For A Alleimal Precial Notices see the 4th and 4th Pages BEST PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER 61370.

To JAMES LYND, Eso. Noticing the violent and persistent, and as we believeffalse and libellous, at acks made upon you, both in the press and by pamphicts, and understanding that you refrain from replying to them because of professional and official eliquette, we take the liberty, as your friends and as fellow-Republicans, of requesting that you will, at as early a day as practicable, furnish us with an answer to the allegations alluded to, and with the proofs necessary to rus-

We submit to you that not only your personal reputation is involved, but the viadication of your many warm friends, may, even the very character of the Republican party, whose nominee for one of the most henorable of local offices you are, demand that

you should no longer remain silent. Dignized reserve in a candidate for the Judgeship, and a studied avoidance of all effort to promote his own election, are worthy of every commendation; but when partisan opposition and personal enmity hear their falsehoods and malice to every door in the community-anonymous and dastardly though they be-the interests of our tellow-citizens in general render it incumbent upon you to furnish them with the means of apprehending the error, and of avoidif g unintentional injustice to themselves as well as to you.

Chomas S. Ellis.

. G. Rosengarten,

Very respectfully, yours. J. Gillingham Fell. Morton McMichael, Wm. A Ingnam, Charles M. Prevost, Gallowby C. Morris, T. Rossell Dawson, John P. Verree, F. A. Comiy, Nathan Helies, John McArthur, Jr., E. C. Knight, James L. Claghorn, James H. Orne, Charles Gibbons, Isaac Hazlehurst, Henry C. Lea, Wm. E. Littleton. Charles E. Auspach James A. Freeman, R. P. Gillingham, Willista W. Keer, C. H. Cummings, Charles M. Wagner, H. K. Cummings, John W. Everman, James B. Roney Joseph R. Rhoads, Ferdinand J. Dreer, Amos Briggs, H. W. Gray, Henry C. Terry, John Price Wetherill,

To Meisra. Morton McMichael, J. Gillingham Fell. William A. Ingham, Thomas S. Ellis, and others. Gentlemen:-

Your kind and considerate letter of vesterday found me under circumstances of painful and extraordinary embarrassment. The nominee of a party that has always aimed to maintain a high standard of qualifications for its official representatives; the nominee for an office of great honor and trust; proud of a personal and official reputation that until now has never been questioned. I found myself through the press and by circulars suddenly and malignantly assailed by an anenymous enemy, without time enough in all probability to ascertain his identity-certainly without time enough, prior to the election, to establish his falsehood and baseness by any legal adjudication-and restrained, too, by the nature of the honorable office in question, from any direct measures of reply or defense.

In this emergency bound, as it were, hand and foot; poignaptly conscious of the numerous and weighty considerations, so well stated by you, demanding an immediate and complete refutation of the libels above referred to, and knowing too how easy and thorough that refutation could be made, I was nevertheless embarraised by the conviction that the facts upon which it is based should not depend upon any mere assertion; yet could not, from the nature of the case, obtain an investigation of the facts by the public.

Your welcome and timely request has removed all difficulty; it has supplied the interposition I so much desired-that of a third party who should fairly investigate the facts, and should authoritatively state to the public the result of that investigation.

In the first place, I would call your attention particularly to the fact that the attack against me has tracts from judicial records, a falsehood which the slightest examination of these records will expose that it is made anonymously, a precaution that would be entirely unnecessary if these libellous falsifiers of the record had published it as it really exists. I now proceed to submit to you a brief state ment of the charges against me, and of the answers to them, as much in detail as the limited time will

1. That as treasurer of a building association 1 was in default \$300, as admitted by a certain sche dule in bankruptcy. The answer to this is, that upon a final settlement of my treasurer's account, it was found that nothing was due to the association; and the judgment upon the bond is satisfied of record. The debt was marked on my schedule as one of "about \$300, supposed to be due;" and was included out of precaution pending the settlement of my accounts, which had not then been settled.

2. That I had been a defaulter from time to time in my accounts as treasurer of the same association, and had, June 10, 1862, given a bond in the sum of \$2500 to cover these defaults.

The fact was, and the records on their face showed it, that this money was borrowed, as any stockholder did and does borrow of a building association, at least eighteen months before I was elected treasurer. The anonymous author of the attacks knew this fac'; it was patent upon the face of the bonds. The accompanying note from one of the directors of the association will substactiate these state

"No. 1103 CHESNET STREET, "PHILADLEPHIA, October 7, 1870.

"JAMES LYND, Esq. :-"I presided at a meeting of the Directors of the Philadelobia Mercantile Loan and Building Association, held December 15, 1863, in which you were elected treasurer pro tempore. You were not treasurer of the association at or before June 10, 1862, nor at any time prior to December 15, 1863.

