Bradford Reporter.

EDITORS:
L. S. GOODRICH. S. W. ALVORD.

Towanda, Pa., Thursday, Oct. 14, 1875.

REPUBLICAN STATE TICKET.

FOR GOVERNOR.
GEN. JOHN F. HARTRANFT.
Of Montgomery.
FOR STATE TREASURER.
HENRY RAWLE.
Of Erie County.

REPUBLICAN COUNTY TICKET.

FOR SHERIFF.
ANDREW J. LAYTON.
Of Litchfield.
FOR PROTHONOTARY.
CAPT. BENJAMIN M. PECK.
Of Towanda Borough.
FOR REGISTER AND RECORDER.
CEPHAS E. ANDRUS.
Of Canton Borough.
FOR TREASURER.
MAJ. J. C. ROBINSON.
Of Ridgbury.
FOR COMMISSIONERS.
CAPT. GEORGE W. KILMER.
Of Asylum.
MORRIS J. COOLBAUGH.
Of Wysox.
FOR AUDITOR.
HANVERSE BOURNE.
Of West Burlington.
J. R. BRASTED.
Of Wells.
FOR CORONER.
D. B. WALKER.
Of Ulster.

Republican Mass Meetings.

Republican Meetings will be held at the following places, on the dates indicated. The meetings will be addressed by able speakers, whose names will be announced in posters previous to the day of each meeting:

FRIDAY EVENING, Oct. 8.
Hahn's School House, Albany.
MONDAY EVENING, Oct. 11.
Center School House, Asylum.
Mountain Lake.
TUESDAY EVENING, Oct. 12.
Canton Boro.
WEDNESDAY EVENING, Oct. 13.
LeRoy.
THURSDAY EVENING, Oct. 14.
Horn Brook.
FRIDAY EVENING, Oct. 15.
Monroeton.
Armenia.
Franklinville.
MONDAY EVENING, Oct. 18.
Rome Boro.
Liberty Corners.
Gaffney's Mills.
Scott's School House, Towanda Twp.
Ferry.
Litchfield Center.
TUESDAY EVENING, Oct. 19.
Windham.
WEDNESDAY EVENING, Oct. 20.
Stevensville.
Bones Hill.
East Canton.
THURSDAY EVENING, Oct. 21.
Derrick, Dailyaay School House.
Green Center.
FRIDAY EVENING, Oct. 22.
West Franklin.
Chent.
Standing Stone.
Litchfield.
Smithville, Ridgbury twp.
Green's Landing, Athens twp.
SATURDAY EVENING, Oct. 23.
Sheshequin.
MONDAY EVENING, Oct. 25.
Burlington Boro.
Towner Hill.
Tuscarora.
TUESDAY EVENING, Oct. 26.
West Burlington.
Negro.
Overton.
Patterville.
Springfield Center.
Ulster.
Wilmot.
WEDNESDAY EVENING, Oct. 27.
Sylvania.
South Creek.
West Granville.
THURSDAY EVENING, Oct. 28.
Gustavus.
Herrickville.
Wyalusing.
LeRoy.
Bardwell School House, Springfield twp.
FRIDAY EVENING, Oct. 29.
Granville Center.
Welles.
Grover.
SATURDAY EVENING, Oct. 30.
Bailey Creek.
Wysox.
M. E. Church near Stones LeRoy.
MONDAY EVENING, Nov. 1st.
Barclay.

REPORTER FOR THE CAMPAIGN.

We will mail the REPORTER from this date to the close of the present campaign, or November 10, for 25 cents.

CHABOD:

The present Register and Recorder, Mr. CHUBBUCK, is before the public as a candidate for re-election. He appears in print with the reasons which strike him as making his continuance in office a matter of propriety and public necessity. We have read his statements, and the only excuse we can find therein for his betrayal of his party and his assumption that he should be re-elected, is, that his predecessors have charged and collected illegal fees.

Mr. CHUBBUCK was a candidate for re-nomination at the hands of the Republican County Convention. He did not secure a sufficient number of votes, and his neighbors in his own town (Orwell) refused him their delegates. There is no pretence or claim that he has been unfairly treated by anybody, but he simply failed to secure a re-nomination because there was a public sentiment against it. Under ordinary circumstances, an honorable man who submits his claims to a nominating convention expects to abide the decision of that body, and this rule is recognized as binding by fair-minded men of all parties. Mr. CHUBBUCK having made himself a candidate for re-nomination, and having taken part in the primary meetings and allowed his name to be brought before the Convention, became bound, in fairness and honor, to acquiesce in the decision, unless there was such manifest impropriety in its proceedings as would absolve everybody from respecting its action. Mr. CHUBBUCK does not, nor dare not, make any such assertion; but he simply failed, because the Republican voters saw no good reason why he should be continued three years longer in office, in preference to a soldier who had lost a limb on the battle-field.

