not be discouraged, but renew the effort again and again, until success shall crown our exertions.

In our columns to-day under head of "Legislative News" may be found a loyal preamble and resolutions endorsing President Grant and General Sheridan. It may astonish some of our supporters to learn that he opposed these resolutions. He used to make you believe he was such a good Republican, you know. Howe is a sharp, shrewd man, but is not at all remarkable for sincerity.

John McCormick, one of the wealthiest citizens of Mt. Vernon, Ohio, was murdered in his store for money, on the night of the 3th inst. Murderers unknown.

E. D. Hammond, teller of the Second National Bank of Lawrence, Ka., has absconded, being a defaulter to the amount of \$14,000.

Senator Hitchcock on the 6th inst. Introduced a bill to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri river at Deatur, Neb.

The bank of Bowker, Kennard & Co., of Lincoln, suspended on the 6th inst. They publish a card stating that all liabilities will be paid.

GROUND-HOG DAY.

No doubt many of our readers in this locality are close observers of "signs," and especially of ground-hog day, as it comes after a long and tedious winter, when the bright days and enlivening showers of spring are longed for. Many of our readers may be well posted on ground-hog day and traditional stories of the animal, but Sol Miller, of the Kansas Chief, knows more about ground-hog day than any living man, and we therefore give a short sketch from the pen of Mr. Miller on this grave and important matter.

Tuesday the 21, says the Chief, was as dark, gloomy and cheerless a day as is seldom to be encountered—rain and sleet in the morning, snow at noon, and still snowing at night, with a fierce northwestern gale. Not a ray of sunshine during the entire day, and consequently not even an ephemeral gleam cast shadow, much less a ground-hog. The sun, which, inasmuch as his hogship could not see his shadow, and this being so, he remained out, and we may soon look for a breaking up of winter. This may be depended upon.

Ground-Hog Day, it is scarcely necessary to inform our readers, is of Egyptian origin, and is very ancient. It is also called Candlemas, or Candle Mass. In Egypt, during winter, while we have cold they have darkness. Their days, during that season, are similar to last Tuesday's "Day, as Egypt," is a familiar comparison. In ancient days the ground-hog was very abundant there, and his tail was used for making candles. But at the beginning of winter, he would burrow deeply into the earth, where he would remain for weeks, and the supply of candles would become exhausted. Dark as the days were, what must the nights have been?—dark without candles, too! In Egypt, the operations of nature are as regular as clock-work. Here, we cannot tell where they know exactly when the Nile will overflow, as when there will be a new moon, or how long natural occurrences. So with the ground-hog. On the second day of February he invariably came from his hole. If the sun was shining, it dazzled his eyes, after lying so long in darkness, and he went back and took another nap until the dark days were over. But if it was cloudy, he could remain out without hurting his eyes, and went sporting around in his joy.

The people seized the opportunity to kill the animals, and lay in a mass of candles to last the close of the dark season—hence the term candle-mass. The day was observed by rejoicing, beating out the drums, fests, cock-fights, and cutting the coupons off of hogs. From those days the legend has descended to us in its present form.

The plague of darkness was caused by an epidemic killing off the ground hogs, and thereby cutting off the supply of candles. The King's daughter was "laid" for ground-hogs when she found Moses in the bushes. A great number of incidents are related in connection with the animal. It would be entertaining and instructive to our readers, to procure some standard work on the ground-hog and study it carefully.

A SCENE IN CONGRESS.

On the 4th inst. the Civil Rights bill was being considered in the House when the following exciting scene occurred:

Mr. Brown, of Kentucky, opposed the bill, although he acknowledged that it was a foregone conclusion that the day's sun would set upon it as a law of the land. Mr. Brown, on the Republican side had been dragged into its support. Its success had been in a measure accomplished by daring and adventurous invasions on the time honored rules of the House. It had been done in malice and in violation of the constitution, and would be executed in violence and in bloodshed, as he feared. You men who propose to pass the bill, weigh in the balance and be found wanting.

The Speaker informed Mr. Brown that he must address the Chair.

The Speaker then directed the reading of the resolution, and it having been read, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Mr. Brown to the area in front of the Speaker, all the Democratic members followed him, and exhibiting great feeling on the occasion, while many Republicans, who were crowding the galleries, were straining their eyes and ears at the unusual incident.

Mr. Brown remained standing, with one hand in his breast and the other behind his back, while the Speaker, in a dignified and severe tone, administered the censure of the House in the following language:

"Mr. John Young Brown, you are arraigned at the bar of the House under its formal resolution, for having transgressed its rules by disorderly conduct on the floor of the House, in violation when your attention was called to the rules by the Speaker. For this duplicate offense the House has directed that you be publicly censured at this bar. Now words from the Chair in the presence of the House, its most painful duty could possibly add to the gravity of the occasion. It remains only to pronounce, in the name of the House, its censure for two offenses of a duplicitous and a duplicitous nature."

BISMARCK AROUSED.