"I have examined your accounts as Treasurer of said association, and find that there was in reality nothing due by you, even at the time of filing your petition of bankruptcy.

"Very respectfully

"H. W. GRAY." 3. That while I was City Solicitor, and receiving a salary from the city, I returned in my schedule

among my debts:"To the City of Philadelphia, for taxes on real estate for the years 1865 and 1866, \$400. By the operation of the Bankrupt act he was thus discharged from the payment of his (my) debt to the city, at the very time he was taking pay as its Solicitor. Is this a specimen of his official fidelity?"

This debt was so returned by me, because the law com elled me to state all my debts; but the falsity and baseness of the charge of inti 'eli y to my trust as City Solicitor will be appreciated, when it is considered that this very debt was included among those which were "to be paid in full;" that it was charged against and a lien on my estate; and that the record shows it was so paid before I was discharged. The annexed certificate from Richard Peltz. Esq., the Receiver of Taxes, is conclusive to

this point :-"DEPARTMENT OF RECEIVER OF TAXES. "PHILADELPHIA, October 1, 1870. "I hereby certify that the taxes assessed against James Lynd for the years 1865 and 1866 were collected for the city through sheriff's sale of his properties made in 1868; and the money was paid into this department January 2, 1869.

"JOSHUA NUTTALL. "Registrar,

"I certify the above statement to be correct. "RICHARD PELTZ, "Receiver of Taxes."

tin the face of the very record from which this anonymous libeller has pretended to find the material for this attack, is found my complete vindication. After such an exposition of the utter faisity and of the malignity, for the author knew of the falsehood-of the attack upon me, it would seem that no further answer to any of his allegations is

4. That as the President of the Consumers' Mutual Coal Company I issued circulars containing talse representations us to the condition and capacity of the company; that I much some \$17,160 by the sale of the company's stock; and that the money that I

SPECIAL NOTICES.

lost in it was not in fact lost by row, but by those of my creditors from whom I borrowed it. The answer to the se alleg clous is as easy and as

complete as to the preceding. The circulars referred to were founded on and contained the entire reports of the very best mining engineers here and at Pottsville-reports on which I reiled, as did every one eye, and which were teprinted verbation, and put in the hands of eve y stockholder.

The anonymous libeller, when he pretends to pub-

lish my 'sworn statements, does not give the fact that when I subscribed to the stock and became an officer of the company I was the owner of some considerable property; that any borrowed money I may bave owned was secored by collaterals, or mortgages, or liens on my real estate, and that almost the only debts which were not secured were those incurred (by accommodation notes) to pay off the morigage debts of the said Consumers' Matual Coal Company, which notes were taken by the mortgagor on account of and credited on the mortgage. An examination of the schedules eferred to wit show to any candid man that but for these debts so contracted, no application to the Bantrupt Court would have been necessary. But it is said I made some \$17,000 out of the company not accounted for. If I did, why was not my discharge opposed instead of being unanimously acquiesced in? To state such a question is to answer it. Like all the other charges contained in the libellous and most unfounded attack on me above referred to, these affecting my conduct as President of the Consumers' Mutual Coal

holders of the company, and of all others interested therein. I have thus substantially answered every specification in the charge against me, and the proofs are ready for your examination. While I have refrained from passion, I cannot help remarking that no candidate for office in this city has ever been thus assailed, and that no eximency of partisan politics, no virnience of personal hatred, can justify the use of means so false and base to defeat a political oppo-

Company are answered by an examination of the

whole record, and of the documents, which are and

always were open to the investigation of the stock-

nent or personal enemy. In conclusion let me say, that so far as I am personally concerned in this statement I have but one thought, and that is to preserve the good opinion of my fellow-citizens. The office of Judge of the District Court, however much I might be proud of and prize it under other circumstances, is, in view of the attack made upon me, of secondary consequence. My personal vindication is more important to me than any chicial honors or emoluments.

Yours, respectfully, JAMES LYND. PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 7, 1870.

TO THE VOTERS OF PHILADEL PHIA.-The undersigned, as Citizens of Philadelphia, impressed with the growing importance of placing trustworthy and intelligent persons in Public Offices, respectfully recommend to their fellow-citizens the election of

MR. WM. R. LEEDS TO THE SHERIFFALTY

The proper administration of the office of Sheriff peculiarly exacts such qualifications, and Mr. Leeds is known to the undersigned as a gentleman who possesses them, and who is therefore worthy to receive the support and confidence of the people.