Mr. CHUBBUCK is a respectable man, of whom we would not willingly say an unkind word. His present attitude is of his own seeking, and he must abide the consequences. But he must allow us to say to him, in all kindness, that by the course he has taken he is forfeiting his fair renown, and will lose the confidence and respect of honorable and upright men of all parties. He has been a professed Republican, of the strictest sect. He has been elected as such to office for *nine* years, and he is still the incumbent of a lucrative office, to which he was chosen by Republican votes. But Mr. CHUBBUCK, like many a better man before him, has been in office so long that he has come to consider the office as being his property, and he will not give it up until the people give him notice to quit. He has to learn from experience what good sense should have taught him,—that more men are destroyed politically by their greed for office, and their not knowing when to quit, than from any other cause.

It is not too late for Mr. CHUBBUCK to repair the great mistake he has made—and regard for the honored name he bears (if for no other reason) should cause him to hasten to do it. It is useless for him to say that he has not made bargains with the Democracy to betray and sell out the candidates of the Republican party. Our opponents do not forego a nomination and give the field to a bolting candidate, without good reason to expect some profit therefrom. Mr. CHUBBUCK can never convince the public that he has not made a contract with the Democratic leaders by which that party is to be benefited, in consideration of the failure to nominate a candidate for Register and Recorder and of the Democratic votes he expects to receive. To use no harsh epithet, this is a betrayal of the party to which he professes to belong, which has honored him equal to his merits, and an act of treachery and stultification such as never fails to bring political disgrace and public reprobation.

The Republican candidate for Register and Recorder, Mr. ANDRUS, is in every respect the peer of the present official. He enjoys as good a reputation for honesty and capacity. He has served his country faithfully and gallantly in the field, and bears in his maimed body the certificate of his patriotism and bravery. Mr. CHUBBUCK asperses his good character and does an unseemly act, when he assumes that because by his allegations excessive fees have been charged in the office Mr. ANDRUS will not be honest. Does the Register and Recorder's office now contain all the honesty there is in the county? and does Mr. CHUBBUCK comprise all the official capability and integrity in his person? We would hope not. While we give him credit for all he claims, viz.: that he has not charged illegal fees, we cannot see any great virtue in that, which is simply common honesty and mere official duty. And if we concede all he charges against his predecessors, why should that affect Mr. ANDRUS unfavorably? Is he responsible for the misdeeds of all the former Registers and Recorders?

Mr. CHUBBUCK knows better; and his attempt to hold on to his office three years longer by betraying his party and to the detriment of a soldier, upon such paltry excuses, will be a lamentable failure; and he will realize, if he persists, when too late, that the people are not to be moved by such silly pretenses, and that ingratitude and recreancy always secure to the deserter of his principles and party universal disrepute and contempt.

WHEN PIOLLET offered his Free Soil resolution in the House of Representatives of this State, he did so ostensibly and professedly to "sustain WILMOT." But when the slave-drivers cracked their whips, the Democratic party of the North obeyed the commands of its masters, and servilely and cringingly licked their boots. That great and once powerful party, was transformed into a pro-slavery party, and the sycophants and place-hunters of the North hastened to prostrate themselves at the feet of the Oligarchy. The first to turn traitor to the Free-Soil cause, the earliest to give in his abject submission to the demands of the slavery propagandists, the loudest in his advocacy of the nefarious plans of those who sought to extend the area of human bondage, was Col. PIOLLET, the same PIOLLET who had moved the resolution endorsing the WILMOT proviso! And from that time forward, he became not only the most obsequious servant of the slave-drivers, but an implacable, bitter, malignant, unscrupulous villifier and persecutor of DAVID WILMOT. Displaying the natural enmity a traitor to principle always entertains toward an honest and true man, PIOLLET was the leader in the vindictive personal warfare waged on the great Free-Soiler, and for years endeavored by the most disreputable means, to break down DAVID WILMOT. His motives were impugned, his personal character assailed—and he was hunted and hounded with a persistence and malignity almost diabolical. The effort failed, so far as the people of this Congressional district were concerned, but up to the day of his death, PIOLLET never forgave WILMOT for being true to his principles, and for pursuing a political course which was in such marked and favorable contrast to his own inconsistent and traitorous actions.

Baffled in his attempts to destroy the reputation of WILMOT, and utterly unable to appreciate political honesty and consistency, the fact that WILMOT was stricken by disease, and already in the Valley of the Shadow of Death, which in any manly nature would have softened, if it did not obliterate the rancor engendered by political contests, only increased the venom and animosity of PIOLLET, and caused the outbreak of brutality with which he regaled the Fishing Creek traitors at Nob Mountain. The conspirators against the authority of the country probably applauded PIOLLET when he broke out in the following tirade:

"These are two of the men who have left our party because they could not stand Democratic corruption! And it is a singular fact that all these fellows leave us when we are in a minority. David Wilmot, in my neighborhood, was a great professor of the principles of our party. At one time he could not possibly stay with us—the Democratic party got to be so corrupt! What has become of him now? If you ever knew him when he was a Democrat you would not know him now. He was a fair-looking man then—he is a walking ghost now. Conscience has had a terrible effect upon him, and there is nothing that saves his poor carcass but the four thousand dollars a year he gets for doing nothing. (Great Laughter.) He is Judge of the Court of Claims at Washington. There was a Court of that name established some years ago, with three Judges on its bench. While Wilmot was in the senate he got a bill passed to authorize the appointment of two more Judges on the bench, and to get around that little provision of the Constitution which declares that no Senator or Representative shall be appointed to any office which may have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during his continuance in office, he made a bargain with the lamented Lincoln to hold off and not make the appointment until his term in the Senate expired, so that he could get it. There was a nice, illegal, cunning way of getting around a plain provision of the Constitution which he, as a Senator, had sworn to support!"

