The Republican.

GEORGE B. GOODLANDER, Editor.

CLEARFIELD, PA.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, NOV. 17, 1875.

Reader, if you want to know what is going on in the business world, just read our advertising columns, the *Special* column in particular.

The Democrats of Clinton county like us Clearfielders gave the Treasuryship to the Radicals, just for the fun of seeing how they will do it.

Senator Wallace leaves for the National Capital the latter part of next week, preparatory to assuming his Senatorial duties.

Prof. Janney's account of the Black Hills reports little gold, but good soil, fresh water, tall trees and few Indians. That does not "pan out" very well.

GOOD.—We notice that our friend Kinter, Democratic nominee for Sheriff in Indiana county reduced the Radical majority from 1,900 to 983. He will make the landing next time.

Congress meets at Washington on the first Monday of December, and will organize by electing Democratic officers. What a cleaning out there will be in the Capitol building.

A foot of snow fell at Buffalo, N. Y., on Sunday morning, and the telegraph wires at Omaha, Nebraska, were covered with sleet a foot thick. So said the Associate Press dispatches.

The Philadelphia *Times* aims to be very precise when it says: "John Lemon's official majority for Senator in Blair and Cambria is 711. He kissed 1,639 babies during the contest." Lemon's a sucker!

RESTORED.—Oregon falls into the Democratic line. The State has been revolutionized, and the Democratic candidate for Congress is elected by 1,200 majority against 4,095 for Grant in 1872.

QUITE A STREAK.—Although Mercer county gave Hartranft nearly 800 majority, the Democrats elected their Prothonotary, Clerk of the Courts, and Recorder, by majorities ranging from 300 to 500.

Mrs. Elizabeth Woodruff, wife of H. D. Woodruff, Esq., senior editor of the Johnstown *Democrat*, died on the 7th inst., after an illness of three months. She was a very estimable lady, and was beloved by all who knew her.

THE GAME AND THE BLAME.—To the Radicals of Pittsburgh, Allegheny, Philadelphia, Lancaster, Harrisburg, and other large cities and towns we can now transfer the title of being the "Whiskey Party." They have earned it.

IMMOVABLE.—The returns of the Virginia election show that despite the numerous independent candidates for Legislative honors, the Democrats have made gains over their former large majority in both branches of the General Assembly.

The Philadelphia *Commonwealth* instead of blaming Pershing's defeat on the financial plank of the Erie platform, should give the facts and state that Pershing was honestly and fairly elected Governor of Pennsylvania, but was cheated out of the office by fradulent and corrupt votes in Philadelphia.

Hartranft only carries twenty-nine counties in Pennsylvania, while Pershing has a majority in thirty-seven counties. The rural districts, where honest elections are held, show increased Democratic majorities, while in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other cities, where the Treasury Ring and Liquor League used money, whisky, and other corrupt means, the Republican vote is increased.

A GOOD STANDARD.—The new constitution of Alabama contains a provision that all banks organized in that State must have a specie basis, and all their notes must be redeemed in silver and gold. Suspension of specie payments is forbidden, and bank charters are granted only for twenty years.—The loaning of the State or municipal credit to individuals or corporations is prohibited.

TROUBLE AT HEADQUARTERS.—The petty plurality for Mr. Rice, contrasted with the old-time majorities of seventy and eighty thousand votes, proves, in the opinion of the Springfield *Republican*, that the Republican party has no firm or permanent hold upon Massachusetts, and warns it that without noble aims and more commanding it cannot expect to carry the State in the next national campaign.

ABSENTEEISM.—The aggregate vote polled for Buckalew and Hartranft three years ago, was 672,406. The vote for Governor at the recent election aggregated only 609,564. This demonstrates the fact that over 62,000 persons in this State expressed no opinion on the 2d of November. That vote will be out next fall. And we are satisfied that three-fourths of the voters will never vote for Grant again, if they ever did before.

THE GOVERNMENT FAMILY.—Whether it is defrauding the Revenue through the whisky ring or locating Government depositaries, some member of the Grant family always has a finger in it. The New York *Herald* publishes some evidence to show that when Henry Clews & Co. were appointed bankers for the Government in Europe, "Mr. Boutwell thought it a great mistake, and his opinion was overruled by the only officer who had authority to control him." The fact, adds the *Herald*, that the appointment was procured by corrupt means "puts the high officer who enforced it in a most unenviable light." This high officer was President Grant; and the corrupt means considered in the payment of a large sum of money to his brother-in-law, whose intimacy at the White House was constant, and who was known to have also obtained money from the sale of other appointments.

GOVERNMENT WHISKY.

It appears that the government family has been taking a hand in cheating the Treasury out of millions of dollars of revenue in the "crooked whisky" business. It appears that Grant's brother, Orville, and secretary, Babcock have been in partnership with the rogues. The New York *Sun* in alluding to this fraud says:

The more that we learn about the whisky frauds in St. Louis, the more apparent becomes the fact that they have been carried on with the full knowledge of high officials in Washington, who have protected the rogues engaged in the conspiracy against the public treasury. The Cincinnati *Gazette* publishes several letters written in 1874 by a very prominent lawyer in that city to J. W. Douglass, then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in which the operations of the St. Louis Ring were fully exposed, the names of its leaders being given without concealment. This lawyer wrote that he had a client who had himself distilled during the years 1871 and 1872 over $500,000 worth of whisky, of which amount some $300,000 was "crooked" and paid no tax to the Government, and he gave the names of the officials through whose agency his client was enabled to evade payment. He offered affidavits and other evidence in support of these allegations, yet he found it impossible to induce Commissioner Douglass to take any steps in the matter. Even when he told that official that the St. Louis distillers boasted that they had their support in the Administration in Washington, and that Douglass himself was in the Ring, the latter meekly pocketed the imputation and refused to proceed against the men who were robbing the Government.

GRANT ALL OVER.—Everybody knows that Tom Murphy, Grant's Collector at the Port of New York, three years ago made Grant a present of a $40,000 Cottage at Long Branch, New Jersey, where "the government" spends the Summer. That Grant is getting ready to forsake Long Branch and turn his cottage into cash we need but refer to the fact that on the 15th of October last two mortgages were recorded in the County Clerk's office in Freehold, Monmouth county, N. J. They were given by Ulysses S. Grant and Julia D. Grant, his wife, to Wm. B. Dinsmore, as President of Adams Express Company, and were drawn for the sum of $10,000 each. Look at the shrewdness of the "gift taker." In one year from this the property will not be worth the $20,000. Grant has got the cash in his pocket and he will never pay the mortgages.

