Juniata Sentinel.

A union of lakes, and a union of lands,
A union no power shall sever;
A union of hearts, and a union of hands,
And the American Union forever!

MIFFLINTOWN:
Wednesday Morning, April 18, 1866

H. H. WILSON, Editor and Publisher

☞ *THE JUNIATA SENTINEL* ☜ has the *Largest Circulation* of any paper published in this County. It is therefore the *best advertising medium.* It is a Paper, truly loyal, ably conducted, a first class Localist, and well worthy of the patronage of every loyal citizen in the County.

UNION REPUBLICAN STATE TICKET

FOR GOVERNOR,

MAJ. GEN. JOHN W. GEARY,

OF CUMBERLAND COUNTY.

☞ Soldiers of Pennsylvania remember that Heister Clymer voted against a joint resolution of our Legislature, asking Congress to increase the pay of the private soldiers and non-commissioned officers of the army. (See page 295 Legislative Record session 1864.) While you were battling for the Union he was exhausting his ingenuity in devising means to counteract the succes of your arms.

Call of the County Committee.

The members of the Union Republican County Committee will meet at the Public House of S. R. Notestine, in the borough of Mifflintown on

MONDAY, APRIL 23rd, 1866,

at 1 o'clock P. M. A full attendance is earnestly requested as business of importance will come before the committee.

The following persons compose the County Committee:

Mifflintown—J. J. Patterson, A. R. Martin.
Fermanagh—Elias Horning, R. C. Gallaher.
Fayette—Michael Hoffman, Capt. L. Degan.
Monroe—A. G. Shellenberger, S. Strouser.
Susquehanna—Levi Light, Sol. Updegrove.
Greenwood—S. Shellenberger, H. H. Minium.
Delaware—J. P. Thompson, Elihu Benner.
Walker—J. A. Galiaher, John Motzer.
Patterson—S. H. Brown, George Goshen.
Milford—Col. J. K. Robison, A. Shover.
Turbett—Stewart Turbett, L. E. Mathers.
Perrysville—Lt. Samuel Laird, P. S. Liggett.
Spruce Hill—Wm. Evans, Thos. Patton.
Beale—Dr. J. P. Sterrett, R. Doyle.
Tuscarora—James Irwin, Geo. M. Smelker.
Lack—Mathias Stump, John Leonard.
Black Log—Rob't. McIntyre, Sam'l. Shearer.

J. J. PATTERSON, Chairman.

CAMPAIGN PAPER.

As there are many persons in the county who are not subscribers to any newspaper, we have concluded to furnish the SENTINEL to all new subscribers through the coming political campaign at rates that will be within the reach of every man in the county. And we trust our friends in each district will go to work in good earnest and get up clubs. The people should understand the great questions that will be agitated in the approaching campaign, and thus be enabled to vote intelligently at the coming election. We will furnish the SENTINEL from the third week in April until the last week in October—by which time all the official returns will be published, at the following rates:

Single copy	80
Five copies	3 50
Ten copies	6 50
Fifteen copies	9 00
Twenty copies	11 50

OUTGOING SENATORS.—With the adjournment of the Legislature on next Thursday, the terms of seven Republican and four Democratic Senators will expire. The list is as follows:

1. Jeremiah Nichols, Union, Phila'da.
5. Wilmer Worthington, Union, Chester.
10. H. B. Beardslee, Dem., of Wayne.
15. D. B. Montgomery, Dem., of Northumberland.
16. David Fleming, Union, of Dauphin
17. Benjamin Chapneys, Union, of Lancaster.
J. M. Dunlap, " "
20. Geo. W. Householder, Union, of Bedford.
24. John Latta, Dem., of Westmorl'd.
26. Wm. Hopkins, Dem., of Washington.
28. Thos. Hoge, Union, of Venango.

NO FAITH IN CLYMER.—The Harrisburg correspondent of the Philadelphia *Press* says that there is but little enthusiasm to be noticed among the Democrats. Indeed, they act as if they were well convinced that the most mortifying defeat awaits them in October. One of their leaders has a standing bet, which he says will be open until the day of election, that Gen. Geary will not be elected by thirty thousand majority! This bet will give an idea of the sentiment which prevails among the Democracy thereabouts.

COMMUNICATION.