A SCRAP OF HISTORY.

The public acts of public men are always open to discussion and criticism. It needs no argument to show the justice and propriety of this proposition. The Democratic nominee for State Treasurer, has a public covering a period of nearly half a century, and while it would be impossible to refer in detail to all his public acts, there are some things which ought to be brought to remembrance at this time, and one of them was referred to the other day by a prominent Democrat, and at present a candidate for a high position in this county, in a public place, and in a public manner. The said Democrat was holding an official position under the Democratic party and resided in this place at the time PIOLLET was dismissed as Superintendent of the Canal, and WM. BRINDLE appointed as his successor. The Canal Board directed Mr. BRINDLE to prepare and submit to them a report of PIOLLET's transactions. The report was prepared and submitted to the Democratic official referred to above, for his opinion and advice as to what was best to be done with it. The gentlemen who now brings to recollection the transaction says the report made very many damaging charges against PIOLLET, showing him to be anything but an honest, upright official; "but," added this aged Democrat, "for some unknown reason the report was never made public." Mr. BRINDLE still lives in this State and is now advocating the election of PIOLLET as a *reformer*, and our Democratic candidate in this county cannot exactly understand how he can reconcile his official report of thirty years ago with his honest professions. Now we submit the question whether it is not the duty of Mr. BRINDLE and our Bradford county Democrat who is a candidate on the county ticket with PIOLLET to give this report to the people. To be sure it is somewhat stale, perhaps, but it is part of the history of PIOLLET, and the people have a perfect right to see it.

THERE is an old and trite saying, that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country." We have been impressed with its truth, when reading in the newspapers from abroad the complimentary allusions to our neighbor, Col. PIOLLET. We discover that the people of this County have displayed a sad want of appreciation by defeating him *four times* when he was a candidate for office. And we also learn that he is possessed of all the cardinal virtues, and of a measure of deserving traits, which make him almost fit for canonization. Verily we have to go abroad to hear the news at home.

The Colonel's political standing too, is improved by distance. Here he has been an outlawed democrat for some months past. The fearful denunciations heaped upon him last fall, by POWELL's friends, were more forcible than elegant. For the Colonel managed with his usual talent for double-dealing, to cheat both sides, and while professing to favor the election of both LAPORTE and POWELL was really for neither. And it is but a few weeks since the Democratic County Committee contemptuously refused to endorse the Colonel and second his ambition for Gubernatorial honors. His nomination for State Treasurer, came unexpectedly upon the faithful here, and as unwelcome as a frost in June, but of course they must swallow the bitter dose, though wry faces testify how nauseating it is.

Meanwhile the Colonel must be gratified to see it publicly asserted that he is a plain and simple hard-working farmer, incorruptible and honest, of undoubted integrity, of unquestionable piety, of exemplary abstemiousness, not given to strong drink, and in fact, a model and exemplar in all the walks of private and political life. Verily, if the Colonel is disappointed in holding the keys of the Treasury, he can console himself that he is the possessor of so many amiable qualities and shining virtues, hitherto unsuspected and unappreciated.

THE following paragraph is from the *Sunday City Item*, of Philadelphia. The Prohibitionists of Bradford are respectfully requested to read and reflect:

"THE AMERICUS CLUB.—Friday night Paunchious Piollet visited the latter club, and had a good time. The veteran jolly plowman told several funny stories and made a good impression generally. Some of the boys attempted to sit the night out with the farmer, but they soon found that he was a veteran, and while some had to be put in their little beds he was as bright as a dollar. John Kelsh and Bill Scheible say 'it was like pouring water down a rat hole.'"

All Hail

"The Sober Second Thought!"

OHIO

Repudiates the Sham Democracy

And Wheels Into Line

Hayes Elected!

MAJORITY FROM

5,000 to 20,000!

IOWA

Comes to the Rescue with

38,000

MAJORITY!

THE DEMOCRACY IN THE LAST DITCH!

Now For Pennsylvania!!

The news from Ohio is very meagre, but all parties admit that the State has gone Republican.

Iowa gives an old-fashioned majority of about 38,000.

GRAND RALLY.

His Excellency, General JOHN F. HARTRANFT, Governor of Pennsylvania, and Hon. W. W. KETCHUM, will be in

TOWANDA ON TUESDAY NEXT, October 19, at 2 o'clock, P. M., to address the citizens of this county in the Court House. Let every township in this county be represented.

