

The Centre Democrat.

BELLE FORT, PA.

The Largest, Cheapest and Best Paper
PUBLISHED IN CENTRE COUNTY.

Take Your Choice.

Here are integrity, honesty, bravery—
Here are rascality, bribery, knavery—
Here is a plain and old-fashioned capacity—
Here is a sample of greed and rapacity—
Here is one blameless, just as from the start he was—
There is one baser than ever his party was—
Here is a man with a record unblemished yet—
There is a man who has been false to the trust of us—
What can he claim but the blame and disgust of us—
Here is a man whose word is verity—
One who is noted for truth and sincerity—
There is a man who has been false to the trust of us—
How as a leader can he be a guide to us—
—N. Y. Sun.

TORN BY A MUSKET BALL.

The Nature and Cause of Hancock's
Wound at Gettysburg.

His Fall Upon the Field of Battle—Statement
of the Surgeon Who Extracted
the Bullet—What Gen. Mitchell
Knows About It.

NORRISTOWN, Pa., Sept. 28.—Mr. Francis Jordan, ex-Secretary of State, having, in a recent speech at Harrisburg, made use of "Col. Baxter's" contemptible aspersion of Gen. Hancock's conduct at Gettysburg, Mr. Ovid F. Johnson wrote a letter to Dr. L. W. Read, of this place, inquiring into the nature of Hancock's wound. Dr. Read was the General's attendant surgeon after his removal from the battle-field to be cared for at Norristown. Following is the statement made by Mr. Jordan in his Harrisburg speech:

On his arrival on the field of Gettysburg, Gen. Hancock reported to Gen. Slocum, and from a peculiar cannonading accident was struck in the back with a nail from a board fence; he was taken to the hospital, where he remained until the fight was over. From sworn testimony from persons who were near the General when he was wounded it can be shown that he was not in command, and did not fight the battle as is claimed by his friends.

In answer to Mr. Johnson's inquiry, Dr. Read wrote as follows:

DEAR SIR: Your communication dated September 18 has been received. In response to your interrogatory, "Did you extract a bullet from Gen. Hancock after the battle of Gettysburg?" I did—a conical one of large size. It entered the anterior and upper third of the thigh, just inside of the femoral artery, penetrated eight inches and was imbedded in one of the bones of the pelvis. The operation was performed nearly two months after the receipt of the injury."

This conclusively settled the question as to the nature of the wound and the cause of it. But it did not settle another point in the dispute, and communication was at once opened with Gen. William G. Mitchell, which resulted in the receipt of the appended history of the manner and time in which Gen. Hancock was wounded at Gettysburg. It appears in the columns of the Norristown Register. Gen. Mitchell at that battle was Gen. Hancock's assistant adjutant-general, and, although not present at the time Gen. Hancock was wounded, was with him a few minutes after he fell:

"At Gettysburg, where Gen. Hancock commanded the left center of the army, July 3, 1863, he received a wound which was supposed, at the time, to be mortal. He was struck by a musket ball while on his line of battle just at the moment of the enemy's grand final assault on the third day. The ball passed through the front of his saddle and carried into the wound with it a large wrought nail from the saddle tree. The bullet and nail entered near the groin, the ball passing back through the thigh and lodging near the socket of the thigh bone, which it slightly splintered. The Gen. was assisted from his horse by two officers of Gen. Stannard's staff, who were near him at the time. He remained upon the ground until the assaulting column had been driven entirely from the field—giving orders to his troops (from the point at which he lay he could see the field of battle by raising himself on his elbow), and from that point he sent one of his aids to inform Gen. Meade that we had won a great victory.

"This wound so disabled Gen. Hancock as to unfit him for field service until the following December, when he returned to the army of the Potomac and resumed command of the Second Corps, to take part in the campaign of 1864. The wound, however, had not healed and gave him great trouble and annoyance during the campaign, and although he continued with his command, he was obliged to travel in an ambulance a great portion of the time. His habit on the march was to remain in his ambulance at the head of his column until in the vicinity of the enemy, when he mounted his horse and so remained until the fighting was over. During the whole of the summer of 1864 he was daily attended by a surgeon, on account of his wound, which at that

time was much irritated and discharging more or less all the time, small portions of the bone at times passing from it. While in front of the enemy's works at Petersburg, Va., in June 1864, when the troops were constantly under fire and the General was obliged to be mounted nearly all of the time both day and night, his wound became so inflamed and dangerous that he was compelled to relinquish command of the corps for a few days (June 17, after the bloody fight of that day was over,) he turned over the command to his next in rank. He did not, however, leave the field, but continued with the troops, and again assumed command of the corps June 27, finding himself much relieved by the discharge of quite a large piece of bone from the wound. He continued to suffer from his wound during all the remaining time of the war, and indeed felt serious effects from it to this time, March, 1873."