SPEAKING TO THE POINT.—The editor of the New York *Sun*, in alluding to Grant's speech, says: "A correspondent asks us to explain why we say Grant's Des Moines speech indicates a perverted moral nature. Because it not only contemplates and fore-tells with coolness, and without any sentiment of horror, a bloody war between American citizens, growing out of differences in religion, but it is calculated to foment and encourage, with all the authority of the Presidential office, such damnable animosities. It is not only intensely wicked, but hostile to the Constitution and to the traditional policy of the country. No man of an upright mind and a true American heart could entertain such ideas or deliver such a speech."

[illegible] the election the editors of the Tyrone *Herald* stated that they had gone down to Huntingdon and married the Scott and Guss factions, and the internal strifes of our party are now healed in Huntingdon. But behold on the 2d that county, which should have given Hartranft 800 majority, gave Pershing 59 majority and the whole county "fusion ticket" embracing true and old-time Democrats and Republicans, tired of official corruption and dishonesty, is elected by from 749 to 139 majority over the Radical county ticket, known there as the Woods-Orlady coalition and formerly the faction followers of ex-Senator Scott. Tyhurst and Jones have evidently got another marriage on hands.

COL. MCCLURE'S PAPER.—The *Times*, of Philadelphia, appeared on Monday morning last, in an enlarged form and a new dress. Although the *Times* has been in existence but eight months, it has a circulation larger than any other daily paper in the State, with but a single exception—the *Public Ledger*. Mr. McClure announces that in a few days he will have in operation one of the best presses the world can produce, with a capacity for printing thirty thousand complete copies of the paper, on both sides, in an hour, without touching the paper by hand. The *Times* is the newsiest paper in Philadelphia, and we wish it an abundant return for its efforts to give the public a first-class paper.

Some of those temperance men who started out just before the election to work up an interest for the new whisky party, with Hartranft at its head, having done their work, can now fall back into the temperance ranks. They play temperance so long as there is nothing else to bother their brains about. Like jumping Jacks, they move when the political leaders pull the wires. There are but very few professed temperance reformers, aside from the female portion, who do not make it a secondary political action. The year of the greatest effort and expectation the crop was of the poorest results.

The notorious Bill Mann has been elected Prothonotary of the several Courts of Common Pleas in Philadelphia, seven of the Judges voting for him. The votes of the other five Judges were scattered among as many different applicants for the position. Philadelphia recently voted for a continuance of Pilgrim rule, and it is but proper that the leader of that corrupt organization should be rewarded by these Radical Judges. The office is the most lucrative and responsible one in the gift of the Judges, but they have placed it in very bad hands for the next three years.

UPSET.—Mississippi elects five Democratic Congressmen out of six. The House delegation in the Forty-third Congress stood five Republicans to one Democrat. This is not all. The Democrats have as fully cleaned the county offices of scalliwags and carpet-baggers as they have the Congressional delegation. The former good character of the State has been restored by the people, after experimenting with political harlots for fifteen years.

UP TO THE STANDARD.

According to the *Democrat* this is the way they hold elections over in Indiana county:

"On the morning of the recent election in North Mahoning tp., the free and independent voters were no little astonished and surprised to find posted on the building where the election was held, a notice signed by the election officers of the district—notifying all persons that no Republican ticket would be received or counted which had on it the name of P. Milliken Kinter, the Democratic nominee for sheriff. This notice remained posted up for several hours, and was taken down by Daniel Ramey. The officers signing this notice were Joseph Shields, Judge, and G. W. McConaghy and R. C. Hoover, Inspectors.

We have never known a more palpable and flagrant violation of the spirit of our election laws than this. It was one of the basest and most unrighteous attempts at the coercion of voters that has ever come to our knowledge. Can there be any freedom of choice in our elections when the officers appointed to receive the votes of the citizens notify the electors that unless they vote for certain candidates their ballots will not be counted?

We hope to see an example made of these men, who so far forget their duty as officers and law abiding citizens, as to assume the role of the most virulent and prejudiced politician. As sworn officers of the law is was their plain duty to receive the ballots of all legal electors without question, and without in any manner dictating to them how they should vote, and at the close of the polls to count the vote. What business had these men outside of the room—what business had they to issue an order that the ballots of those only voted for *their* candidates would be counted? Was their action based on ignorance, or was it the result of a plan deliberately formed to coerce the free and independent citizens of their township? We hope some public-spirited citizens will make the necessary information, and allow these gentlemen to make their defences before our court of quarter sessions. They should not escape punishment."

ANOTHER WARD IN TROUBLE.

The Naval Academy at Annapolis Maryland, is stuffed chuck full of Radical instructors and officials, but still the colored "wards of the nation" encounter the displeasure of "the government." The last outrage perpetrated at the Institution on the "colored race" is recorded in this way, by the Baltimore *American*, whose editor has been one of the chief advocates of miscegenation and negro equality for 15 years. Hear him:

"The colored cadet in the naval academy, Henry E. Baker, jr., from Mississippi, was dismissed from the academy yesterday by the secretary of the navy, at the re quest of the superintendent. This cadet has occasioned continual trouble since his entrance, more than a year ago, into the naval school.—Numbers of classmates and others at the school have been reported and several even dismissed, for molesting or troubling him in various ways, but the hypothesis that he was only an innocent victim of unprovoked aggressions is proven untenable by the concurrent testimony of his class and by the report of the board of inquiry in regard to the latest difficulty in which his name appears. It was clearly shown before the board that Baker used, on the occasion referred to, language too gross for publication and totally inexcusable, and this flagrant breach of decency, coupled with the previous accumulation of minor offenses, which he has committed, induced the superintendent to request his dismissal. Baker was turned back at the end of the last academic year to the class below for deficiency in the most important branches in the year's work, that of mathematical studies, and nothing appears in his record as a cadet to entitle him to be considered a creditable representative of his race, or a loss to the service to which he belonged."

This is the last government outrage perpetrated on the "national wards." But we suppose the "wards" will still continue to vote the Radical ticket.