MCKEAN, BORIE & CO. BENJAMIN BULLOCK'S SONS, WILLIAM SELLERS & CO., RANLOLPH & JENKS. ALEXANDER WHILLDIN & SONS, M. BAIRD & CO., BUNTING, DURBORROW & CO., EDWIN H. FITLER & CO., JUSTICE, BATEMAN & CO., LEWIS WHARTON & CO., COATES BROTHERS ALEXANDER G. CATTELL & CO., STOKES, CALDWELL & CO., WETHERILL & BROTHER, AMES H. ORNE, SON & CO., BROWNING & BROTHERS, H. C. ORAM & CO., HENRY DISSTON & SON, HOFFMAN & KENNEDY. R. & G. A. WRIGHT, WM. STRUTHERS & SONS NOBLITT, BROWN, NOBLITT & CO., WILLIAM A. SIMPSON & SON. EDLIOTT & DUNN BRIDESBURG MANUFACTURING CO., MISKEY, MERRILL & THACKARA. E. R. TAGGART & CO. ANSPACE & STANTON JOHN & JAMES DOBSON. THOMAS BIRCH & SON. BROWN & WOELPPER, FIELD & HARDIE, LAMBERT, THOMAS & CO., GROVE & BROTHER, TAUSSIG, LIVINGSTON & CO., CHARLES GIBBONS, MORTON MCMICHAEL ALEXANDER HENRY CHARLES M. PREVOST JOHN P. VERREE, N. B. BROWNE, PREDERICK M. ADAMS, NATHAN HILLES, JOHN PRICE WETHERILL BARTON B. JENKS, JAMES L. CL' GHORN, SPENCER ROBERTS, JOHN RICE HENRY BUMM. CHARLES GILPIN. WILLIAM H. KERN HECTOR TYNDALE RENRY B. BENNERS DAVID WALLACE HENRY H. BINGHAM. EDWARD BROWNING. WALTON, MENRY D. MOORE, A. H. FRANCISCUS COFFIN COLKET. HENRY CARTWRIGHT. JOHN H. MURPHY, JOHN H. CHAMBERS. HENRY C. HOWELL.

10 7 30 HEADQUARTERS UNION REPUBLICAN CITY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, No. 1165

CHESSET Street. OCTOBER 6, 1870. Whereas, a systematic attempt has been made in the Twenty-sixth ward to distract the Republican party with the evident design of throwing the ward

into the hands of the Democracy, and Whereas, certain persons, aided by the misrepre sentations of Democratic newspapers, have endeavored to deceive the Republican voters of said ward as to who are the nominees of the party; therefore, Resolved, That this Committee republish its decision in the case of said ward, so that those citizens who desire to support the Republican ticket may not be misled by the traitorous movements of persons in the pay of our enemies. The following is the Republican ward ticket in the Twenty-sixth ward :-

Select Council-JAMES B. ALEXANDER. Common Council-Captain WM. THORNTON. ROBERT BRIGGS, JOHN S. HUHN. School Directors-FRANCIS GWYNN, Sa,

JOHN KESSLER, Constables-ALEXANDER MCNEIL, JOHN LAIRD. Any other ticket pretending to be Republican is

only intended to deceive. By order of the Union Republican City Executive Committee.

JOHN L. HILL, President. MARSHALL C. HONO, j Secretaries.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

The great importance of the approaching Congressional election to the interests of our city, and being the regular Republican nominee for Congress in the Second district, the time has arrived when I should lay before the people a short but complete statement of my reasons for asking their support. I claim to be the regular Republican no minee for

three reasons :-I. That I was nominated by the convention held Wednesday, June 15, 1870, in accordance with the rules governing the Republican party.

II. That a majority of the whole number of delegates voted for me, having received 40 votes out

III. That I was renominated by the convention held Tuesday, September 13, 1870, in accordance with the decision of the Executive Committee of the State Central Committee, receiving 44 votes out

As soon as Mr. O'Neill was defeated in the nomination, the influence of all the United States Government departments within the city (Revenue, Post Office, Custom House, Mint, Arsenal, Navy-Yard, etc., etc.), was brought to bear upon the various ward executive committees to induce them to send such representatives only to the City Executive Committee as would favor Mr. O'Neill In this they succeeded, and to-day a majority of the Republican City Executive Committee hold office under the United States and city govern-

Mr. O'Neill then appealed to the City Executive Committee, protesting against my recognition as the regular nominee by that body. His plan was to have the whole matter referred to a sub-committee consisting of the members of the City Com nittee who represented the wards comprising the Second Congresional district. To secure a majority of said subcommittee, the seats of Messrs. Peak and Everly, of the First and Twenty-sixth wards, were contested. A committee, consisting of Messrs. Huhn, Porter, McCuilcugh, Hong, and Albright, was appointed, to whom these contested seats were referred. Of this committee, Messas, Porter and McCullough, representing the Eighth and Tenth wards, were delegates for Mr. O'Neill at the convention of June 15. Now what was the consequence? Messrs. Peak and Everly were thrown out and Lutz and McBride (both O'Neill men) admitted, although it was positively and distinctly shown that in the First ward Mr. Peak received a majority of the votes cast and that a friend of Mr. O'Neili's seized the credentials of the Ward Executive Committee, and whilst destroying them drew a pistol and threatened to shoot the first man who dared interfere. In McBride's case the testimopy showed that the Twenty-sixth Ward Executive Committee consisted of fifty-one memters, and that out of these 51 McBride received 17

