

A MASTERLY LETTER.

Hancock's Reverence of Civil Law.

THE FULL TEXT OF HIS LETTER TO SHERMAN IN THE TRYING TIMES FOUR YEARS AGO—CONGRESS THE TRIBUNAL. FAITH IN A PEACEFUL SOLUTION OF THE TROUBLE—FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMY.

From Monday's Philadelphia Times. Shortly after the nomination of Gen. Hancock at Cincinnati, it was charged against him that during the electoral crisis of 1876-7 he had written a letter to General Sherman in which he had made known his opinion on the disputed election and declared his intention to support Mr. Tilden's claim if the latter chose to take the oath of office. It was claimed by the Republican press that this letter was little short of revolutionary in its declarations and that its publication in full would greatly damage his chances for the Presidency. General Hancock from the first said when questioned about the matter, that anything he had ever written to General Sherman was out West when the story came out. On hearing of it he said that he had received no letter from General Sherman upon which any such construction as is indicated above could be placed. Since then, General Sherman having come within reach, the New York World has finally obtained a copy of the letter from his files, and it was printed in that journal and the Times yesterday.

General Hancock being spoken to by a Herald reporter on Saturday had this to say on the subject:

"I hardly remembered writing the letter," he said, "until I saw a reference to it in some of the newspapers. When I wrote it I had no idea that it would ever be published. I was in a Western town on private business, with no secretary or member of my staff with me. I wrote it frankly and with no constraint."

"And stick by what you wrote?"

"I never wrote anything I am afraid of having known and that I would not stick to."

"And you desire this letter to be published?"

"I only waited for the consent of General Sherman, and that having been given there is no obstacle against its publication."

The following is the full text of the letter:

CARONDELET, P. O., ST. LOUIS, Mo., December 28, 1876.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Your favor of the 4th inst. reached me in New York on the 5th, the day before I left for the West. I intended to reply to it before leaving, but care incident to my departure interfered. Then again, since my arrival here I have been so occupied with personal affairs of a business nature that I have deferred writing from day to day until this moment, and now I find myself in debt to you another letter in acknowledgement of your favor of the 17th, received a few days since. I have concluded to leave here on the 29th (to-morrow) p. m., so that I may be expected in New York on the 31st inst. It has been cold and dreary since my arrival here. I have worked "like a Turk" (I presume that means hard work) in the country in making fences, cutting down trees, repairing buildings, etc., etc., and am at least able to say that St. Louis is the coldest place in the winter and the hottest place in summer that I have encountered in a temperate zone. I have known St. Louis in December to have genial weather throughout the month; this December has been frigid and the river has been frozen more solid than I have ever known it.

I was not in favor of the military action in South Carolina recently, and if General Ruger had telegraphed to me, or asked for advice, I would have advised him not under any circumstances to allow himself or his troops to determine who were the lawful members of a State Legislature. I could not have given him better advice than to refer him to the special message of the President in the case of Louisiana some time before. But in South Carolina he had the question settled by a decision of the Supreme Court of the State—the highest tribunal which had acted on the question—so that his line of duty seem even to be clearer than in the action of the Louisiana case. If the Federal court had interfered and overruled the decision of the State court there might have been a doubt certainly, but the Federal court only interfered to complicate, not to decide or overrule.

Anyhow, it is no business of the army to enter upon such questions, and even if it might be so, in any event, if the civil authority is supreme, as the Constitution declares it to be so, the South Carolina case was one in which the army had a plain duty. Had General Ruger asked me for advice, and if I had given it, I should, of course, have notified you of my action immediately, so that it could have been promptly overruled if it should have been deemed advisable by you or other superior authority. General Ruger did not ask for my advice and I inferred from that and other facts that he did not desire it, or that, being in direct communication with my military superiors at the seat of government—who were nearer to him in time and distance than I was—he deemed it unnecessary. As General Ruger had the ultimate responsibility of action and had really the greater danger to confront in the final action in the matter I did not venture to embarrass him by suggestions. He was a department commander and the lawful head of the military administration within the limits of the department; but, besides, I know that he had been called to Washington for consultation before taking command. I knew that he was in direct communication with my superiors in authority in reference to the delicate subjects presented for his consideration, or had ideas of his own which he believed to be sufficiently in accord with the views of our common superiors to enable him to act intelligently according to his judgment and without suggestions from those not on the spot and not as fully acquainted with the facts as himself. He desired, too, to be free to act, as he had the eventual greater responsibility, and so the matter was referred to him and myself.