THE SPEAKERSHIP.—A Washington correspondent of the New York *Times* in alluding to the election of a Speaker of the next Congress, which meets on the first Monday of December says:

"The contest for the Speakership will soon assume a more active form, or at least will attract more attention. Randall expects the nomination on the first ballot in the Democratic caucus. Cox thinks the contest is between himself and Kerr. Kerr has sense enough not to boast of his prospects. Fernando Wood is by no means out of the contest. While these Democratic magnates are confident of seizing the office, lesser lights, such as Milton Sayler, Gilbert C. Walker, General Banks, and possibly some others, are held in reserve for compromise candidates.—Kerr is the most able and honest of the candidates, and Banks is the best fitted to preside. Randall is the best parliamentarian, excepting Banks, and Walker is the best looking of the candidates. The exigencies of politics and the ambitions of Presidential candidates will probably dictate a man who will not become too prominent as Speaker, and therefore troublesome, so that some one not yet mentioned may be finally selected as a compromise between all interests."

An exchange says the Hon. Cassius M. Clay, still hale and hearty, made five vigorous speeches in the Mississippi canvass. In one place he so thoroughly exposed a carpet-bagger who had just delivered a speech, that the people seized him and would have thrown him into the Mississippi river had not Clay personally interceded in the man's behalf. Mr. Clay made a Fremont speech at Curwensville in 1856. He is an able man and until recently he was one of the most Radical of Radicals. But from this on he proposes to antagonize the Grant family and government corruption generally.

A MIX.—The Elk *Democrat* says that politics in M'Kean county was slightly mixed this Fall. Pershing carried the county by thirty-six votes, and the Democrats elected the District Attorney, two Commissioners, and one Auditor, while the Republicans elected the Sheriff, one Commissioner, two Auditors and the Coroner. The vote on Prothonotary was a tie, and, in order to prevent embarrassment and complication, the candidates have agreed to divide the honors and profits of the office, one acting as Prothonotary and the other as his deputy.

Carry the news to Simon and Gov. Pollock! Bellefonte, the home of Governor Curtin, gives 15 majority for Pershing, a Democratic gain of 58. And old Centre, Curtin's county, gives 1,400 for Pershing, the biggest majority it has given for thirty-five years. Carry the news, carry the news, carry the news to Simon.—*Bellefonte Watchman.*

CHEAP GRIEF.—An Albany (N. Y.) paper says: "A Mrs. Croft attended a Troy funeral and wept so loudly and so bitterly that a policeman searched her and found five stolen tidies in her pockets."

PENNSYLVANIA—OFFICIAL.

The following is the official vote of the State for Governor this year, as compared with the vote for Lieutenant Governor last year. Hartranft's plurality is 12,030. Piolette received 293,150 votes, and Rawle 302,875; Rawle's plurality, 9,725. The Prohibition vote foots up 13,244 for Browne, and 12,468 for Pennypacker. Both the Republican candidates obtain their election by a minority vote:

COUNTIES.	1874 — LIEUT. GOV'R. Latta. D.	Olmstead, R.	1875 — GOVERNOR. Pershing, D	Hartranft, R
Adams	3,014	2,569	3069	2477
Allegheny	15,704	13,089	13246	18707
Armstrong	3,523	3,858	3121	3505
Beaver	2,486	2,877	2702	3086
Bedford	2,959	2,524	3099	2906
Berks	10,610	5,299	13433	6864
Blair	3,226	3,390	3166	3711
Bradford	4,264	5,519	4265	6526
Bucks	6,514	6,153	7000	6713
Butler	3,698	4,123	3891	3796
Cambria	3,379	2,238	3399	2325
Cameron	449	479	476	552
Carbon	2,420	2,060	2728	2347
Centre	3,083	2,118	3504	2097
Chester	4,554	6,152	5005	7015
Clarion	3,254	1,954	3221	2196
Clearfield	3,065	1,582	3273	1819
Clinton	2,436	1,431	2598	1771
Columbia	2,956	1,123	3757	1643
Crawford	4,724	4,821	5526	6146
Cumberl'd	4,378	3,683	4309	3603
Dauphin	4,197	5,293	4704	6574
Delaware	2,207	3,599	2079	4075
Elk	1,127	464	1055	503
Erie	4,612	5,087	4744	6699
Fayette	3,714	3,111	4299	3472
Forest	328	367	319	376
Franklin	[illegible]	[illegible]	3954	4674
Fulton	1,019	700	981	684
Greene	2,663	1,469	2699	1517
Hunting'n	2,588	2,839	2603	2546
Indiana	1,694	3,590	1715	3640
Jefferson	2,161	2,048	2248	1923
Juniata	1,536	1,029	1771	1198
Lancaster	6,171	10,532	7581	12725
Lawrence	1,322	2,781	1427	2335
Lebanon	2,293	3,431	2608	3859
Lehigh	5,813	4,087	6758	4630
Luzerne	10,312	8,631	11135	9899
Lycoming	4,495	3,533	4641	3488
McKean	918	915	976	940
Mercer	3,845	4,175	4267	4911
Mifflin	1,540	1,583	1586	1446
Monroe	2,067	508	2630	662
Montgomy	7,863	7,390	8339	8364
Montour	1,455	875	1332	1002
Northam'n	6,891	3,921	7248	4364
Northum'd	3,547	3,263	4567	3691
Perry	2,424	2,279	2448	2429
Philadel'a	46,887	59,850	47980	65262
Pike	1,039	238	1056	434
Potter	940	1,526	1019	1223
Schuylkill	9,184	7,517	9037	7699
Snyder	1,087	1,452	1369	1701
Somerset	1,627	2,835	1689	2989
Sullivan	829	422	719	336
Susqueha'a	2,766	3,425	2951	3517
Tioga	1,698	3,614	1909	3933
Union	1,176	1,837	1177	1784
Venango	3,255	3,281	2940	2953
Warren	1,960	2,306	1740	2057
Washingt'n	4,306	4,255	4763	4917
Wayne	2,433	2,236	2135	1854
Westmor'd	5,799	3,916	6242	4957
Wyoming	1,687	1,489	1610	1365
York	7,111	4,083	8285	5263
Total	277,195	272,516	292145	304175
Majority	4,679			12030

AFTER THE BATTLE.

The smoke has cleared away; the dead have been buried, the wounded are under proper treatment, and we can take a calm review of the situation. For fifteen years the Republicans have held the field, and were strongly entrenched in power. One by one their main outposts have been captured, and last year there was a rout along their whole line. A desperate rally this year, aided by power and plunder, has enabled them to recapture a few points but they have lost so terribly elsewhere that a grand charge next year will lead to their utter annihilation.