After the organization of the City Committee, the matter was referred to this sub-committee, in accordance with the plan above mentioned. This committee consisted of Messrs. Lutz. Porter, Hill, McCullough, and McBride, three of whom are Assistant Assessors of Internal Revenue, McBride, Porter, and McCullough, the latter two also delegates of Mr. O'Neill's. Hill is Collector of Deligquent Taxes and from Mr. O'Neili's ward, the

Ninth, and Lutz Alderman of the First ward. When Mr. O'Neill and myself appeared before this committee, I protested against its jurisdiction for the following reasons:-

I. That a Congressman was a State officer, and that the highest political authority in the State, to wit, the State Central Committee, was the only power that could decide contests for the nomination for that office.

II. That the City Committee was a local committee, whose jurisdiction extended only to city and county officers. III. That the State of Pennsylvania was divided

into twenty-four Congressional districts, and that, with the exception of the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth, and Twenty-second, the districts were composed of a combination of counties, 5 consisting of a combination of 2 counties, 3 of 3, 3 of 4, 5 of 5, and 1 of 8. 1V. That in the Fifth Congressional District, con-

sisting of the Twenty-second, Twenty-third, and Twenty-fifth wards of the city of Philadelphia and Bucks county, no provision in the rules was made for the election of delegates in the city wards so long as they should be connected with Bucks county in the formation of a Congressional district. See section II, rule 5. V. That if a dispute should a ise in any of three

districts no one County Committee could decide, but the whole matter in dispute would have to be referred to the State Central Committee. VI. That if the State Central Committee had jurisdiction in one case, they had it in all.

I also, in the presence of Mr. O'Neill and the corrmittee, stated that I would do anything to settle the dispute harmoniously and quietly, as there were already sufficient dissatisfaction and strife in the ranks of our party, and offered the following propo-

I. To appear with Mr. O'Neill before the State Centra! Committee, submit the facts, and abide by its

II. To refer the matter to a committee of six, Mr. O'Neill to select three and myself three, none of whom should hold office under either City, State, or General Government, That the committee should be sworn in our presence, then submit the evidence, and abide by the decision of a majority. If the committee should be evenly divided, allow them to select a seventh, whose decision should be final, and from which there should be no appeal.

III. To go before the people, hold a new delegate election, have the inside officers sworn in our presence, and then go into convention.

IV. To reconvene the convention, and if possible mutually agree upon a chaliman of the temporary organization and a Committee on Credentials. If not, to allow the City Executive Committee to detail one of their number to effect a temporary organization, and also to appoint the Committee on Credentials. That whoever should receive a majority of the votes should be the recognized nominee.

I pledged myse f that if under any of the above propositions Mr. O'Neill should be the favored one, I would support him with my whole strength and induce my friends to do likewise.

Mr. O'Neill rejected all of the above propositions, and would listen to nothing except the sub-committee of the City Executive Committee, consisting, as I have before shown, of three Assistant Assessors of Revenue, two of whom were his delegates, and the remaining two directly in his interests.

I then requested the committee to postpone the consideration of the case until the question of Jurisdiction could be laid before the State Central Committee, which would convene at Altoona in a few days; promising that if the State Committee should overrule my plea of jurisdiction, to submit to the decision of the City Committee. Mr. O'Neill and I then left the room, and the committee, without notifying me as to whether or not they would admit or overrule my plea of want of jurisdiction, and without examining a witness, with the exception of Mr. King, one of the G'Neill faction, repo ted to face of Mr. O'Neill. This was on Saturday, August 13. On Tuesday, August 16, the State Central Committee met at Altoons. I appeared before them, and notified them of the trouble in the Second district, and asked to be heard. After lengthy debate the committee refused to hear me on account of the absence of Mr. O'Nei'l. It was, however, decided that they (the State Central Committee) had absolute jurisdiction over disputes arising in all the Congressional districts, and referred the dispute in the Second to their Executive Committee, consisting of Mesers. Leeds, chalman, T.ttermary, Miller, and Elliott, of Philadelphia; Mackay, of Allegheny; Scranton, of Luzerne, and Garretson of Schuylkell. This committee was announced by the secretary, who read from his minutes, and acquiesced in by the chairman, Mr. John Covode. Subsequently the Executive Committee mot in

I'htiadelphia on the 29th of August and September

SPECIAL NOTICES.