A correspondent of the London Telegraph gives the following picture of Bismarck while speaking in the recent exciting debate in the German Parliament: "Never did I hunt him on turn more savagely—I venture to say, the impression of what I saw and heard being still strong upon me, more terribly than Prince Bismarck turned on his assailants, whom he may figuratively be said to have rendered into a thousand pieces. His gigantic frame absolutely trembled with passion; his gray eye flashed, and his heavy moustache bristled; a paper he took up during his first speech, for the purpose of referring, vibrated visibly in the passionate grasp of his sinewy hands, and ever and anon his closely buttoned uniform became tense almost to splitting across his huge chest, as he set back his shoulders and threw up his head, regarding his foe with that implacable glance which never fails to shake the strongest nerves, when he darts it at an object of his hatred or contempt. In the course of an experience neither brief nor ordinary, I have seen many remarkable men at moments when they may have been expected to labor under excitement of the most vehement description; but I have never yet witnessed the consciousness of unbounded power expressed in the physique and bearing of a human being as I saw it in Prince Bismarck. As he stood forward, facing the House, the natural sternness of his aspect accented by the natural rigidity of his military tenure, he looked to me like the incarnation of an ungodly will; like a Colossus, unquestionably capable of bearing upon his mighty shoulders cares and responsibilities that would crush common mortals into powder."

Mr. Brown—No, sir, I am describing a character who is in my mind and eyes. This man's name was Bismarck, and he was the slayer of the world; but I was to desire to express all that was pusillanimous in war, inhuman in peace, forbidding in morals and infamous in politics. I should call it Bismarck. (Sensation.)

Speaker (interrupting Brown)—The gentleman did not deal in good faith with the Chair; he did not answer in good faith the question addressed to him.

Mr. Hale, of New York, insisted that Mr. Brown's language be reduced to writing and read from the Clerk's desk. While the reporter was writing down the excitement in the House was at red heat.

The report of Brown's remarks having been read from the Clerk's desk, Mr. Hale, of New York, offered a resolution that Brown be censured for the course of the House, and that he be now brought to the bar of the House in custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and there be publicly censured by the Speaker in the name of the House.

Mr. Dawes offered as a substitute that he be expelled from the House, for a gross violation of the rules and privileges of the House, and for

falsely stating to Speaker that he did not refer to any member of the House.

Mr. Hale declined to yield the floor to Mr. Dawes' substitute, and moved the previous question. The House refused to accede to the previous question.

Mr. Dawes said he regretted the necessity of offering the resolution; he had been shocked and pained by what had occurred to-day, and nothing but the belief that it was imperative necessary that the House should vindicate itself and its rules, would have induced him to offer the resolution.

After an exciting debate Mr. Dawes asked whether the gentleman from Kentucky desired to speak now.

Mr. Brown, rising and speaking with great deliberation, said that this was the first time that evasion or prevarication had been ever attributed to him. He had always spoken in plain and susceptible of understanding, and he was willing to stand by the record.

Mr. Dawes: I would inquire of the gentleman, frankly, whether he has any remarks to make regarding the character of the language which he used.

Mr. Brown: I stand by the record. (Sensation.)

Mr. Dawes said he had not only desired to see whether the members on both sides would stand up for the decorum of the House, but had also desired to give the gentleman from Kentucky an opportunity to express regret; that the gentleman, however, had not availed himself of the opportunity; on the other hand, in the presence of the House he had reiterated and reaffirmed the position which he had taken. He found, however, that the gentleman from Kentucky supported from the Democratic side of the House, and now said, rather than have my resolution fail from want of aid from that side, I withdraw it and call for the previous question on the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York.

The previous question was seconded. Mr. Eldridge asked to have the word "prevarication" struck out of the resolution, and he was immediately substituted for it, but there were objections made to it by many Republican members.

Mr. Cox moved to lay the resolution on the table. Negative; yeas, 82; nays, 117.

The resolution offered by Mr. Hale was then adopted; yeas, 161; nays, 79.

Butler who had sat quietly throughout the whole proceedings, now rose and asked leave to make a personal explanation. Unanimous consent was given, and he proceeded:

The courtesies and proprieties of the House seemed to be entirely overlooked, and no observation, although the gentlemen of the minority were engaged in hunting up and bringing to the attention of the country, various reports of short comings, and other things of minor importance, which prevented me replying to them. I have been here now eight years, and have engaged in debate perhaps a good deal more than most men, and I now call upon all the gentlemen who have served with me during the present Congress, and any who have served with me during any of the eight years I have been here, to say whether, in all the time, I have ever commenced a personal attack on any man in this House, or whether I have ever said a word of my way to say an unkind word of a single gentleman, or whether I have ever spoken a word to whom I have offended; let this be settled once for all. I have endeavored with studied courtesies never to attack and I have also endeavored to have a man, and I never endeavored to have a man, until he was so provoked that he would do as he pleased. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. Speaker (having to the Chair)—I have no more to say.

The Speaker then directed the reading of the resolution, and it having been read, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Mr. Brown to the area in front of the Speaker, all the Democratic members followed him, and exhibiting great feeling on the occasion, while many Republicans, who were crowding the galleries, were straining their eyes and ears at the unusual incident.

Mr. Brown remained standing, with one hand in his breast and the other behind his back, while the Speaker, in a dignified and severe tone, administered the censure of the House in the following language:

"Mr. John Young Brown, you are arraigned at the bar of the House under its formal resolution, for having transgressed its rules by disorderly conduct on the floor of the House, in violation when your attention was called to the rules by the Speaker. For this duplicate offense the House has directed that you be publicly censured at this bar. Now words from the Chair in the presence of the House, its most painful duty could possibly add to the gravity of the occasion. It remains only to pronounce, in the name of the House, its censure for two offenses of a duplicitous and a duplicitous nature."

Brown. "I wish now to state that I intended no evasions or prevarications to the Speaker, and no disrespect to the House." With these remarks, he turned to the Speaker and said that the exciting incident came to a close.