The campaign of 1875 closes as follows:

REPUBLICAN.		DEMOCRATS.	
Illinois	21	Alabama	10
Iowa	11	Arkansas	6
Kansas	5	California	6
Maine	7	Connecticut	6
Massachusetts	13	Delaware	3
Michigan	11	Florida	4
Minnesota	5	Georgia	11
Nebraska	3	Indiana	15
Nevada	3	Kentucky	12
New Jersey	9	Louisiana	8
New Hampshire	5	Maryland	8
North Carolina	10	Mississippi	8
Ohio	22	Missouri	15
Oregon	3	New York	35
Pennsylvania	29	Tennessee	12
Rhode Island	4	Texas	8
South Carolina	7	Virginia	11
Vermont	5	West Virginia	5
Wisconsin	10		
Rep. electoral votes	170	Dem. electoral votes	196

It will thus be seen that the Democrats lead their opponents by a majority of 26. But the above table is instructive from another point of view. Every State in the Democratic column is reasonably sure in 1876. Not so with those in the Republican list.—Maine was only retained by 5,000 after a desperate fight. In Massachusetts which used to give 80,000 majority, and was considered not only the birthplace of Republicanism but its stronghold, the opposition lost the State in 1874, and this year are in a minority on the popular vote. New Jersey although lost to us through local divisions this fall, is strongly Democratic, and in 1876 will wheel into column. Ohio and Pennsylvania are debatable states, and would have been won this year except for the blunders of our leaders. In Wisconsin there has been a second Democratic victory. Whether or not the majority of 500 or 1,000 by which the State is carried shall be for Taylor or Ludington, or the Democrats or Republicans elect a majority of the State officers, when the character of the canvass is considered and the opposition which Governor Taylor's course in the railroad war has provoked is weighed, even should he be defeated—which we do not think probable—the Republicans must now surrender the State.

This outlook, whilst discouraging to our opponents, should give renewed courage to our friends. We are not beaten but cheated; and are in first class trim for the grand onslaught of 1876. Let us go to work and organize now.—*Bloomsburg Columbian.*

THE RECENT COAL INVESTIGATION.—The joint committee of the Legislature, appointed to investigate the affairs of the Phil'a & Reading Railroad Company, and the Philadelphia Coal & Iron Company, held their final meeting at the Girard House, in Philadelphia, a few days since. After a lengthy deliberation a report to the Legislature was agreed upon. It is understood that the report will be presented to the Legislature in January next, and will set forth that the constitutionality of the act of Assembly which incorporated the Phil'a & Reading Iron and Coal Co. is one which should be decided by the Courts, and not by Committee of the Legislature, and they therefore recommend that the evidence taken in the case be submitted to the Attorney General for his examination, he being the proper law officer to institute proceedings against the corporation, should the facts warrant such action. The committee condemn the policy by which such a charter has been granted by the Legislature, but think that as all other anthracite coal companies of the State had these powers granted them, there was no good reason why they should be withheld from the Reading Company, but the committee express the hope that a different and more prudent course will be hereafter pursued in this matter. On the charge of conspiracy to regulate the price of coal, the committee think that the combination has not been injurious to the public, and if it should become detrimental hereafter the law can be resorted to to restrain and punish the parties. Senator A. J. Herr, one of the members of the committee, was instructed to prepare the report, and the committee adjourned.

TRIAL OF JOS. LANSBERRY AT PITTSBURGH.

The majority of our readers will, no doubt, recollect the fatal result that befel Cyrus Butler, of Brookville, who attempted to arrest Joseph Lansberry, of Lawrence township, for being a deserter in October, 1864. His arrest and escape all are familiar with. He was put on trial for murder in the United States Circuit Court, sitting at Pittsburgh, on Tuesday, the 9th inst. The proceedings in the case we clip from the *Commercial*, which journal says:

Lansberry was among those who had been drafted in the township in which he resided, and as he failed to report, Provost Marshal Campbell sent two special agents to arrest him. In attempting to make the arrest, one of these men (Butler) was shot by Lansberry, and fatally wounded. The assailant fled, and was not arrested until last spring, when he was apprehended and brought to this city for trial on a charge of murder.

Lansberry is about fifty years of age, has followed the occupation of a farmer, and there is nothing striking or peculiar in his appearance. He has a wife living, but no children. He is represented by Messrs. Weir & Gibson, and Thomas M. Marshall. R. B. Carnahan and District Attorney Reed appear for the Government.

TUESDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

When arraigned, the defendant plead not guilty, and the work of empaneling a jury began. This occupied some three hours, the defendant challenging twenty jurors and the Government four. The following named jurors were sworn: Joel Truesdal, merchant, West Alexandria; Henry Snanse, farmer, Woodcock, Crawford county; John R. Anderson, farmer, Washington county; John McDonough, Washington county; H. P. Houseman, farmer, Fayette county; Frank M. Eastman, gentleman, Butler county; Wm. H. Mulford, merchant, Susquehanna county; Wm. A. Reynolds, gentleman, Wyoming county; James McKinney, farmer, Butler county; James H. Geary, farmer, Westmoreland county; Jacob Schaffer, minister, Allegheny county; Joshua A. Ellis, gentleman, Lycoming county.

After the jury had been sworn, R. B. Carnahan, Esq., opened the case on the part of the Government. He commenced by reading the laws under which the prisoner was drafted, and then proceeded to detail the circumstances attending the homicide. He said the Government expected to establish the fact that the murder of Captain Butler was committed by the prisoner, and that the crime was done while the deceased was endeavoring to arrest him as a deserter from the army.

After Mr. Carnahan concluded, District Attorney Reed offered in evidence a number of documents, showing the appointment of Provost Marshall Campbell, in the Nineteenth Pennsylvania district, and the appointment of Cyrus Butler and George Van Vleit, September 17, 1864, as Deputy Provost Marshals or Special Agents; also the records showing the quota of soldiers wanted from Clearfield county and Lawrence township also, where Lansberry resided; also the records showing that Lansberry had been drafted, but failed to report.

THE TESTIMONY.