2 and 6. Mr. O'Neill received notice to appear before said committee, but falled to do so. I appeared at each meeting with my papers, credential, and witnesses, some sixty in number. No quorum could be obtained until the meeting held September 6. The committee, without hearing any evidence, although the resolution agreed upon by the State Committee directed "that both parties be afforded an opportunity to be heard before said committee," adopted a set of resolutions ordering the reconvening of the convention, and selected one of their number, Charles A. Miller, to act as temporary chairman and also a committee on contested

After the adoption by the Executive Committee of the resolution reconvening the convention, I proposed to Mr. O'Neill to acquiesce in the decision and meet in the convention with his delegates, pledging myself that it he should receive the nomination I would heartly endorse and support him. This he positively refused to do.

In compliance with the decision of the State Executive Committee, the convention reassembled on Tuesday, Septemb r 13, when I received the nomination a second time, having received 44 out of 68

In the meantime, fearing that the State Executive Committee was not wholly in Mr. O'Neill's interests, influence had been brought to bear upon Mr. Covode to repudiate the Executive Committee and appoint one which was wholly at the service of Mr. O'Neill. Through the trickery, duplicity, and treachery of honest (?) John Covede this was done and a committee, consisting of Mahlon H. Dickinson (Chief Commissioner of Highways), Chalrman, John E. Addicks (Health Officer), William R Leeds (Collector of Internal Revenue, Second district, and nomince for Sheriff). Pennyoacker, of Chester, Horatio Gates Jones, Garrettson of Schuyikill, and Ewings of Allegheny.

This committee, acting as it did without authority, and in direct disobedience of the resolution agreed upon at Aitoona, and without even notifying me, or attempting to give me an opportunity of being heard before them, adopted a resolution declaring that they had no jurisdiction in the matter.

These are the facts of the case, and if I had been permitted to have the evidence heard by either committee could have shown conclusively :-

I. That Mr O'Neill is not the nominee, that he never received the nomination, his detegates having bolted f. om the Convention.

II. That a majority of the delegates were against him, 46 out of 68. III. That there has never been a contest for a

Congressional nomination in any district in the State where there have been such outrageous and stupendous frauds committed upon the peop'e as there have in this. IV. That on the part of Mr. O'Neill some of these

frauds are as follows:-1. Failure to comply with the rules relative to

registering voters. 2. Striking legat voters from the registry, because in opposition to Mr. O'Nelil. 3. That seven of his delegates were inside officers at the delegate election, judges of their own elec-

4. Bribery of election officers by money and Government appointments.

5. Stuffing of ballot boxes. 6. Destruction of ballot boxes where the vote was against Mr. O'Neill, by a mob organized for that

purpose. 7. Voting of men under the names of voters known

to be deceased. 8. Voting known Democrats. 9. Voting on names of the removals from di-

visions. 10. Voting men from the Second, Third, and

Fourth wards and residents of other cities. 11. Control and manipulation of the City Executive Committee by Mr. O'Neill, by showing among other things that Mr. O'Neill, upon several occasions, asserted "that he was all right-he had fixed the City Executive Committee, and that Creely would

only have five votes in said committee. The question to be determined is, Are party rales to be binding or not? Is it worth while for a man to exert himself to procure a nomination for office, and after having done so honorably, to have his nomination set aside by the City Executive Committee because a majority of said committee favor some other man?

Mr. O'Neill is not the nominee of the people of the Second district. He is the nominee of the City Executive Committee-a committee which should be for the good of the whole Republican party, but which, as at present constituted, is a partisan committee in the interests of, and controlled by, United States Government officials.

The real secret of the opposition to my nomination is simply this :- In the convention Mr. O'Neill did not have a delegate who did not hold office under the General Government, and which he had been instrumental in procuring. These men having failed to secure his nomination, it is now "rule or ruin." So long as they are holding position and draining the United States Treasury they are strict party men, but the moment they have to give place to others they become disorganizers,

The 11th of October will decide whether or not Mr. O'Neill, who, notwithstanding the printing of his name upon the ticket by the City Executive Committee, is running as an independent candidate, can

be elected in opposition to the choice of the people. I further desire to state that, willing to make any sacrifice of my personal interests for the benefit of my party, I have repeatedly offered to withdraw, provided Mr. O'Neill would do the same, and take up a new man. This he has steadily refused.

As to my position and views upon the leading questions of the day, I am strongly in favor of protection to American industry-no man can properly represent any portion of the State of Pennsylvania who is not; indexibly opposed to the importation of coolie labor in any form, deeming it degrading to the intelligent, educated workingmen of the country, and in opposition to the principles of our republican institutions, and pledge myself that if elected will do all in my power to secure such legislation as will effectually prevent coolie importation. I am opposed to the granting of the public lands for merely speculative purposes. The future welfare of our country demands their reservation for the benefit of actual settiers. And, finally, am as sound upon, and as true to, all Republican principles, as any man in the Republican party.