PIOLLET'S ESTIMATE OF METHODISTS.

The following characteristic anecdote we take from the *Indianian*, published at Warsaw, Ind. It is furnished to that journal by a son of the Rev. JAMES HODGE, who formerly lived at LeRaysville, and who died there full of years, and respected by all who knew him. The anecdote displays accurately the peculiar characteristics of the Democratic candidate for State Treasurer, in his emphatic and bitter denunciation of the Methodists for the unanimity with which they opposed the extension of slavery, and in the facility with which he "goes back" on his own declarations and swears "he didn't say it." No man in the State can beat him in distorting the truth, and repudiating his own acts and language; but in this instance he was nicely caught:

A BAD PENNY RETURNS.

The nomination of Col. V. E. Piollet, of Bradford county, Pa., by the Democrats, as candidate for the office of State Treasurer, naturally calls to mind an anecdote of the Colonel, which my father related to me some twenty years ago, and which I will preface by saying my father was a Methodist minister, traveled for a number of years, but located about 1830, and moved from his home in Wyoming Valley to LeRaysville, Bradford county. Shortly after his removal, Col. Piollet called upon him to buy some cattle, and, as it was late in the day when their business was done, father invited the Colonel to stop with him for the night. Their conversation was upon various subjects, and among the rest, politics, in the course of which Piollet made this remark: "The whole of this slavery agitation is due to the *d—d Methodists.*" Father kept his own counsel, and the visit ended without the Colonel's knowing that he had been talking to a Methodist preacher. Years passed on, and about the time that the old Whig party gave up its organization and the Republican party was formed, when a Mr. Plummer, a Methodist, was the Democratic candidate for Canal Commissioner, there came, in some local Democratic paper, a personal appeal to my father and Judge Aaron Chubbuck—two who were strong Methodists and had been life-long Democrats—that they should support Mr. Plummer because he was a Methodist. An opposition paper at once sarcastically suggested that they should also support Col. Piollet, who was at that time the Democratic candidate for some office, because of his oft repeated assertion that the whole slavery agitation was due to the d—d Methodists. A few days after these statements appeared in the papers, the Colonel and some of his political friends held a meeting in LeRaysville for the purpose of enlightening the people.—When the public gathering was over, Piollet strolled leisurely down the street, and, apparently by accident, dropped into my father's office, as was natural, for they had been now acquaintances of many years' standing. After speaking of various matters, the Colonel, in his most subdued and gentle manner alluded to the statements that had been in the papers about his having spoken in unbecoming terms of the Methodists, and assured my father, with all becoming gravity and apparent sincerity, that they were all false; that he had never applied any approbious epithets to the Methodists, nor spoken in any way disrespectfully of them; in fact, he had always held them in the highest esteem. And for a final clincher to this solemn appeal, he said: *"Besides I am not a man that ever allows himself to indulge in any such language."*

Those who know the Colonel will appreciate the joke, and those who do not know him, will feel some of it when they know that he is one of the most notoriously blasphemous men in Pennsylvania. Those who knew my father can readily see the quiet smile that stole over his face as he told us the whole story after the Colonel left. He did not vote for the Colonel nor for Plummer.

H.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE.

CAPT. AMES writes us a long letter, ostensibly to deny the charge made in the REPORTER, of last week, that he was our authority for saying that an agreement was made to the effect that CHUBBUCK, in consideration of the Democratic Convention omitting to nominate a candidate for Register and Recorder, would carry sixty votes to STORRS. We have the proof that Mr. AMES *did* so state; and he hardly denies it. We subjoin that portion of Mr. AMES' letter referring to this subject:

S. W. Alvord, Editor Reporter:

DEAR SIR: I observe in the last issue of the REPORTER that you have given me as the "authority for the statement that one of the arguments employed to prevent the Democrats from nominating a candidate for Register and Recorder was the assurance that if such a course was pursued Mr. Chubbuck could carry 60 votes in Orwell for Mr. Storrs." I have no recollection of saying to you or any other person, at any time, what is above quoted. I did say, partly in way of retort, to one of my friends in Orwell, in answer to the inquiry why we did not make a nomination for Register and Recorder, that I was told by Democrats from his town that in case we would nominate Mr. Chubbuck, or leave that office a blank, it would bring to the support of the Democratic ticket at least 60 Republican votes in said township of Orwell. That reasoning was used, as above stated; but I have no recollection of using Mr. Storrs' name, nor do I think I did so. I was one of the delegates from Sheshequin, and favored a clean, straight Democratic ticket. I remember well what I said in reply to those Democrats of Orwell, for my feelings had not become entirely smooth over the little ripple of discussion that had taken place in caucus by this subject, and presume, from what I said, they thought me at least a little radical. I have yet to learn where the Democrats have ever gained anything by this course of action; they have tried it often and always lost by it. The Republicans would sooner vote for a reliable and honest Democrat, than one of their own party who has for any reason thought proper to quarrel with them. The Democrats helped to elect a member of Congress in 1862, and I know of no good that grew out of it to the Democratic party. It is said that a very good way to judge of the future is by the past. If we are to be governed by that, then we should have nominated a candidate for Register and Recorder. The Democratic Convention made a good choice of men to fill the various offices of the county, and I believe we could have found one for Register and Recorder that would have commanded the respect of both parties.