The following testimony was then elicited:

Col. H. S. Campbell sworn—Was Provost Marshal of the Nineteenth district in 1864; knew Cyrus Butler; recommended his appointment as special agent; knew Van Vleit; Mr. Butler was under my control as Provost Marshal; in October, 1864, I sent Butler and Van Vleit specially to arrest Lansberry; it was reported to me that in attempting to make the arrest Lansberry had been killed; Lansberry's arrest had been ordered because he was a non-reporting drafted man.

George Van Vleit sworn—In October, 1864, resided in Brookville, Jefferson county; in October, 1864, was special agent of the Provost Marshal's department; knew Cyrus Butler; he held a similar position; he resided also in Brookville; Mr. Butler and I received orders to go to Clearfield; first we went to see how things stood in Clearfield county about deserters from the draft. Attended to this duty and reported. Then went a second time to make some arrests, which we did. A third time we were sent specially to arrest a man named Lansberry. We expected resistance, as we were told Lansberry was a desperate character. This was about the last of the month. We proceeded with caution. A man named Miller was with us. We went near to the house on Sunday morning and watched for a time. A man came out and Miller said that it was Lansberry. He went to the barn. It was a foggy morning and about daylight. We then went to the house, and when he returned from the barn I told him to halt, that he was my prisoner. Butler also told him to halt. He went into the house, closing the door. We forced the door and followed him in. Lansberry went up stairs, closely followed by Butler. When Butler was about half way up the stairs he was shot by Lansberry. I suppose it was a gun he fired with, as when I got up the stairs I saw him strike Butler with the gun, breaking the stock. Butler fell, I supposed, dead. Lansberry and I then had a little scuffle, but not much. He got out and got ahead of me; pursued him a short distance, when he disappeared in a piece of woods; Miller and I went back, and found Butler had gone out of the house, and I found him a hundred and fifty rods from the house, lying beside a fence; Miller went for a wagon and we hauled Butler to Clearfield; he died at Dunlap's hotel, about two o'clock the next morning (Monday); I remained with him until he died; the ballet entered near the naval, a little to the left.

Cross-examined—Had not been drinking that morning; have no recollection of ever being in David Miller's house; did not drink there; when we followed Lansberry into the house, we went through one room, into another in which was the stairway. Some one of us may have asked "where the man went to," but do not recollect of saying anything. Do not recollect that either of us threatened to "shoot the son of a —." We were not boisterous, and neither of us threatened or cursed. We did not shoot first.

Mr. Marshall asked the witness how he could describe the manner in which Lansberry held the gun and shot Butler, when he (witness) did not see either the man or the gun at the time of the shooting—and he replied that, from the position of the parties, Lansberry must have held the gun so as to shoot down the stairway. This is only a supposition or inference.

In chief—After the shot was fired, Lansberry struck Butler over the head and shoulder with the gun, the stock of which was broken. I examined the gun afterward, and found it had been discharged. Butler and I both fired, simultaneously, in the direction where the first shot came from.

The court then adjourned until ten o'clock on Wednesday morning.

WEDNESDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

Upon re-assembling, the Government resumed the examination of witnesses, as follows:

VAN VLEIT RECALLED.

Mr. Van Vleit was recalled by Mr. Carnahan: Do not recognize the prisoner; saw him but a very short space of time eleven years ago; Miller joined me in the pursuit for Lansberry; he was the man who struck and shot Col. Butler.

Re-cross—Did not say to a woman in the house, in the hearing of Morris Wallace, "D—n you, I will have mercy on you;" did not use any insulting language to her; asked Mrs. Owens where the man (Lansberry) was; did not flourish the gun over her head and threaten her; did not swear at Miller when I called him in; don't know that I called him in; don't use profane language.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH MILLER.

Joseph Miller sworn—Reside in Bradford township, Clearfield county, and lived there in October, 1864; know Joseph Lansberry; that is him there (pointing to the prisoner); have known him for thirty years; saw him on the 30th of October, 1864, at his own home; Mr. Butler and Mr. Van Vleit had came from Jefferson county to arrest Lansberry; they did not know where he lived, nor did they know the man; they found out that I knew him, and employed me as guide; arrived at Lansberry's about four o'clock, and we waited till daylight, when Lansberry came out; I told them that he was the man, and they went to arrest him; Lansberry went to the barn and afterwards went to the house; I was about 250 feet from him when I recognized him; there was a woman in the house, and as the officers entered heard her exclaim, "my Joe," and something else, but don't recollect what it was; the shooting occurred just then; think she cried that the "officers had him," or had come to get him; at this time Lansberry was feeding some stock about fifteen or eighteen feet away, but when the woman cried out he immediately ran to the house; the next thing I heard was the shooting, and Lansberry soon afterward ran out of the house and fled, Van Vleit followed and calling me to join in the pursuit; I fired at him three times with a revolver; Lansberry ran to the woods, he had a rifle barrel in his hand; the stock was broken off; heard three shots in the house, two together and one in a little while afterward; saw Colonel Butler after my return from the chase after Lansberry; I was with the party which took Mr. Butler back to Clearfield; saw Colonel Butler on Sunday about 10 A. M., which was the last time I saw him alive; examined the gun barrel which Lansberry had carried; Van Vleit was upon the other side of the house when the woman cried out.

Cross-examined—I ran toward Lansberry as he fled, and he sort of passed in front of me; saw his left side; he had his coat on; there was a dog with him; saw blood on his left coat sleeve; I had fired once at him, but it was not within reach of him; saw the blood on his arm right after I fired the first shot; I think the blood was on his arm when he came out of the house; did not examine the gunbarrel with a ramrod; the gunbarrel has been lost.

PREVIOUS THREATS.

John S. Radebaugh sworn—Am acquainted with Joseph Lansberry; talked with him in 1864 concerning the draft; met Lansberry near Clearfield, and we talked the matter over; I told him I heard he had been drafted; asked him what he was going to do—whether he was going to put in a substitute for $300, or report; he said he was going to do neither; I told him he had better do one or the other, and if he had no money he could borrow it likely.

Thomas M. Marshall, Esq., one of the counsel for the defense, objected to the testimony, and Mr. Carnahan stated in writing what he proposed to prove by the witness, viz: that the prisoner had announced that he would not obey the draft.

Witness resumed: I told him they would take him dead or alive, and he said the first man "who comes to take me I will shoot." That ended the conversation.