I remain, very respectfully, JOHN V. CREELY.

TO THE WORKINGMEN OF PHILADEL PHIA .- As President of the Trades Union Apti-Coolie League, and as the President of the preeting held by that body at National Hall on Wednesday evening, it becomes my duty to warn you of a falsehood by which it is attempted to deceive you. The advertising columns of the "Morning Post" of October 6 contain resolutions denouncing Hon, William D. Kelley, and pledging the League to support General William B. Thomas for Congress. The advertisement states that they were unanimously adopted, and a paragraph in the editorial column refers to them as having been passed. Now, I hereby certify that none of these resolutions were even proposed to or considered by the meeting, and that the advertisement is a falsehood and forgery. WILLIAM MOWBRAY,

President of the Trades Union Anti-Coolie League and President of the National Hail meeting, 1072t

TO WHICH PARTY DOES HE BELONG ? General William B. Thomas-Dear Sir :- Yesday I received a note frem you enclosing two tickets -one Republican, the other Democratic-and a number of stickers, with your name as a candidate for Congress in the Fourth district. Enclosed in the note was an appeal to me for my vote. Now, as I am a party man, and always wish to vote unders'andingly, if you will answer me one question, I can then determine whether to vote for you or not. And, I doubt not, there are many other voters in the district who would like to have the question answered, and who will be governed in casting their vote by your answer. The question is-Are you a Republican or a Democrat? An answer will oblige at least one voter in the FIFTEENTH WARD.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

TO THE VOTERS OF PHILADELPHIA. I have before me a pamphlet (extensively errorlated), and which many of you have doubtless seen, entitled "James Lynd, Esq., as a Candidate for Judge of the Listrict Court," addressed "To the Citizens of Philadelphia,"

This document is signed "Independent Voters, And yet they are not so independent as to give us their names, in order that we may judge for ourselves whether they are really independent voters or emissaries in the interest of the Democratic candidates. Candor is a characteristic of the Americanborn citizen, and also of the well-bred citizen, though of foreign birth. Such would scarcely venture to appeal to his fellows to read his charges against a candidate for an honorable office without at the same time disclosing his own name as a voucher for what he says. Such has not been done

What stronger argument of the instrucerity of these anonymous authors can we have than the fact that they dare not show their hands? Are we not entitled to their names, in order that we may know their status for truth and honor, and whether they are related by blood, business, or birthplace with the distinguished gentleman who is Mr. Lynd's competitor? Their names would give us the key to the motives which inspire them, and thus enable us to give proper credit to their statements, or daily discount them-possibly reject them-because tospired by personal enmity, or as coming from the paid agents of the Democratic party, which seeks in this strong Republican district to get the control of our local indiciary.

A careful reading of this pamphlet will convince any one that its statements are unfairly made, and the extracts detached and garbied and put together in just such a way as most exectually to injure Mr. Lynd and his competitor. And every intelligent person well knows that even a document exhibiting truth and henor may be so garbled as to make it appear untruthful and inconsistent. For example, we find in the Testament that Judas betrayed his master for thirty pieces of silver; and again, that he repented and hung himself; and again, those other words, "Go thou and do likewise," Now, put these detached statements from the inspired volume together, and we have, "Judus betrayed his master for thirty pieces of silver, and repented and hunghimself; go thou and do likewise.

Unjust as would be such a rendering, it is as fair as are the garbled statements set forth in this anonymous pan phiet.

This document arraigns Mr. Lynd upon three

1. He has been discharged as a bankrupt. ?. He borrowed money of a Building Association, from the pryment of which he got relieved by being disclarged as a bankrupt,

2. He was President of the "Consumers Mutual Coal Company" at the time it became insolvent. Well, what if all these are true? Have not hundreds of good and honest men, who have borrowed money in the course of their business, and became afterwards involved, taken the benefit of the Bank-

rupt law in order to get relief? Is this one of the unperconable sins which man may commit? If it is wrong for an unfortunate debtor to avail himself of the Bankrupt law, why did the members of our National Legislature pass it, and the Executive give it his approval? Are they not as censurable for passing such a law as the unfortunate debtors who avail themselves of its provisions?

Again, what if Mr. Lynd had the misfortune to be the President of said Coal Company at the time it became insolvent? Did not the stockholders elect him? And are they or he consurable in the And are they or he censurable in the premises?