The Mysterious Figures.

A Bourbon (Ind.) despatch of Sept. 21st tells of an unexampled excitement which prevailed in that place at the time stated. It says:

We are having a unique time out here. On Saturday night several small boys chalked the mysterious figures.

\$329

all over the city. They appeared on every fence, wall, post and curb from one end of the city to the other. They were chalked on the doors of the Post Office and of the Campbellite church. Even the thresholds of distinguished citizens did not escape. All the Hancock men in town began to laugh, and a fair share of the Garfield men began to curse. About midnight a brigade of Republicans armed with mops, scrubbing brushes, brooms, and pails of water, scattered itself all over the city, and began to wash out the figures. Small boys, however, travelled in the wake of the scrubs, and the figures

\$329

re-appeared as fast as erased. After five hours work the scrubbing brigade went home in disgust. Senator Allison, of Iowa, was announced to speak on the following Monday. He received telegraphic notice of the cropping out of the mysterious figures, and halted within forty miles of the city. After a council of war he took track for home. On Monday the excitement broke out afresh. Half a dozen prominent Republicans appeared on the street with the mysterious figures chalked on their backs. A distinguished Campbellite clergyman awoke at 7 A. M., and was enraged to find

\$329

on the soles of his boots. Little white flags bearing the cabalistic symbols floated from various points. A Garfield butcher went into hysterics because some one had inscribed the figures on the collar of his dog. The Hancock men laughed more heartily than ever, and the Garfield men cursed like an army in Flanders. They were even more excited than they were when they received the news of their defeat from Maine. After again vainly trying to wash out the figures they threatened to resort to the shotgun policy. These threats made the Hancock men roar with laughter. The curses of the Garfield crowd were so appalling that even the imported colored element stood aghast. The worst or best of it is that the

\$329

mania has spread to adjoining towns, and it threatens to run over northern Indiana like wildfire. If it reaches Ohio the Lord alone knows what will happen.

\$329.

Garfield not the Soldier's Friend.

From the Doylestown Democrat.

Garfield is one of the most unfortunate men who ever sat in Congress. He was not only the friend of all the jobs which came before the House, but he was just as persistent in his opposition to measures which should have met the support of every member. While he voted for all the land grants to railroads, and to increase his own pay 50 per cent, and to date back two years, he voted to cut down the wages of printers in the government office. In a speech on the subject he said he thought they got too much pay. In 1864, he voted against increasing the pay of soldiers to \$20 per month. In 1865, a bill was introduced into the House to increase the pay of both officers and men of the army; but Garfield opposed the increase of the men's pay, and favored increasing the officers'. In 1862, he voted against giving honorably discharged soldiers 160 acres of land each, and this in the face of voting away one hundred and ninety-six millions of acres to railroads. When the bill came up in Congress to grant pensions to the few surviving soldiers of the War of 1812, Garfield voted against it; and he likewise voted against granting pensions to the surviving soldiers, or their widows, of the Mexican war. With this record before their eyes, how can Garfield be claimed as the soldier's friend?

If I were President I would veto all legislation which might come before me providing for the consideration or payment of claims of any kind for losses or damages by persons who were in the Rebellion, whether pardoned or not.—Gen. Hancock's letter of Sept. 23.

The Effect Upon Business Interests.

The favorite argument against a change of administration is the injury that will be done to the business interests of the country. To listen to the speeches and to read the articles upon this subject it might be inferred that the country was really in the keeping of the Republican party, and would go straightway to ruin if not looked after by its candidates. Milton described an eclipse as "shedding disastrous twilight on half the nations, and with fear of change perplexing monarchs," but an eclipse was never half such a bugaboo as the probable election of General Hancock, if we are to judge from what we read in Republican papers. Those who write and talk such stuff must have a very low opinion of the good sense of the people of the United States, for they know very well that the fact is the country gets along as well as it does in spite of the politicians, and not because of their protecting care. Two or three very plain propositions will dispose of the pretense that the success of any party is essential to our welfare:

First. The men who constitute the administration to-day, with one or two exceptions, never had ability enough to manage their own business in such a way as to greatly distinguish themselves, and if Mr. Hayes never became anything more than a second or third rate lawyer in a small city like Cincinnati it is absurd to suppose that by making him President he could be forthwith made capable of controlling the business interests of the whole country. Mr. Evans was, of course, of a higher grade; but, after all, he was pretty accurately described by the late Judge Grier as "a mere sentence monger." Mr. Sherman has shown fair business capacity in his own affairs, but there are fifty men on Third street and twice fifty on Wall street who are his superiors, and there is not one of the rest of them who could get half the salary in any private corporation he now receives. It is a hackneyed quotation of the saying of Chancellor Oxenstiern: "Go, my son, and see with what little wisdom the world is governed." But the greatest lack of wisdom is on the part of the governed when they come to think they owe everything to their rulers; for, certainly, if the men in office have not succeeded in private life, it is folly to suppose that they are any better capable to manage the affairs of other people. If the country really needed to be taken care of, it would be in a bad way in such hands. But, luckily, the great American people have it and themselves in their own keeping, and if they wish to change their servants—not their rulers—they need not and will not be afraid to do it.

Second. If all our present prosperity is due to the Republican party, how does it happen that in 1873, when the panic occurred, and during the long years of the steady decline in values thereafter, the Republican party, having full control of all departments of the government, did not arrest the depreciation and ruin, and restore confidence and prosperity? And why was it that it was not until the Democratic party had acquired control of the House of Representatives that there was a check to the fall, and not until it had secured the Senate the reaction set in? If we were to judge by the order of events, we might say the Republican party was responsible for the breakdown in 1873, and the Democrats entitled to the credit of the revival of business which began to show itself in 1878, and fairly set in by 1879; but the truth is that this, too, would be absurd. The advance in prices, which is sometimes mistaken for prosperity, went on all over the world till 1873, and the decline was equally universal till 1879, and for these general movements up and down neither party is responsible. Third. It does not follow, however, that it is a matter of indifference to business men whether one party or the other gets in. The mania for railway building, stimulated by improvident land grants, had much to do with the unnatural high prices of 1872 and the completeness of the collapse that followed the next year, and the misgovernment and plundering of the Southern States from 1865 to 1876 delayed the restoration of prosperity in that section. The Republican policy was certainly fairly tested down there, and if we are to believe the accounts given by Republicans themselves, it only led to the robbery and massacre of the negroes. That policy was given up four years ago, and by common consent good order now prevails; the negroes are well paid and well fed, and while we hear a great deal about the wheat crop making resumption possible, the value of cotton exported is almost equal to that of both wheat and flour—\$212,000,000 last year, as against about \$225,000,000—and if it had not been for Republican misrule in the South, we might have had "the good times" a year or two sooner. Fortunately, what has been done in the South cannot be undone, and there is no great chance for mischief left. Upon the whole, therefore, we do not think it greatly matters whether one half-dozen of men or another sit around the Cabinet table in Washington during the next four years. So long as prices keep

going up, the people will think themselves prosperous, and when the turn comes, four or five or ten years hence, they will think that the world has come to an end again; but whether they are to be rich or poor, successful or unfortunate, will depend upon their own conduct. If they wish to be happy, they must be virtuous, and that is all there is about it.

How Votes Are Made for Hancock.

To the Editor of the World.

SIR: At a Republican mass-meeting held at New London, this county, yesterday, and addressed by W. H. Gibson, of "Ohio treasury fame," there was a large banner carried over a wagon load of young ladies representing the different States, the banner in question bearing this motto:

"Arnold, a Traitor,
Sept. 23, 1780.
Sept. 23, 1880,
Is Hancock one?"

This, of course, was authorized by the Republican committee. It was carried in the procession. It stood for an hour in the principal street of the town, and I have not heard this infamous insult denounced by a single Republican.

Now, Mr. Editor, I was a soldier in Hancock's old Second Corps. I received a wound—causing the loss of my leg—at the battle of Gettysburg. While being carried from the field I saw General Hancock riding at the head of a column of infantry, through a perfect storm of bullets, to close up the ranks. The next day he fell on the front line of battle. I have never voted the Democratic ticket in my life, but shall vote for "Hancock and Union" this fall. My blood boils as I think of this scandalous insult to one of the most glorious soldiers and men of this or any other country. I wonder if the soldiers of the Potomac Army will stand calmly by and see themselves degraded by this insult to General Hancock and still vote with the party that perpetrates this infamy?