Cross-examined—I was in a buggy and Lansberry was on foot; the conversation took place before the fall election; don't remember what I went to Clearfield for on that day; told the conversation to William Betts, of Clearfield; he is not here; told it to others, but can't remember who they were; never hunted the woods for Lansberry with a gun to kill him.

Re-direct—Never saw the prisoner from the time of the conversation related to in 1864, until yesterday in Court.

Dr J. G. Hartswick sworn—Resided in Clearfield in October, 1864; saw Cyrus Butler, or a gentleman of that name, on a Sunday a few hours after the occurrence; cannot remember who was with him; he was in a dying condition from a bullet wound in the abdomen; saw him but once.

Michael Frank sworn—Resided in Clearfield in 1864, and knew Joseph Lansberry; was postmaster at that time; he came into my office; I told him he was young and he had better go or pay $300; I told him I would help him; told him to run down a raft and it would meet the expenses of a substitute; he said if he paid the money his property would be levied upon and sold; he was not married then; I told him I would get out the lumber for him and not charge him a cent; I left there in 1869, and never saw him from the time of the conversation related.

Cross-examined—He seemed pleased with my proposition; once afterward he sent word with his brother that he wanted to see me, but he never called; at that time the officers were in pursuit of him, and things were getting quite warm.

John S. McKernan sworn—Resided in Clearfield in 1864, and was Deputy Provost Marshal; did not know Joseph Lansberry; I went to Lansberry's house to arrest him; afterwards went to the river, where a crowd of men were at work, and Lansberry was pointed out; it appeared the first man I passed was Lansberry; I turned around and saw that he was running away; he was nearing a wood; I was on horseback, but knew I could not overtake him; do not now recognize him.

Westly Miller sworn—Was sent to Lansberry's house on October 30th, 1864, by Colonel Butler to see if Lansberry was at home; (the testimony of this witness was corroborative of that of his brother, Joseph Miller, elsewhere given) saw Colonel Butler after the shooting; I procured a conveyance and took him to Clearfield; the wound was from a gun shot, and the ball seemed to be of pretty large caliber; I recognize the prisoner as Joseph Lansberry.

Dr. Charles M. Matson sworn—Was surgeon of the Board of Enrollment in 1864, and stationed at Waterford, Erie county.

A WITNESS OBJECTED TO.

E. G. Rathbone was the next witness to be called on the part of the Government.

Mr. Gibson, for defense, objected to the examination on the ground that the defense had not been notified that Mr. Rathbone would be called as a witness. He thought if the Government intended to deal fairly with the prisoner, a complete list of witnesses should be furnished before the case was called up for trial.

Judge M'Kennan said that the act of Congress, requiring the list of witnesses to be furnished to defendant, certainly did not require that the complete list should be furnished every time. If the defendant had notice any time, the requirements of the law had been fully met.

Some further discussion ensued between counsel, when District Attorney Reed stated that from the information he had been able to gather, Mr. Rathbone had not been present at the last term of court, and that the name of the witness had not been at any time furnished to the defendant. He regretted this, as Mr. Rathbone was an important witness on the part of the Government. In view of the facts stated, however, he would ask leave to withdraw the witness.

After the witness had left the stand Mr. Carnahan announced the case closed on the part of the Government. He gave notice to the defense, however, that the Government would hold that the failure to notify the defendant that Mr. Rathbone would be called as a witness, would not prevent them from calling him as a witness for defense.

THE DEFENSE.

Mr. Weir opened the case for the defense. He said that they expected to be able to prove that Van Vleit and Butler had made a sudden and violent attack upon Lansberry, firing two shots at him, and putting him on the defensive from the very start; and that the subsequent resistence of Lansberry was in self-defense, and to save his own life.

THE TESTIMONY.

Martin V. Owens, sworn—Reside in Clearfield county, two and a half miles from town, at the house of Joseph Lansberry; (the witness here described the premises from a diagram submitted by counsel for the defense;) Lansberry was at home on Saturday night, October 29th; the next morning, as I was returning from the barn, I saw him coming in; the next thing I heard was an uproar at the door, and two men came to the door, and uttering loud oaths, said; "Let us in here;" Lansberry had came into our part of the house; his apartments were in the other part of the house; think one of the men was named Van Vleit; they broke through the door; an inside door was closed by one of the women, when the men threw it open again; they asked me where Lansberry was and I told them he had gone out; the small man said "I was a liar," the large one said I am going to shoot the d—— anyhow; he has gone up stairs; this was said in a loud tone of voice; they then pulled the stair door open and started up stairs; the largest man was ahead going into the stairway; then I heard two shots fired; the next thing I saw Lansberry go out of the door; next saw the small man come down stairs and go out of the door with a gun barrel in his hand and started after Lansberry; Mr. Miller also followed him; did not notice a wound upon Mr. Lansberry, or blood upon his arm; Lansberry's dog, which went away with him, returned bespattered with blood.

A discussion here took place between the court and counsel for the defense in regard to the admission of evidence as to the conduct of the officers after the flight of Lansberry, the court insisting that it was not admissible as evidence.

Mr. Gibson argued that it tended to show the powerful violence of the officers, and if it could be shown that the officers, acted in a highly criminal manner, their brutal conduct would rob them of the shield of their authority.

The witness resumed—Each man as he entered the house of Lansberry had a revolver in his hand, and held it out at arms length; but a short time elapsed from the moment they entered the stairway until the firing occurred; did not hear Van Vleit and his companion say anything until they got to the door; they came in the door alongside of each other; they were close to the stairway when they called out they would shoot him (Lansberry) and immediately proceeded up stairs.

Cross examined—Lived in the house with Lansberry from May until October; he had been at home frequently before the 30th; when he came into our apartments on that morning he came with a rush; I was standing up at the time; could see the door on the west side of the house, but did not notice Lansberry going out there or up stairs either; the whole thing came upon me so suddenly that I could not notice everything; don't know why I told the officers that Lansberry was not there; did not know that he was up stairs at the time; I was alarmed, but did not know what was up, Lansberry never told me he expected a visit from the officers; I heard the door crack when it was burst open; the diagram was made under my care; I stood in one place nearly all the time; don't know what it meant on the diagram by first position of Owens in the corner; I was not in the corner; there was another Owens in the room; it was my wife; there was no other man of that name in the room; am certain one of the men called me a d—— liar; am also certain Col. Butler said he would shoot the d—— ——; heard two shots at the head of the stairs, or somewhere on the stairs; was very near but could not state whether they were pistol or gun shots; they came one after the other; did not hear a word said or spoken on the stairs; it was dark at the head of the stairs, and you could not see very much in there; saw Lansberry run out of the door on the west side; Lansberry had a gun and revolver.