You are not told how he labored to make the Company a success; nor that he put every dollar he had in it, and even borrowed money on his private account to keep it up, and lost in it all he was worth, and thus forced to avail himself of the benefit of the bankrupt laws for relief. This is studiously ken from you, while it is unfairly insinuated that Mr. Lynd corruptly borrowed the money, etc., and then got discharged as a bankrupt. Impartial reader, this could not have been or Mr. Lynd could not have got a discharge as a bankrupt, as he did, without one objection from the numerous stockholders of said Company, or creditors whom these nameless self-constituted guardians of public mora's have volunteered to protect. And to aver otherwise is to reflect on the Honorable Judge who granted his dis-

charge. I was a 'oser of reven hundred and fifty dollars by the failure of said Company, and I would blash to accuse Mr. I yad with being the cause, knowing, as I do, that it 'ailed by reason of causes which he could net control.

The case then fatrly stated against Mr. Lvnd is this, and this only :- He became embarrassed in his tusiners, and like hundreds of others, in order to get relief, applied for and obtained by jedicial decree, an honorable discharge as a bank-

Mr. Lynd was the universally respected President of the Select Council for four years, and for a term City Solicitor, during all which time he discharged his duties with signal fidelity and ability. Is it not apparent, ther, that this hue and cry against him is entirely groundless, having no stronger foundation than his misfortune in business, and an obvious desire on the part of his anonymous traducers to elect the Demacratic cardidate? I was a fellow-student in the same office with Mr. Lynd, and have known him intimately and favorably continuously since. and I cheerfully add my testimony to that of his numerous friends, that he is in honorable and honest man, and in every sense of the word a gen leman, a good lawyer, and, if elected, will in my opinion, make an excellent Judge.

Now, candid reader, I have not said one word in disparagement of the distinguished gentleman on the Democratic ticket as Mr. Lynd's competitor. have merely analyzed, and I think fairly criticized, this insidious attack made upon Mr. Lynd. This I have done from a sense of daty, and, in conclusion, I trust you will maturely consider for yourselves what your duty in the premises is, and not become involuntary assistants in the schemes of designing men, who dare not assume the responsibility of their acts by Living their names to those whom they address and covertly seek to influence. October 6, 1870. (III) AMOS BRIGGS.

THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS. The attention of our citizens is directed to the able legal article published as an advertisement in this morning's "Press." It is an exhaustive article upon the question of site, showing conclusively why no other than the Penn Squares ought or can be legally used for Public Buildings, and further, why no buildings can ever legally be erested upon Washington Square.

The voting citizens of Philadelphia are requested to take a walk to-morrow (Sunday)-the day all have the most leisure-around both Washington and the Penn Squares, and after relieving their min is about a monstrous building in the middle of the streets, determine for themselves, after an ocular examination and careful consideration, where the best interests of the city require the new Pablic Buildings to be built, independent of the logal objections to any other Square than Penn Squares. "PRO BONO PUBL CO."

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR OF THE CITY

OF PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER 7, 1870. At a meeting of the "Commissioners for the Eroction of the Public Buildings" the following resolution

Rerolved. That the officers of this Commission be directed to publish, through the public press, the fact that no action has been taken by the Board touching the location of the Public Buildings at the intersection of Broad and Market streets, and that the Commission is empowered by act of Assembly either to locate separate buildings upon the four squares, or one building at the intersection, as a

JOHN BICE, Prasticate Attest-Charles R. Roberts, Secretary.

majority of the Beard may determine.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

BO TO AMOS BRIGGS, ESQ .- SIR: -1 CA'L myself a Republican, but still an Independent Voter, especially when Judicial offices are to te filled. Therefore, having read the pumphlet against MR LYND, and attaching weight to it since its charges were founded upon the records of the Court. I was glad when I heard that in the Ledger of to-day

you reviewed that pamphlet. Lexpected its charges would have been fairly met and answered. I expected this because of your ability, and because you are identified with no party. I cannot forget the sacrifices you have made to your independence; how ready you have been to defy party discipline; to denounce those highest in party position and office; to repudiate measures believed by party leaders to be essential to national safety, and to act with the opposition when you believed your party men and measures to be wrong. From your ability independence, and honesty, I expected an answer that would be satisfactory to me. I concede that what pon state as the points of the pamphlet are demolished, but after reading it I would have stated the points:-

1. Not that he has been discharged as a bankrupt, but that the causes of his bankruptcy were dis

ereditable. 2. Not that he owed a Building Association, but that he was a debtor to it on his official bond as i s Treasurer, and that he was indebted to it for sums of money borrowed whilst Treasurer, but when he could not tell, and for which he gave a worthless security upon land in Montgomery county. In other words, that through and by him, the custodian of its money, the association lost a large sum of money.