If any one is disposed to doubt the exact truth of this statement, I can furnish the names of any number of eye-witnesses to the outrage.

Respectfully, F. B. NICKERSON,
Late Sergeant, Co. K, 8th O. V. I.
Greenwich, Huron Co., Sept. 24, '80.

A Question of not Much Consequence.

Mr. John Sherman, recently, in a speech delivered at Washington, said that when the war broke out every Republican rallied to the flag, and the rebels were all Democrats. Mr. Sherman was then an able-bodied man and a Republican, but he did not rally to the flag, although he made, it is said, a good deal of money during the war. His brother, General Sherman, did the fighting for the family. Mr. John Sherman's assertion is still further untrue. The rebels were not all Democrats. They were Democrats and Whigs and Americans, and were divided in politics, just as the Northern soldiers were. From localities where Democrats were in the majority, there went to the war a majority of Democratic soldiers, and from localities where the Republicans predominated there went more Republican soldiers. There is no way of determining the respective numbers of Democrats and Republicans among the rank and file, but we can judge somewhat by the politics of the generals who went into the service when the war broke out. Not that the generals were entitled to more credit than the rank and file. Generally the generals did not amount to a great deal. The Union army was immense in the able qualities of its high privates, its corporals, and its sergeants, for they did good fighting and won victories often where the generalship was very bad. But who were the Republican generals when the war broke out?

McClellan, the organizer of the great Army of the Potomac, was a Democrat; so was Fighting Joe Hooker, dead now, alas! and not here to vote, as he fought, with Hancock; so was Meade a Democrat, and Baldy Smith, the head of the National Association of Hancock Veterans, and C. F. Smith, and Thomas, the hero of Chickamauga, and McPherson, and Lyon, and Gordon Granger, and the noble Sedgwick, and Canby, and Mansfield, and Reynolds, who gave his life at Gettysburg, and Heinzelman, and Meagher, and Corcoran, and Wool, and Griffin, and Bayard, and Custer, and Sykes, and Sherman, and Rosecrans, and Buell, and Steedman, and Williams, and Keyes, and Couch, and Logan, and Ward, and Franklin, and Averell, and Morell, and Schofield, and Sweeney, and Sickles, and Stoneman, and Morgan, and Hartman, and Fitz John Porter, and the McCooks—five of them—all from one family, and John Corse, who held the fort at Altoona, and Ben Butler, and U. S. Grant—a Breckenridge Democrat by the way—and last, but easily greatest of them all, the hero of the battle that broke the back of the rebellion, the peerless Hancock of Gettysburg. And in the navy there were a few notable Democrats, such as Farragut, and Worden, and Porter. There were Republican generals, it is true; there was General Banks, who was a General only in a very general sort of a way, and there was Carl Schurz, too, the great piano player of the White

House. Frank Blair was a Republican. Gen. Sigel was a Republican. He is on the stump for Hancock now, and doing splendid service, and all the Germans are "fighting mit Sigel, too." Tom Ewing, of Ohio, was a Republican, but he is working for Hancock now; so is Palmer, once the Republican Governor of Illinois. Henry W. Slocum, the illustrious soldier who commanded the left wing of Sherman's army on the march to the sea, was a Republican; he is on the stump for Hancock now. Banks and Schurz alone, of all the Generals we have named, were Republicans when the war broke out and are Republicans now, and there were but six altogether, who, according to John Sherman, rallied to the flag when the war broke out. And shall Mr. Sherman, in view of these undisputed facts, assert uncontradicted that the Democrats were all rebels, and that only the Republicans rallied to the flag?

The Southern Bugaboos.