Sheshequin, Pa. C. H. AMES.

How do Mr. CHUBBUCK's temperance friends like the arrangement alluded to by Capt. AMES? Do they expect to support him while he betrays the balance of the ticket and throws his influence for the Democratic candidates?

WYALUSING, Pa., Oct. 4, 1875.

FRIEND ALVORD: In the BRADFORD REPORTER of Sept. 30 is an article on "The Prohibition Party," to which I wish to reply, through the columns of the same paper. Hoping that you will grant me this favor, I send you the following for publication:

I consider the said article an unkind and unchristian attack of an anonymous correspondent upon the private character and public reputation of my two friends, Messrs. Chamberlain and Butts, simply for political capital. Their political record is misrepresented by the writer, and the statements and insinuations there made are false and slanderous. If the Republican party has already been switched by the tail of the Prohibition cow, such publications will only lead to its being gored by her horns, when the true state of the case is understood by the people. Mr. Chamberlain does not deny using, *as a medicine*, "Rhubarb wine, while holding a seat in the House of Representatives;" but he does deny that "he dealt it out promiscuously among members of that honorable body to prove its medicinal qualities." This anonymous writer thus insinuates that Mr. C. is not a true temperance man, and is only a Prohibitionist in order to "retaliate against party for expected favors unrealized!!" And then, to prove such a conclusion beyond a doubt, he declares that Mr. C. "voted to repeal the Prohibitory law of Wyoming county, notwithstanding the urgent appeals and remonstrances to the contrary," which is an unmitigated falsehood. For the *facts* see the *Legislative Record* for 1868, page 381 to 383. Upon the third reading of "the House bill No. 465, entitled, 'An act to submit the question of license or no license in Wyoming county to a popular vote of the people of said county,' the yeas and nays were called three times. 1. Upon the amendment "to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a small section repealing the Prohibitory liquor law of last year, which was passed for Wyoming county," the vote stood—yeas 40, nays 41. *Mr. C. voted in the negative, and thus defeated the amendment.* 2. On the amendment to change the time of holding the election, which was unimportant. 3. Upon the final passage of the bill the vote stood 53 yeas to 37 nays, Mr. C. again voting in the negative, and giving as his reasons, that nobody had asked for such a law, and that the temperance people of Wyoming county were satisfied with the law as it was, and had petitioned the Legislature to let it stand. Thus in every act, speech and vote of Mr. C. during his three years as Representative, he was recognized by the Legislature and by his constituents as a staunch temperance man. And the party has honored him with more than he has ever asked or expected.

I am sorry that the Republican party in Bradford county is obliged to publish such scurrilous attacks upon men who are above suspicion or reproach, in order to save it from defeat. A cause that will not succeed without such a defense ought to fail, and let all the people say Amen.

Now, friend Alvord, if you don't want to serve the cause of "The Prohibition Party," don't make the REPORTER a mud-throwing machine, nor a medium of falsehood. In behalf of my assailed friends, yours for "The Prohibition Party."

J. B. SUMNER.

AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. CHUBBUCK.

Mr. WEBB propounds some pertinent questions in the following letter, which, if honestly answered, will not place Mr CHUBBUCK it the most enviable light:

EAST SMITHFIELD, Oct. 9, 1875.

MR. O. J. CHUBBUCK:

Dear Sir:—The very remarkable course you have seen proper to pursue, justifies (and I feel deserves) notice by some person who is familiar with the the office you now hold. The circular which you have scattered broadcast over the county, starts out by saying: "The following extracts, &c., show the comparative cost of the present (your's) with preceding terms." In your letter published in the REPORTER of the 7th inst., you charge the party (because of its having nominated another instead of yourself) of demanding "a new lease of power to rob widows and orphans." If by these charges or allegations you do not mean to convey the idea that *all your Republican predecessors* had been guilty of robbing widows and orphans, then I confess my inability to give the English language a proper construction. I was elected to that office in 1854 and occupied it for six years, and while there, as Register of Wills, for granting letters of administration, including blanks, where you charge $4, I charged $3.19; for probate of wills and granting letters thereon, where you charge $4.50, I charged $3.44; as Recorder of Deeds and Mortgages, where you charge from $1.75 to $2, I charged from $1.60 to $1.75; as Clerk of the Orphans' Court, in appointment of guardians, where you charge $1.50, I charged $1.56. In sales of real estate where you charge $4, I charged $4.06; upon valuations to widows, where you charge $2.50, I charged $1.50. You made no allusion to final accounts, so I take it for granted no one has exceeded you in charges for that item, but where you charge $9.50, I charged $8.50. Mr. Scott, who preceded me, did not charge more than I have stated was charged by myself. I have given the usual charges for those services, and you will find no more exceptions in Mr. Scott's or my terms than your books will show for yourself. In the granting of letters I have stated the charge for one person, and for every additional person I charged six cents, and for remuneration (when there was one) I charged the same as you, 50 cents. I seek no controversy with you, but justice to myself and others, as well as the party that has honored us, demands this statement, and I think when you consider the nature and extent of your attack, you will admit it was low and cowardly. If individuals have done wrong or committed errors, they are responsible, not the party. Is there evidence of reform in *your favor* under the statements herein made? Did not the party three years ago know as well as it does now, of what you complain, if true? And did not its leaders, and Monroe Smith in particular, take an active part in making the change?