Mr. Carnahan gave notice that he would continue the cross-examination of this witness in the morning, as he was not yet through with him.

The Court then adjourned until ten o'clock on Thursday morning.

THURSDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The cross-examination of Mr. Owens was continued at considerable length, after which the defense called Mrs. Owens, his wife, who corroborated his statement as to the threats made by Butler and Van Vliet before the shooting. She did not see the shooting but was in the house at the time.

COL. BUTLER'S DYING DECLARATION.

At this point the counsel for the defense called Joseph H. Deering and stated that they proposed to ask the witness if he had not heard Col. Butler make a dying declaration relative to the shooting.

Counsel for the Government objected, when His Honor, Judge McKennan, stated that if it could be shown that Col. Butler knew he was dying the evidence would be admissible, if not, it would not be taken.

The witness was then interrogated as to whether Col. Butler had told him he thought he was dying, and replied that he had not, whereupon the evidence was ruled out and the witness left the stand.

LANSBERRY'S WOUND.

Mr. Reed was then called, and testified that Lansberry and himself had gone to school together; he saw Lansberry the day of the shooting, at Selfridger's, one mile from his home. He was wounded in the left arm; it was a bullet wound, and was bleeding when he saw it.

Morris Wallace, Amos Reed, Ellis Irwin, L. R. Merrill, Martin Owens, Capt. Mathew Ogden and Michael A. Frank were called and testified as to the character of the defendant for peace in the county in which he resided.

On cross-examinination, Frank testified that he understood after the defendant had been drafted that he did not intend to report. For a year prior to the murder he had not been at home, and he was unable to state the reputation of the defendant for peace.

The defense here announced that they would rest their case, and after consultation the counsel for the Government said they would offer no testimony in rebuttal.

The court then adjourned until ten o'clock on Friday morning.

FRIDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

At the opening of the United States Circuit Court, the counsel in the case of Joseph Lansberry proceeded to make their arguments to the jury.

POINTS SUBMITTED.

The counsel for the defense submitted a number of points, which they asked the Court to charge. The points were as follows:

1. That the twelfth and thirteenth sections of the act of Congress of March 3, 1863, authorizing persons to be drafted into the military services of the United States, which declare that persons drafted who fail to report after being notified as required by said act, shall be regarded as deserters, and the twelfth section of the act of Congress of February 24, 1864, under which the defendant stands indicted, are highly penal and must be strictly construed.

2. That by the twelfth section of the aforesaid act of March 3, 1863, those who were drafted were legally entitled to be notified thereof by proper authority, "within ten days after they were drafted, by written or printed notice, to be served personally, or by leaving a copy thereof at his last place of residence, requiring them to appear at a designated rendezvous to report for duty."

3. That if the jury believe that Joseph Lansberry, the defendant, was not personally served with such written or printed notice, or that no copy of such written or printed notice was left at his place of residence, he was not a deserter, or non-reporting drafted man within the meaning of said act, and was not therefore liable to arrest as such.

4. That on an indictment for murder under the twelfth section of the aforesaid act of the 24th of February, 1864, conversations of the defendant about "arranging to pay his commutation money," or declarations that he "would neither go or pay," are not sufficient evidence that he was served with the notice required by the twelfth section of the aforesaid act of March 3, 1863.

5. That if the jury should find that the defendant was not served with the notice prescribed by the twelfth section of the act of March 3, 1863, but should find that he believed, from other sources of information, that he was drafted and did not report, he was not liable to arrest as a deserter or non-reporting drafted man, under the provisions of the aforesaid act.

6. That if the jury should find from the evidence that the defendant was drafted, and lawfully notified thereof and failed to report—that Butler and Van Vleit were special agents, lawfully authorized to effect his arrest—that they went upon his premises on the Sabbath, and without giving him notice of the object or purpose of their presence, broke into the house, and with loud oaths, uttered within the defendant's hearing, that they would shoot him, and with loaded revolvers in their hands, immediately rushed up stairs, toward the room where he was from which there were no means of exit, but by the said stairway, and fired upon and wounded the defendant, and that the defendant believed that his life was in imminent danger, or that he was about to suffer great bodily harm, and so believing, fired upon Butler, which afterwards resulted in his death, then and in such case his offense is excusable homicide in self defense, or at most but manslaughter, and therefore not guilty of murder in manner and form as he stands indicted.

7. That if the jury believe that Butler and Van Vleit, in attempting the arrest of the defendant, did so in such a violent and threatening manner, with deadly weapons in their hands, as to create the belief in the mind of the defendant that they were about to take his life, or inflict upon him great bodily harm, and that he, so believing and to save himself, fired upon them, which afterwards resulted in Butler's death, then, and in such case, defendant is not guilty of murder in manner and form as he stands indicted, and the verdict of the jury should, therefore, be that of not guilty.

9. That the evidence of the defendant's good character as a peaceable citizen is a legitimate element in his defense, and should be taken in consideration by the jury in connection with all the other evidence in the case.

10. That if upon a careful consideration of all the evidence in the case, the jury should have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the defendant, their verdict should be that of acquittal.

In regard to the necessity for notice from the Government to a drafted man that he is a deserter, Judge McKennan ruled that an officer could not take a man unless it could be shown that the man had knowledge that he was a deserter. Without notice he was not bound to submit and surely had the right to defend his liberty.

After arguments upon the point relative to the necessity for notice from the Government to a man that he is a deserter, His Honor decided that an officer could not take a man unless it could be shown that the man had knowledge that he was a deserter. Without notice he was not bound to submit and surely had the right to defend his liberty.

THE ARGUMENTS.

Mr. Carnahan opened on behalf of the Government, remarking that the indictment was found during his administration as United States District Attorney, and at the request of the Attorney General he had consented to continue his services until the case was concluded. He then reviewed the testimony at length, and claimed that Lansberry had ample notice that he had been drafted. He not only said he would not report, but asserted that he would shoot any one who attempted to arrest him. He knew that Van Vleit and Butler were Government officers, and they made known their purpose when they called him to "halt," saying "you are my prisoner."