As I have been writing thus freely to you I may still further unobscure myself by stating that I have not thought

instructed another. There might be danger in that and it was studiously left out of the charter.

But you are placed in an exceptionally important position in connection with coming events. The Capitol is in my jurisdiction also, but I am a subordinate and not on the spot, and if I were, so also would be my superior in authority, for there is the station of the General-in-Chief. On the principle that a regularly-elected President's term of office expires with the 3d of March (of which I have not the slightest doubt) and which the laws bearing on the subject uniformly recognize and in consideration of the possibility that the lawfully-elected President may not appear until the 5th of March, a great deal of responsibility may necessarily fall upon you. You hold over. You will have power and prestige to support you. The Secretary of War, too, probably holds over; but if no President appears he may not be able to exercise functions in the name of a President, for his proper acts are those of a known superior—a lawful president.

You act on your own responsibility and by virtue of a commission only restricted by the law. The Secretary of War is the mouthpiece of a President. You are not. If neither candidate has a constitutional majority of the Electoral College, or the Senate and House on the occasion of the count do not unite in declaring some person legally elected by the people, there is a lawful machinery already provided to meet that contingency and decide the question peacefully. It has not been recently used, no occasion presenting itself, but our forefathers provided it. It has been exercised and has been recognized and submitted to as lawful on every hand.

That machinery would probably elect Mr. Tilden President and Mr. Wheeler Vice President. That would be right enough, for the law provides that in a failure to elect duly by the people the House shall immediately elect the President and the Senate the Vice President. Some tribunal must decide whether or the people have duly elected a President. I presume of course, that it is in the joint affirmative action of the Senate and House, or why are they present to witness the count if not to see that it is fair and just? If a failure to agree arises between the two bodies there can be no lawful affirmative decision that the people have elected a President, and the House must then proceed to act, not the Senate. The Senate elects Vice Presidents not Presidents. Doubtless, in case of a failure by the House to elect a President by the 4th of March, the President of the Senate (if there be one) would be the legitimate person to exercise Presidential authority for the time being, or until the appearance of a lawful President, or for the time laid down by the Constitution. Such courses would be peaceful and I, I have firm belief, lawful.

I have no doubt Governor Hayes would make an excellent President. I have met him and know of him. For a brief period he served under my command, but as the matter stands I can't see any likelihood of his being declared elected by the people unless the Senate and House come to be in accord as to that fact, and the House would of course, not otherwise elect him. What the people want is a peaceful determination of this matter, as far as possible as possible and a lawful one. No other determination could stand the test. The country, if not plunged into revolution, would become poorer day by day; business would languish and our bonds would come home to find a depreciated market.

I was not in favor of the military action in South Carolina recently, and if General Ruger had telegraphed to me, or asked for advice, I would have advised him not under any circumstances to allow himself or his troops to determine who were the lawful members of a State Legislature. I could not have given him better advice than to refer him to the special message of the President in the case of Louisiana some time before. But in South Carolina he had the question settled by a decision of the Supreme Court of the State—the highest tribunal which had acted on the question—so that his line of duty seem even to be clearer than in the action of the Louisiana case. If the Federal court had interfered and overruled the decision of the State court there might have been a doubt certainly, but the Federal court only interfered to complicate, not to decide or overrule.

Anyhow, it is no business of the army to enter upon such questions, and even if it might be so, in any event, if the civil authority is supreme, as the Constitution declares it to be so, the South Carolina case was one in which the army had a plain duty. Had General Ruger asked me for advice, and if I had given it, I should, of course, have notified you of my action immediately, so that it could have been promptly overruled if it should have been deemed advisable by you or other superior authority. General Ruger did not ask for my advice and I inferred from that and other facts that he did not desire it, or that, being in direct communication with my military superiors at the seat of government—who were nearer to him in time and distance than I was—he deemed it unnecessary. As General Ruger had the ultimate responsibility of action and had really the greater danger to confront in the final action in the matter I did not venture to embarrass him by suggestions. He was a department commander and the lawful head of the military administration within the limits of the department; but, besides, I know that he had been called to Washington for consultation before taking command. I knew that he was in direct communication with my superiors in authority in reference to the delicate subjects presented for his consideration, or had ideas of his own which he believed to be sufficiently in accord with the views of our common superiors to enable him to act intelligently according to his judgment and without suggestions from those not on the spot and not as fully acquainted with the facts as himself. He desired, too, to be free to act, as he had the eventual greater responsibility, and so the matter was referred to him and myself.