Mr. Chubbuck, it is generally understood that you have been one of those Republicans who favored rotation in office; that you have been particularly opposed to renominations, and clamored against the "Ring;" that when a candidate three years since you assured your friends, and especially your neighbors in Orwell, that you was a one-term man, and therefore opposed to Mr. Smith for Sheriff; under no circumstances would you allow the delegates of Orwell to vote for him—that you would suffer defeat yourself rather than that should be done. They believed your statements and gave you their delegates, but to their utter surprise (with your consent and approval) the delegates of Orwell voted for Smith, and you became the "Ring" candidate for Register and Recorder. They demonstrated their disapproval of your acts at the time by giving you less votes at the election than they gave Smith, and as a further reward for your treachery they defeated you in the election of delegates. Do you mean to say the people of Orwell are in favor of wrong and corruption? That is what you do say in effect, for had Orwell been for your nomination you would have been much more likely to have succeeded; but without Orwell, your own township, you had no chance. Can you mention any one who has been nominated by a party with his own township against him? In the face of all this, however, you went into the Convention, and as an honorable man was as much bound by the action of the Convention as was Mr. Gladding three years ago when defeated by you. In holding the office for only one term you are as well treated as seven out of nine men who have preceded you by elections.

What reason have you to intimate that Mr. Andrus, if elected, will not discharge his duties with integrity? What you have said is, that the party, by refusing to nominate you, is corrupt and in favor of robbing widows and orphans. If either of the half dozen gentlemen who were candidates had been nominated, you would have said the same; in short, that you were the only honest man in the party. This is extremely modest, to say the least. Will you be so kind as to inform the public who you are in favor of, for Governor, and whether you would have been for Brownson if the Republicans had nominated you for the office you desired; and whether you are for Storrs or Layton for Sheriff, or neither. Can you explain the action of the Democrats in making a full ticket, except as to your office? Do you believe they deem you a more honorable man or better officer than Mr. Peck? I shall await a reply, and expect you to admit the truth of my statements or show they are wrong, and in what respect.

Very truly yours,
JAMES H. WEBB.

AS I WAS contemplating the doctrines and principles of the two great political parties, and speculating upon the chances and possibilities of their holding or continuing in power; as my mind ran along the years of the future, I fancied the Pennsylvania election passed; the Democratic party victorious; Pontius Pilate Treasurer and Cyrus Governor: Republicans defeated; many staid at home; others voted the Prohibition ticket; many went with Senator George over to the enemy; the Democrats were noisy boasting of their great strength and power; enjoying their victory; trampling the Republicans under their feet, and airing their dignity and importance in grand style. They boasted wonderfully of their good fortune in electing a man so pure and honest, and one (who never swears like Pontius Pilate) to safely keep the public money and his mother-in-law's farm. While the Democrats were thus jubilant, I observed that Republicans were sad. Soldiers who had lost a limb or an arm fighting the enemies of their country, were turned out of every clerkship or place they had occupied under State or General Governments. The party axe fell right and left, and chopped off the heads of all Republican clerks, Postmasters, laborers—all shared the same fate; none escaped. The widow whose husband was killed in the army was driven from a country Post Office, and a Democrat appointed in her place. To the victors belong the spoils.

In the seceding States a shout of joy went up that brought out from his hiding place every KuKlux Rebel, who bawled himself hoarse over the great Democratic triumph. There was rejoicing and gladness throughout Rebeldom such has had not been heard or known since the days of secession. A law was passed by Congress authorizing the payment of the rebel debt and pensioning rebel soldiers. The colored men are hunted and intimidated, and driven from the polls and not allowed to vote,—and treated worse, if possible, than when they were slaves. The same men who starved Union soldiers at Libby and Andersonville have the power now, and use it with a vengeance. Drunkenness and lawlessness is the order of the day. If there is any one thing above all others of which the dominant party boasts, it is cheap whisky and free fights. Blackened eyes and bloody noses are plenty at every public gathering. The fundamental doctrine of every officer is, punish your enemies and reward the faithful. The portrait of Jeff Davis is on banners and exhibited in public places. Those who fought to destroy the country and now vote the Democratic ticket, are honored and preferred before those who served their country faithfully in her darkest hour, and were crippled and maimed in its defense.