Mr. Gibson and Mr. Marshall followed in very able speeches for the defense, elaborating the legal principles embodied in the points which they had submitted.

It was nearly three o'clock when Mr. Marshall concluded and the court adjourned until a quarter before ten o'clock on Saturday morning, when Mr. Reed will commence the closing speech for the Government.

SATURDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

After District Attorney Reed had addressed the Court, Judge McKennan charged the jury.

The important feature of the charge was that in regard to notice. The Court held that it was a most essential part of the Government proof to show that defendant, in committing the crime charged, was prompted by a motive to hinder or obstruct an officer in the discharge of his duties imposed under the act. Can a man, His Honor asked, be said to resist an officer in the discharge of his duties, unless he has knowledge that the person he is resisting is really an officer? The very essence of the offense is in resisting or obstructing an officer in the performance of duties specially devolving upon him, and pre-supposes knowledge. He then referred briefly to the evidence bearing upon this point, and quoted portions of the testimony of Van Vleit, Miller, and other witnesses on the part of the Government. He said the jury must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant knew the officers, who were dressed in citizens' clothes, who visited his house in the night time, and who made every effort to surprise and capture him, were officers acting under the law. It was for the jury to say whether the testimony offered by the Government established the point.

LANSBERRY ACQUITTED.

The jury retired, and in less than an hour they returned a verdict of "Not guilty!" Lansberry was then discharged, and was warmly congratulated by his friends.

—The list of special buildings on the Centennial grounds is constantly increasing and present indications are that their total number will be from 200 to 250. Most of the important foreign nations—England, Germany, Austria, France, Sweden, Egypt, Japan and others—are putting up one or more structures for each exhibiting purposes, or for the use of the commissioners, exhibitor and visitors.

IS IT YOU

Who said that you would like to get such Clothing as City People wear, rather than the *wholesale goods* commonly sold? This will tell you how to do it.

The very large increase of our business allows us to make A STILL LOWER SCALE OF PRICES, AND

You Can Save Enough

in buying a Suit at Oak Hall

TO PAY FOR THE TRIP

from anywhere in this County to the City of Philadelphia, and have a day of sight-seeing besides. Wanamaker & Brown stand by this Statement, and so will you after one trial.

Character of the Goods we sell! For Men & Boys. — To be *sure* of what we sell we manufacture our goods, some of them in our own building. They are well cut, sewed and finished. They can be relied upon. Storekeepers out of the city misrepresent us when they say they sell our goods, as *we do not wholesale*, but confine ourselves to retail. We bear no ill-will to any one, and state this only because some dealers sell poor goods as coming from our house. To each of our customers we are responsible for articles bought of us. By our plan of Ticketing the *right names* of the materials on our goods, no one can be misled as to qualities.

How Wanamaker & Brown treat their CUSTOMERS. — THE price in plain figures and *nothing off*. The same price to acquaintances and strangers. To city people and country people equal advantages. With each article sold, a *Guarantee* is given, that the Price is as low as it can be bought anywhere, and that the quality is as represented; also, that the money will be paid back in full, if purchaser within 10 days wishes, for any reason, to return the goods, unworn.

Exactly where the Store is. — THIS is important indeed, because unprincipled people having stores in Philadelphia, *counterfeit* our signs, cards, advertisements, and stop strangers on the street, *with false directions* about where the store is, so that they may sell their counterfeit goods. There is but one Oak Hall in Philadelphia, it is a large building, the size of four ordinary stores, and is on the South-east corner of SIXTH—SIXTH—SIXTH—SIXTH—SIXTH—SIXTH and Market Streets.

Those who cannot come to the City. — WE send patterns of material and prices by mail when requested. Persons can have made-up goods sent by Express, by sending their measure (we furnish easy directions that any one can measure by,) and describing color wanted, and price desired. Payment can be made to the Express Co. on receipt of goods, and the privilege of examining them is allowed before paying. Where goods do not please, we will return the money and pay the expressage back to Philadelphia.

You should be sure to see our name on the Building and over the door as you enter.

WANAMAKER & BROWN.

"MONEY MAKES THE MARE GO!"

TEN YEARS' EXPERIENCE!

IRONSIDES STORE, November 6, 1875.

TO THE PUBLIC:

I wish to inform my old patrons and the public generally that after Ten Years' experience in doing business on the Credit System, I have come to the conclusion to try it on the CASH PLAN, for the following reasons:

1st. My Ledger is about full, and I do not wish to open a new set of books.
2d. The Credit System is often the cause of considerable trouble and loss.
3d. Good paying customers have to pay more for their goods to make up for [illegible] ones.
4th. By SELLING STRICTLY FOR CASH, we have no bad accounts, and can afford to sell goods AT A VERY SMALL PERCENTAGE, as an inducement to buy FOR CASH.

In view of these facts I have decided on and after MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8th, to do a STRICTLY CASH BUSINESS, and in order to accomplish this purpose I am determined to make my prices so low that no man who enters my store with the CASH, can leave it without the article he desires to purchase. This resolution will be strictly adhered to, and I invite an examination of my prices by all who are in need of anything in my line. To those who have been in the habit of promptly paying their bills, I would say that this "change of base" is intended for their benefit, as well as my own, and I hope they will not take umbrage at an arrangement which gives them their goods at lower figures than I could otherwise afford, for the reasons above stated,—they have been paying the debts of poor customers, and under the credit system must continue to do so.

Inviting all to call and be assured of my intention to sell at prices which will make it an object to buy for cash, I remain,

The Public's Obedient Servant,

G. S. FLEGAL.

Philipsburg, Pa., Nov. 17, 1875-3t

AUDITOR'S NOTICE.—

John F. Orwalt vs. John Schwarick. — In the Court of Common Pleas of Clearfield Co. Fi. Fa. No. 14, June Term, 1875.

The undersigned Auditor, appointed by the Court, to distribute the moneys arising from the sale of Defendant's personal property, hereby gives notice that he will attend to the duties of his appointment, at his office, in Clearfield, on Tuesday, the 7th day of December, A. D. 1875, at ten o'clock A. M., when and where all persons interested may attend. A. G. KRAMER, Auditor.

Clearfield, Nov. 17, '75-4t

SITUATION WANTED—

By a young man as clerk or accountant. Any parties wishing to employ such will apply immediately. References given. Address, Box 41, Karthaus P. O., Clearfield county, Pa. Nov. 17, '75-4t