As I have been writing thus freely to you I may still further unobscure myself by stating that I have not thought

instructed another. There might be danger in that and it was studiously left out of the charter.

But you are placed in an exceptionally important position in connection with coming events. The Capitol is in my jurisdiction also, but I am a subordinate and not on the spot, and if I were, so also would be my superior in authority, for there is the station of the General-in-Chief. On the principle that a regularly-elected President's term of office expires with the 3d of March (of which I have not the slightest doubt) and which the laws bearing on the subject uniformly recognize and in consideration of the possibility that the lawfully-elected President may not appear until the 5th of March, a great deal of responsibility may necessarily fall upon you. You hold over. You will have power and prestige to support you. The Secretary of War, too, probably holds over; but if no President appears he may not be able to exercise functions in the name of a President, for his proper acts are those of a known superior—a lawful president.

You act on your own responsibility and by virtue of a commission only restricted by the law. The Secretary of War is the mouthpiece of a President. You are not. If neither candidate has a constitutional majority of the Electoral College, or the Senate and House on the occasion of the count do not unite in declaring some person legally elected by the people, there is a lawful machinery already provided to meet that contingency and decide the question peacefully. It has not been recently used, no occasion presenting itself, but our forefathers provided it. It has been exercised and has been recognized and submitted to as lawful on every hand.

That machinery would probably elect Mr. Tilden President and Mr. Wheeler Vice President. That would be right enough, for the law provides that in a failure to elect duly by the people the House shall immediately elect the President and the Senate the Vice President. Some tribunal must decide whether or the people have duly elected a President. I presume of course, that it is in the joint affirmative action of the Senate and House, or why are they present to witness the count if not to see that it is fair and just? If a failure to agree arises between the two bodies there can be no lawful affirmative decision that the people have elected a President, and the House must then proceed to act, not the Senate. The Senate elects Vice Presidents not Presidents. Doubtless, in case of a failure by the House to elect a President by the 4th of March, the President of the Senate (if there be one) would be the legitimate person to exercise Presidential authority for the time being, or until the appearance of a lawful President, or for the time laid down by the Constitution. Such courses would be peaceful and I, I have firm belief, lawful.

I have no doubt Governor Hayes would make an excellent President. I have met him and know of him. For a brief period he served under my command, but as the matter stands I can't see any likelihood of his being declared elected by the people unless the Senate and House come to be in accord as to that fact, and the House would of course, not otherwise elect him. What the people want is a peaceful determination of this matter, as far as possible as possible and a lawful one. No other determination could stand the test. The country, if not plunged into revolution, would become poorer day by day; business would languish and our bonds would come home to find a depreciated market.

I was not in favor of the military action in South Carolina recently, and if General Ruger had telegraphed to me, or asked for advice, I would have advised him not under any circumstances to allow himself or his troops to determine who were the lawful members of a State Legislature. I could not have given him better advice than to refer him to the special message of the President in the case of Louisiana some time before. But in South Carolina he had the question settled by a decision of the Supreme Court of the State—the highest tribunal which had acted on the question—so that his line of duty seem even to be clearer than in the action of the Louisiana case. If the Federal court had interfered and overruled the decision of the State court there might have been a doubt certainly, but the Federal court only interfered to complicate, not to decide or overrule.