Hon. H. A. Herbert, member of Congress from the Second district of Alabama, upon being notified of his renomination, made a speech bearing directly on the senseless attempt of the Republicans to frighten honest voters into accepting a tainted candidate for the Presidency by pretending to believe that the election of General Hancock would lead to the payment of all sorts of Southern claims. Quoting the eloquent passage from Hancock's letter of acceptance; in which he speaks of the Union as the main pillar in the edifice of our real independence, Mr. Herbert added that if we could only get the masses of the North, those who are honest voters and not office-seekers, to understand and know that this is the sentiment that actuates us, that we recognize the results of the war fully, that we support the constitution with all its amendments, that we protect and guard the rights of these freedmen who constitute so large a part of this audience, we should add thousands of votes to Hancock in November. But every vile slander that ingenuity can invent and malice can perpetrate is being distilled into the ears of the Northern people. John Sherman, in a speech made at Cincinnati, actually stooped so low as to tell the people of the North that if the Democracy got in power they would claim pay for its slaves. I see that Porter, candidate for Governor, is repeating the same stuff in Indiana on that stump. The idea is so preposterous that it passes my understanding that any voter could be influenced by it, but such men as Porter and Sherman would not condescend to use such an argument if they did not believe they could make votes by it. To catch a vote there is nothing they would not say. This is a hard saying, but I am justified in it when men of their intelligence resort to such arguments. Look at it. The South contains scarcely more than a third of the voting population of the Union. The slaveholders were not a third of the Southern white people. Since the freedmen have become voters the former slaveholders are not more than one-eighth of our voters. To pay this one-eighth of our people we would have to saddle the other seven-eighths of our people with a debt of one hundred and fifty millions of dollars. Why, if we were separated from the North by a gulf so wide and deep that the lightning of the telegraph could not leap it, we could not pass such a law. Fellow-citizens, this is a Democratic district. I am the Democratic nominee. I believe I am acceptable to the party, but if I should seriously announce to the people that I was in favor of taxing the voters who were never slaveholders to pay those who were, I could not be elected. I could not carry a county in the district. There is not a district in the South that could be carried on any such platform. When, then, Mr. Sherman announces that there is danger that the former slaveholders of the South will make the whole United States pay one hundred and fifty millions of dollars for the liberated slaves—well, my friends, I will only say he knows better. Another slander he indulges in is that if Democracy is successful will endeavor to pension Confederate soldiers for the Confederate war. Gentlemen, I was a Confederate. I bear on my person scars received in fighting under the Southern cross. I yield to no man in love for my dead comrades or in sympathy for the living heroes of that Confederacy. Yet it never came into my mind in the wildest flights of my imagination, nor did it ever cross yours, that the government of the United States or any other government could afford to pension soldiers for fighting against it. It is equally untrue that we could or would embarrass the government with claims for quarter masters' stores taken during the war. All we ask is the right of local self-government! We don't want to control the domestic affairs of Indiana. They know how to govern themselves in these matters better than we do, and we know how to control domestic affairs better than they do. We want a fair shake in the blessings of honest government. We demand to be admitted to a full and free participation in its benefits as equals, and we do not expect the government to enrich its people, for the government has nothing but what it takes from the people. But I cannot waste time in answering Sherman's slanders here

before this audience. I only wish the people who listen to him were down here to listen to me and to shake you by the hands and talk to you. Then they would find out how the people of the South are slandered, and they would spurn their deceivers from them, and in November next they would rise in their might and rebuke, by an overwhelming defeat, this Republican party as a disturber of the peace of the people.

Gen. Garfield's Credit Mobilier Record.

From his own sworn testimony before the Poland Committee, Jan. 14, 1873.

I never owned, received or agreed to receive any stock of the Credit Mobilier of the Union Pacific Railroad nor any dividends or profits arising from either of them.

From Judge Poland's report, Feb. 18, 1873.

The facts in regard to Mr. Garfield, as found by the committee, are that he agreed with Mr. Ames to take ten shares of Credit Mobilier stock, but did not pay for the same. Mr. Ames received the eighty per cent. dividend in bonds and sold them for ninety-seven per cent. and also received the sixty per cent. cash dividend, which together with the price of stock and interest, left a balance of \$329. This sum was paid over to Mr. Garfield by a check on the sergeant-at-arms and Mr. Garfield then understood this sum was the balance of dividends after paying for the stock.

From the New York Times, February 19, 1873.

Messrs. Kelly and Garfield present a most distressing figure. Their participation in the Credit Mobilier affair is complicated by the most unfortunate contractions of testimony.

From the New York Times, February 20, 1873.

The character of the Credit Mobilier was no secret. The source of its profits was very well known at the time Congressmen bought it. Though Oakes Ames may have succeeded in concealing his own motive, which was to bribe Congressmen, their acceptance of the stock was not on that account innocent. The dishonor of the act, as a participation in an obvious fraud, still remains.

Some of them have indulged in testimony with reference to the matter which has been contradicted. The committee distinctly rejects the testimony of several of the members. This can only be done on the ground that it is untrue. But untrue testimony given under oath is morally, if not legally, perjury.