3. Not that he was president of a coal company when it became insolvent, but that he was its projector, that he and others bought a coal lease, organized the company, sold the lease to the company at an advance of over \$300,000, and issued a prospectus full of glowing promises, and that the company failed because the promises of the prospectus were untrue. By again reading the pamphlet I think you will find that it quotes from Mr. Lynd's examination, that he borrowed all the money he put into the company. I am informed that certain acts that would prevent a bankrupt's discharge are barred by time, and that some debts are not affected by a discharge at all, but still survive, and that therefore no inference is to be drawn in his favor because the Court has granted a discharge.

I may be wrong in thinking the above to be the charges of the pamphlet; if I am, many err likewise; at all events, such charges are made. Your position as the counsel of Mr. Lynd will enable you to show these charges unfounded if they are so. Will you be kind enough to meet the real points of the case against Mr. Lynd? Your advocacy and defense of him are generous because you were his competitor for his nomination; and because of that and the other reason mentioned in this note, an explanation from von will have a great effect upon earnest Republicans. Yours, truly,

A REPUBLICAN.

BES CHANGES IN PHILADELPHIA.

Perhaps no city in the United States has undergone such great changes as the metropolis founded by Penn. Street after street has been added to the old limits, and rows of stately and splendid buildings occupy the places of waste and barren commons. Still, there is a great want, which every Philadelphian more or less feels, and that is, that we have no spacious public squares where the pecple at large can throw off care for a time and enjoy a brief season of leisure, and it was a pity tlat William Penn, when he designed the city, had not left a large area in the mist as a breathing space that could then easily have been done at a small

cost. As the question now stands, we must do the best that we can, and not meddle with those that we have. This is particularly the case with Washington and Independence Squares, and there are many reasons why these pieces of ground should touched, but be left an open and public green forever. To any one who will for a moment glance at the past, it will be exceedingly plain that such were the intentions of the rulers of the city who first planned and executed the present buildings. The first act was passed in 1729, when an appropriation of £2000, Pennsylvania currency, was made, to build a State House, to Andrew Hamtiton, Thomas Lawrence, and John McCully, to superintend the new building, and carry out the act of Assembly. Nothing was done till 1730, when the lot on Chesnut street was purchased, and in 1744 the suilding was

finished. But the position of affairs was exceedingly different from what it now is. The city was small, Parts that are now thickly settle i were then vacant lots. Trinity Church, at the corner of Sixth and Spruce, was in 1783 considered out of town, and as a matter of course there were, excepting a few shantles, no dwellings west of that edifice, and as a matter of course the State House was then the centre of the city, and so remained for more than half a century, In 1832 Tenth and Chesnut was reputed the exact

centre. But from that time the nath of fashion took a westwardly direction, and trade followed in its wake. Vacant lots, which before had been considered. as of little account, were now thrown into the market, and realized large sums for their owners. The mansions which previously had been the abodes of the wealthy and aristocratic were now converted into stores, and other great alterations made. The population of the city rapidly increased, railroads and freight stations appeared in the weatern part of the city, and the erection of buildings of all kinds circulated a prodigious amount of capital.

The Court House, in the mean time, had not corresponded to the wants of the community. The accommodations here are still all wofully insufficient. Lawyers complained that the Row offices were too small for the incessant litigation of the county, and that valuable papers which were noted as filed on the docket were missing, and thereby parties frequently met with heavy losses.

The community complained, the members of the

bar grumbled-nothing was done; but in the mean

time the city has been paying rents for outside premises, and thus the inconvenience has been sustained of the different branches of the city government occupying premises at a considerable distance from each other. The question now comes up, How is this to be remedied? The answer is prompt, and to every rea-

sonable mind can admit of little delay or equivocation-build on the lots in West Penn Square, donated to the city by William Penn for any purpose of public utility. It has been preed that these lots are too far west for any practical purpose, but a single glance at Chesnut street will convince all who are not strongly

prejudiced of the futility of this objection. Many of the business houses which formerly occupied Front street and the lower part of Market are now to be found high up Chesnut street, and the distance to the Court House (supposing it to be situated on Penn Square) is no farther than the old Court House from their former location. All or nearly all the dwellings from Seventh and Chesnut to Broad have been converted into stores, and the prospect is that trade will encroach still farther west, and that Cirard avenue, part of which is now handsomely built, will be the main artery and centre of the city. This supposition is by no means unlikely, as the rapidly increasing population of Germantown, Mount Airy, and Chesnut Hill, and the dwellings in process of erection in those sections of the city, indicate that some central position must be selected, and all economists agree that it is a wretched olan to build and then, at the expiration of a few years,

he compelled to move. The same outery (though not to such a degree) was raised when the High School was removed from Juniper and Market to its present location, and yet no one now complairs that the institution has at all suife rod.

MERCANTILE COLLECTION AND LAW