Anyhow, it is no business of the army to enter upon such questions, and even if it might be so, in any event, if the civil authority is supreme, as the Constitution declares it to be so, the South Carolina case was one in which the army had a plain duty. Had General Ruger asked me for advice, and if I had given it, I should, of course, have notified you of my action immediately, so that it could have been promptly overruled if it should have been deemed advisable by you or other superior authority. General Ruger did not ask for my advice and I inferred from that and other facts that he did not desire it, or that, being in direct communication with my military superiors at the seat of government—who were nearer to him in time and distance than I was—he deemed it unnecessary. As General Ruger had the ultimate responsibility of action and had really the greater danger to confront in the final action in the matter I did not venture to embarrass him by suggestions. He was a department commander and the lawful head of the military administration within the limits of the department; but, besides, I know that he had been called to Washington for consultation before taking command. I knew that he was in direct communication with my superiors in authority in reference to the delicate subjects presented for his consideration, or had ideas of his own which he believed to be sufficiently in accord with the views of our common superiors to enable him to act intelligently according to his judgment and without suggestions from those not on the spot and not as fully acquainted with the facts as himself. He desired, too, to be free to act, as he had the eventual greater responsibility, and so the matter was referred to him and myself.

As I have been writing thus freely to you I may still further unobscure myself by stating that I have not thought

SHERIFF'S SALES.

BY virtue of sundry writs of Fieri Facias, Levari Facias and Venditioni Exponas, issued out of the Court of Common Pleas of Centre county, and to me directed, there will be exposed at public sale at the Court House, in Belleville, on Saturday, August 21, A. D., 1880, at one o'clock, P. M., the following described real estate of the defendants, to wit:

No. 1. Suit of Henry Meyer vs. H. E. Weirick. No. 226 April term, 1879. Debt, \$85.50. A. L. F. No. 23 August term, 1880. Spangler, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of H. E. Weirick.

No. 2. Suit of Nancy J. Ammerman vs. Alfred Nichols. No. 175 Nov. term, 1877. Debt, \$11.20. A. L. F. No. 114 April term, 1880. Mott, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of H. E. Weirick.

No. 3. Suit of J. L. Rocky vs. H. D. Shewers. No. 429 Aug. term, 1878. Debt, \$50.70. Vend. ex. No. 11 term, 1880. Keighly, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in Walker township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of H. D. Shewers.

No. 4. Suit of Steinknecher & Bro. vs. John Campbell. No. 245 Nov. term, 1878. Debt, \$12.07. A. L. F. No. 11 term, 1880. Keighly, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in Belleville borough and Spring township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by Willow Bank at set, on the east by Holmes street, on the south by public road leading from Holmes street, on the west by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of John Campbell.

No. 5. Suit of Lucas & Bro. vs. Reuben Pletcher. No. 102 Aug. term, 1877. F. S. No. 11 term, 1880. Debt, \$42.40. Y. & H. Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in Howard township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Reuben Pletcher.

No. 6. Suit of Mary M. DeArman vs. Geo. House et al. No. 43 April term, 1880. Debt, \$250. Vend. ex. No. 11 term, 1880. Keighly, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of land situated in Spring township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Geo. House et al.

No. 7. Suit of Geo. Grimm et al. vs. R. D. Cummings. No. 119 Aug. term, 1877. Debt, \$32.50. Vend. ex. No. 11 term, 1880. Y. & H. Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of land situated in the village of Port Matilda, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of R. D. Cummings.

No. 8. Suit of Wm. Wolf vs. Daniel Durt. No. 222 November term, 1878. Debt, \$553.38. A. L. F. No. 7 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in Liberty township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Daniel Durt.

No. 9. Suit of J. H. Orvis et al. vs. A. Stewart et al. No. 227 April term, 1876. Debt, \$47.32. Vend. ex. No. 7 August term, 1880. Y. & H. Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of land situated in Spring township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of A. Stewart et al.

No. 10. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Ulrich Wilson. No. 144 January term, 1880. Debt, \$40.50. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building located on a lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Ulrich Wilson.

No. 11. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Geo. Sharp, owner, et al. No. 322 August term, 1878. Debt, \$254.18. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building located on a lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Geo. Sharp, owner, et al.

No. 12. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. A. V. Miller et al. No. 142 January term, 1880. Debt, \$30.00. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building situated in Spring township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of A. V. Miller et al.

Suit of Jacob Mann vs. John Mann. No. 148 Aug. term, 1877. Debt, \$158.86. A. L. F. No. 3 August term, 1880. Fortney, Atty.

All that certain tract of land situated in Centre township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by lands of Hiram Young, on the east by lands of James Haverly, on the south by lands of Robert Mann and on the west by lands of John A. Daley—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a two-story frame house, log stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of John Mann.