When I reflected that this defeat and shame we brought upon ourselves; that had we stood firm, discarded all prohibition and other factions and isms, we could easily have triumphed over all foes, like a clap of thunder the booming cannon awoke me. It was a DREAM! Ohio had gone Republican; the boys were building bonfires and jubilating. Ohio is safe; Pennsylvania can be if we don't vote down our principles. I'll vote it straight—will you?

REPUBLICAN.

THE PEOPLE'S WILL.

Recently, I spent some hours with the Third Party candidate for Governor, R. A. Browne, in free interchange of opinions. His chief point in appearing as a candidate against Gov. Hartranft is, that *the people's will* was defied in repealing Local-Option—that our fathers had fought for the right of self-government, which was overthrown by that repeal, &c. I reminded him that "the people's will" is of a variable nature—one year for this party or measure; another year it is changed.

When men, under the laws, had obtained liquor licenses, which were taken from them in forty-two counties, by Local-Option, they complained that the people's will and vested rights had been illegally wrested from them for a portion of a year. When Local-Option was repealed, some of its friends contended it was trampling upon the people's will, who had enacted it for three years (although I see no proof that it was assured a lease of three years). Both sides of the question make the same complaint, and both are alike unfounded. The enactment and the repeal were from the same source—laws enacted by the people's representatives, duly expressed. If either was a violation of the law, that which shortened a license was as flagrant, certainly, as that which shortened a prohibition. But courts have decided that Legislatures may enact or repeal laws conferring franchises, if public good demands it and no private interest is thereby notably injured.

It is difficult to tell on what constitutional ground Mr. Browne could have asked the veto of either bill. They were within the range of legal power, and no one alleged manifest haste or bribery in passing either of them.

So far, then, from the Governor's doing anything monarchial in allowing the bill to become a law, he would have acted the part of King, a tyrant, a usurper—would have gone contrary to the genius of our institutions—of a country governed by *the people's will*—if he *had* vetoed their deliberate, legal enactments.

Aided by the diversions of a professed temperance party, the people last fall sent to Harrisburg men known to be in favor of repeal. They were faithful to their taust. Right or wrong in policy, the Governor had no business to thwart "the people's will" thus expressed.

No, no, Mr. Browne. You and your little clique of thoughtless followers gave the chance to repeal Local-Option by dividing the party which enacted it. Whatever evil flows must rest upon your heads who made it possible. While Temperance assemblies, in Nation, States and counties, everywhere advise and implore *not* to form political parties upon one idea which is not *the* idea before the public, a few like you insist upon it, dividing the Temperance strength, weakening the Republican party, and doing no good and much harm. You are justly liable for the natural consequences of your own folly. You are aiding, indirectly but surely, four things you profess to hate—Rum, Romanism, Rebellion and Repudiation—by distracting the main body of their opponents. You are playing into the hands of the liquor power, and all Pandemonium secretly rejoices. You may be honest, but you are madly unwise, undoing much good that has been done, and prejudicing thousands against a good cause.—"*Sojourner*," *in Harrisburg Telegraph.*

PERSHING ON PROHIBITING IMMIGRATION.

On the 25th of March, 1863, the House of Representatives of this State took up for consideration a bill entitled "An act to prevent the immigration of negroes and mulattoes into this State."

The first section of this bill made it unlawful for any negro or mulatto to *come into* this State, with the intention to make it a *temporary* or permanent place of residence, under a penalty of $20 fine and instant removal beyond the limits of the State.

The second section provided that if any railroad conductor, steamboat or canal captain, or any other person should bring or cause to be brought into the State any negro or mulatto slave, whether such slave was set free or not, he should be subject to a fine not exceeding $500 and one year's imprisonment.

The third section made it the duty of every sheriff, constable and police officer in the State to arrest all such negroes and mulattoes and remove them from the State.

The first section of the bill being before the House, Mr. Champneys, of Lancaster, denounced the bill as one of the most extraordinary ever introduced into the Legislature. "It is," he said, "a measure utterly unconstitutional." Mr. Shannon, of Allegheny, also declared it "unconstitutional, and so inhuman, monstrous and barbarous in its provisions" that he entered his protest against it. Mr. Pershing, therefore, cannot plead that his attention was not called to the question of its constitutionality, and to the fact that it permitted a man to be punished without being heard.

The first section was then agreed to, yeas 51, nays 41, and Mr. Pershing's name is found recorded among the *ayes*.

The second section was then agreed to, and the third section being up Mr. Cochran moved to amend by adding thereto the following: "*Provided* That nothing in this act shall apply *to any colored person in the military or naval service of the United States.*"

This seems to be a perfectly proper provision; but as the bill was intended to obstruct the prosecution of the war, as well as the abolition of slavery, the Democratic obstructionists of Pennsylvania would not agree to permit any colored person in the service of the United States Government to put his foot within the limits of the State. Upon this amendment the votes were: Yeas 37, nays 50, and Mr. Pershing's name appears among the *nays*.