It is the clear duty of Congress to visit with punishment all who took Credit Mobilier stock from Oakes Ames.

From the New York Tribune, February 19, 1873.

James A. Garfield, of Ohio, had ten shares; never paid a dollar; received \$329, which, after the investigation began, he was anxious to have considered as a loan from Mr. Oakes Ames to himself.

Well, the wickedness of all of it is that these men betrayed the trust of the people, deceived their constituents and, by evasions and falsehoods, confessed the transaction to be disgraceful.

From the New York Tribune, Feb. 26, 1873.

Mr. Ames establishes very clearly the point that he was not alone in this offense. If he is to be expelled for bribery, the men who were bribed should go with him.

CENTRAL STATE NORMAL SCHOOL

(Eighth Normal School District.)
LOCK HAVEN, CLINTON CO., PA.

A. N. RAUB, A. M., Principal.

THIS SCHOOL, as at present constituted, offers the very best facilities for Professional and Classical learning.

Buildings spacious, inviting and commodious; completely heated by steam, well ventilated, and furnished with a bountiful supply of pure water, soft spring water.

Location beautiful and easy of access. Surrounding scenery unsurpassed.

Teachers experienced, efficient, and alive to their work.

Discipline, firm and kind, uniform and thorough. Expenses moderate.

Fifty cents a week deduction to those preparing to teach.

Students admitted at any time. Courses of study prescribed by the State: I. Vol. School. II. Preparatory. III. Elementary. IV. Scientific.

ADJUNCT COURSES

I. Academic. II. Commercial. III. Music. IV. Art. The Elementary and Scientific courses are Professional, and students graduating therein receive Diplomas, conferring the following corresponding degrees: Master of the Elements, and Master of the Sciences. Graduates in the other courses receive Normal Certificates of their attainments, signed by the Faculty.

The Professional courses are liberal, and are in thoroughness not inferior to those of our best colleges. The State requires a higher order of citizenship. The times demand it. It is one of the prime objects of this school to help to secure it by furnishing intelligent and efficient teachers for her schools. To this end it selects young persons of good abilities and good purposes—those who desire to improve their time and their talents, as students. To all such it promises aid in developing their powers and abundant opportunities for well-paid labor after leaving school.

For catalogue and terms address the Principal.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES: Stockholders' Trustees—J. H. Barton, M. D., A. H. Best, Jacob Brown, S. M. Bickford, Samuel Christ, A. N. Raub, R. G. Cook, T. C. Hippie, Esq., G. Kisting, E. P. McCormick, Esq., W. W. Rankin, Wm. H. Brown, State Trustees—Hon. A. G. Curtin, Hon. H. L. Diefenbach, Gen. Jesse Merrill, Hon. William Eglar, J. C. C. Whaley, S. Miller McCormick, Esq., OFFICERS.

Hon. WILLIAM BICKFORD, President, Clearfield, Pa. Gen. JESSE MERRILL, V. President, Lock Haven, Pa. S. MILLAR MCCORMICK, Secretary, " " THOMAS YARDLEY, Treasurer, " "

WOODWARD SEMINARY.

Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies and Little Children.

SECOND AND LOCUST STREETS, HARRISBURG, PA.

Regular term will begin SEPTEMBER 16, 1878. Course of study—Classical and Scientific, with Music and Art.

Board and tuition from \$250 to \$300 a year and no extra. For circulars and all desirable information address 21-2m PRINCIPAL.

PATENTS.

PATENTS procured upon Inventions. No ATTORNEY'S FEE IN ADVANCE. Our Office was established in 1860. We file PATENTS, and obtain TRADE MARKS, DESIGN PATENTS, &c.

INVENTORS send us a Model of your Invention, with your own description of it, for our opinion as to patentability. No ATTORNEY'S FEE UNLESS PATENT IS SECURED. Our Book of Instructions, &c., "How to Proceed with Patenting," sent free on request; also sample copies of the Scientific Record, the Inventor's Journal.

R. S. A. P. LACEY, Patent Attorneys, 604 F St., near Patent Office, Washington, D. C.

GARMAN'S HOTEL.

Opposite Court House, BELLEFONTE, PA. TERMS \$1.25 PER DAY.

A good Livery attached. 1-17

For Sale.

A FARM containing Fifty Acres, and having thereon erected a TWO-STORY FRAME BUILDING and out buildings. Title good. Inquire of A. J. & T. E. GIBST, 3-4

Unionville, Centre county, Pa.