No. 14. Suit of Ferdinand Bower vs. Mary Meyers, Administratrix of Joseph Bower, deceased. No. 114 April term, 1880. Debt, \$172.28. Lev. fa. No. 57 August term, 1880. Mott, Atty.

All that certain tract of land situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Mary Meyers, Administratrix of Joseph Bower, deceased.

No. 15. Suit of H. Lavy vs. D. H. Parsons. No. 128 August term, 1880. Debt, \$130.00. F. S. No. 5 August term, 1880. First, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of land situated in the village of Millsburg, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by Willow Bank at set, on the east by Holmes street, on the south by public road leading from Holmes street, on the west by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of D. H. Parsons.

No. 16. Suit of Sol Schmidt vs. P. Donahue, Administratrix, et al. No. 263 January term, 1877. Debt, \$153.44. Vend. ex. No. 11 August term, 1880. Keighly, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in Rush township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north and northwest by Moshannon Creek, on the east and southeast by lot of John Burdick, on the east and southwest by all the lands of the township, on the north by Phillipsburg to Curwensville—containing one and one-fourth acres, more or less. No buildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Mrs. Patrick Collins and Patrick Collins.

No. 17. Suit of Hagerstown Agricultural Implement Company vs. Michael Bessler, et al. No. 261 Nov. term, 1877. Debt, \$147.25. Vend. ex. No. 8 August term, 1880. Y. & H. Atty.

All that certain tract or piece of land situated in Beaver township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Wm. C. Rumberger, on the east by lands of Philip Reside and on the west by lands of Leah Levy—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a one and a half story frame house, log barn and other outbuildings.

No. 18. Suit of heirs and legal representatives of Joel Kling, Sr., vs. Joel Kling, Jr. No. 67 April term, 1878. Debt, \$66.92. F. S. No. 8 August term, 1880. Keighly, Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of ground situated in Marion township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by Main street, on the east by road leading to Jacksonville, south by lands of Adam Yarrick and on the west by lands of George H. Schaeffer—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a two-story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Joel Kling, Jr.

No. 19. Suit of heirs and legal representatives of Joel Kling, Sr., vs. Joel Kling, Jr. No. 67 April term, 1878. Debt, \$66.92. F. S. No. 8 August term, 1880. Keighly, Atty.

All that certain tract of land situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Joel Kling, Jr.

No. 20. Suit of J. H. Orvis et al. vs. A. Stewart et al. No. 227 April term, 1876. Debt, \$47.32. Vend. ex. No. 7 August term, 1880. Y. & H. Atty.

All that certain lot or piece of land situated in Spring township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of A. Stewart et al.

No. 21. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Ulrich Wilson. No. 144 January term, 1880. Debt, \$40.50. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building located on a lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Ulrich Wilson.

No. 22. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Geo. Sharp, owner, et al. No. 322 August term, 1878. Debt, \$254.18. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building located on a lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Geo. Sharp, owner, et al.

No. 23. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. A. V. Miller et al. No. 142 January term, 1880. Debt, \$30.00. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building situated in Spring township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of A. V. Miller et al.

street and Allegheny street in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of A. V. Miller et al.

No. 24. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Ulrich Wilson. No. 144 January term, 1880. Debt, \$40.50. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building located on a lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Ulrich Wilson.

No. 25. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Geo. Sharp, owner, et al. No. 322 August term, 1878. Debt, \$254.18. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building located on a lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Geo. Sharp, owner, et al.

No. 26. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. A. V. Miller et al. No. 142 January term, 1880. Debt, \$30.00. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building situated in Spring township, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of A. V. Miller et al.

No. 27. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Ulrich Wilson. No. 144 January term, 1880. Debt, \$40.50. Lev. fa. No. 6 August term, 1880. A. & B. Atty.

All that certain building located on a lot or piece of ground situated in the borough of Belleville, Centre county, Pa., bounded on the north by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by land of Amos Fahs, on the west and south by land of Joseph Krosner, on the east by lot of Amos Fahs, and on the north by public road—containing 1/4 acre, more or less; thereon erected a 1 1/2 story frame house, stable and other outbuildings. Seized, taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Ulrich Wilson.

No. 28. Suit of D. M. Leib Adm' vs. Geo. Sharp, owner, et al