The Philadelphia *Times* claims that this man, during the war, contributed all in his power to sustain the Government and carry on the war to a successful conclusion; yet here we find him deliberately voting to close the doors of the State against any one in the military or naval service of the United States whose skin happened to be colored. It was a direct thrust at the Government, and was so intended.

On the final passage of this infamous bill, disgraceful alike to its framers and supporters, the vote was yeas 52, nays 40, and Mr. Pershing is again found voting *aye*. For this and all the other votes on this bill see *Legislative Record for 1863, pp. 545, 546, 547.*

The Democrats of this Stat were at that time, united and firm in their determination to oppose and obstruct the Government in its prosecution of the war, and in every vote and act of theirs in that direction they had the aid of Mr. Pershing. He was as venomous a copperhead as was then to be found; and if there were any in the State capable of outdoing him in subservience to slavery and in aid of the rebellion, they were to be found in the Fishing Creek Confederacy mustered under the lead of Piollet and Buckalew.

But pliant as he was in submission to the demands of the party upon him, neither he nor any of the Democrats in the House had the pluck to say a word in defense of this outrageous bill. They kept silent under the assaults made upon it, and when its unconstitutionality was exposed, they sealed their lips and were dumb. We will give them the credit of being ashamed of it, as they evidently were; but they dared not assert their manhood, and they suffered themselves to be brought up, in force, to pass a bill they dared not open their lips to defend.

But notwithstanding Mr. Pershing kept quiet while this bill was in progress, his votes in its favor, and his vote denying to the colored soldiers and sailors of the Union the right of refuge upon our soil, speak louder for his disloyalty than a mere speech would do. They proclaim, trumpet tongued, his subserviency to the slave power, his truckling submission to the behests of his party, his utter want of patriotism and loyalty, and his willingness to violate the solemn guarantees of the Constution for the purpose of obstructing the Government in its efforts to put down the rebellion; and no amount of plausible talk will serve to dispel the conviction that a man who could vote as Pershing did on this bill is unfit to be Governor of a free people.—*Pittsburg Commercial.*

MR. CHUBBUCK claims to be an honorable man, and yet his base treachery to the party that has kept him in office for nine years is leading him into difficulties all the time. To the man who thinks ANDRUS should be elected because he is a maimed soldier, CHUBBUCK says *the government pays him for the loss of his leg* To others he gives his word of honor, speaking from personal knowledge, that ANDRUS *is incompetent*. What an honorable position for a *fair man* to assume! The Republicans of Canton in point of intelligence will rank with the people of any portion of the county, and yet they presented this incompetent man as their choice for the office, and on the 2nd of November next they will assist in administering to the renegade CHUBBUCK, who has become so careless of the truth, the chastisement he merits.

WHEN the poor colored people were being crushed beween the contending armies in Maryland many of them escaped from their homes, and settled in the southern part of this State. To prevent them from finding shelter in Pennsylvania soil, the democrats in the Legislature introduced a bill excluding them from this State, and CYRUS L. PERSHING, present Democratic candidate for Governor, voted for the bill.

After President LINCOLN had issued the Emancipation Proclamation, PIOLLET said publicly in this borough with an impious oath that the President must recall the document. And yet these demogogues have the impudence to ask colored men to vote for them.

THIS is the way he does it; STORRS was at the fair in Troy last week; approaching a gentleman who had a fine colt on exhibition, the obsequious candidate said: "A very fine colt, Mr. C., the best one on the ground; was entitled to the first premium, which I am glad to see was awarded him. Good-day, sir; Good-day, sir; G-o-o-d-d-a-y, sir." Proceeding but a few steps he accosted another gentleman, who also had a colt on exhibition. "Very hand-some colt, sir, the best one here; you ought to have secured the first premium," said the wily STORRS. Unfortunately for the wordy candidate the first gentleman was in hearing distance, and listened to the shallow hypocracy.

THAT LIE.—Neither Mr. STORRS nor his friends have yet made any reply to our charge of falsehood in reporting that LAYTON had promised money to be paid in the event of his election, and we are therefore safe in assuming that by their silence they admit themselves falsifiers and calumniators. Our offer still holds good, however, and if Mr. STORRS will prove his "story" *true* which he has retailed in the ears of Republicans with so much assumed candor and holy horror, we will repudiate Mr. LAYTON. Failing to substantiate his report, as we stated last week, Mr. STORRS must stand convicted of willful falsehood.

A REFORMER.—When a man assumes the role of reformer he should be careful to see that his own hands are clean. The following is one of many instances which have come to our knowledge where Mr. CHUBBUCK has "robbed the widow and orphan:"

OSWEGO, Oct. 12, 1875.

ED. REPORTER—*Dear Sir:* I have received one of Mr. Chubbuck's circulars, purporting to give the fee bill of Register and Recorder and Clerk of the Orphan's Court. On examining the same I fail to find that either of said officers are by law allowed anything for the discharge of Executors, Administrators or Guardians. A little over a year ago I