CAPTAIN H. H. WILSON.—In the first issue of the *Republican* a statement is published by A. L. Guss and sworn to, which out of justice to myself requires some notice on my part. As the crowded state of your column s last week prevented the insertion of my answer, I beg of you an opportunity for a hearing this week, and ask those who read Mr. Guss' card to read my statement and then judge. Pardon me if the cause of truth requires it to be long. In January, 1864, I purchased from A. L. Guss the half interest in the *Juniata Sentinel* by article dated January 9th, 1864. Possession to date from January 1st. Consideration $750,00, which was paid him. We became equal partners in profits and losses. I promised to try to get W. W. Davis appointed one of the U. S. Assessors, and by an arrangement made first between Guss and Davis before I bought, Davis agreed if appointed, to pay Guss one-third of his salary and to assist in conducting the paper.—This was told to me by them both at the time of the purchase, and I of course agreed to it, as it was no matter to me who got the salary if the duties of the Assessorship were faithfully performed.—I was no party to the agreement, only I approved of it as I wanted the office to go for the benefit of Guss & Davis. I thought Davis would attend to the duties, in which I confess I was sadly mistaken, and I thought the $30,00 a month Guss would get would help Guss along, as he said the *Sentinel* did not pay. He was in debt for nearly all its original cost, and the $750,00 he would get from me would pay that much debt and stop that much interest. If the paper made no money, I would get nothing for my investment, and if it lost, I must pay my half. Mr. Guss was sure of $30,00 a month from the office held by Davis. Mr. Guss does not dare to say that either the firm or myself were to get any part of that fund. It was for him alone. I must risk my money on the chance of a profit from the paper. He says I agreed to let him have all the profits of the *Sentinel* too. This is a mistake, as the article contains no such a clause. It sounds like the child who wanted the "candy and the penny both." He got the $750,00, retained his half, and as Davis was appointed, Mr. Guss got the monthly pay for nearly a year. During this time Mr. Guss was constantly complaining of Davis doing nothing in the office, and finally he and Davis disagreed so much that Davis concluded he would not pay Guss any more. In December, 1864, I think it was Davis told me he would not pay Guss any more, and that he told Guss so. I told him he was honorably and legally bound to do it, and that he ought to do it, and that Guss could easily prove the bargain by Messrs. Balsbach, Stewart and myself. I insisted upon him keeping his word. He said he would not do it and Guss might sue him, that he had nothing he could get. Guss soon told me about it, and said I must make Davis pay him. I told him I could not, and that he should sue him. He said I must get Davis removed and get him the office, which I refused to do.

Just after the election in 1864 Guss insisted upon having B. F. Kepner removed as Post-Master and himself appointed.—Because the Post-Office and Assessorship were refused him, he became very much offended at me. I had not the power to make removals and appointments as he demanded, but was willing to see him gratified, if he could do it himself, but he took great offence because I would not do it for him. Mr. Davis refused to pay him, and at the request of Mr. Guss who made serious charges against Davis' integrity in not accounting for money he received on account of the paper—whether true or not I don't say. The name of Mr. Davis on March 8th, 1865, was taken down from the paper, and the paper was thereafter conducted by Mr. Guss and myself under the name of A. L. Guss & Co. This is endorsed on our article.—Early in the summer of 1865 Guss sued Davis before 'Squire Huzzard for the monthly pay, and proved the contract by Mr. Balsbach and myself, and obtained judgment. Davis appealed to Court, and there Guss dropped it, as he said Davis was worth nothing and a judgment would do him (Guss) no good.

Now, this statement Mr. Guss cannot deny, and I submit to the public if there is any promises in the whole transaction made by me which I did not fulfill. I paid him the $750,00. Davis was appointed and paid Guss the monthly pay for nearly a year, and if Davis violated his bargain with Guss and refused to pay him, it was not my fault. I fulfilled my part of the bargain, and now get from Guss and Davis abuse for the favor I did them. Mr. Guss and I remained in partnership until October 17th, 1865, when I purchased his remaining interest. But not until he offered to sell, so as to engage in his present business. During the one year and nine months of our partnership Mr. Guss got the whole proceeds of the office and I got nothing. Before I bought him out, I asked for a settlement, and Guss said Davis had not paid him, and it took all the proceeds of the office to keep his family and that he had no money left. By our article the half of the profits for that time were mine. He brought his books to my office and furnished the following statement of the business for one year and nine months:

Cash receipts for 1864	$1289,05
" " ¾ year 1865	1202,43
Amount on books	1313,00
	3804,48
Expenses for 1864 & 1865	1738,95
Nett profits	2065,53
Each share	1032,76

This was his own statement, which I know did not include all the actual receipts of the office. It, however, shows Mr. Guss had received $2491,48, leaving a balance of *cash* in his pocket of $752,-53 when we settled, one-half of which ($376,26) was mine. Does he tell this in his sworn statement? Does he say he paid me the half of the cash and the half on the books? He never mentions it.—A witness perjers himself if he don't tell the whole truth. By the same statement he acknowledged to have collected $162,-36 in advance of the time when he last sold to me. I bought him out by article of agreement, and the following was our settlement, as the papers show:

The price fixed was	$750,00
He owed me borrowed money	22,50
Money advanced by me and which he agreed to pay	30,00
Rental for my interest 1¾ year	97,50
Cash paid him as per article Oct. 17, 1865	600,00
	750,00

In addition I released to him my interest in the money in his pocket and on the books; or in other words, I gave Mr. Guss my share of the profits, which were $1032,76, and I only charged him for the use of my money and the loss in the value of the material for that time $97,50, very little more than simple interest. Any person knows the wear and tear of the material in a newspaper office is not less than 20 per cent. every year. I paid him what he paid at first for the office, and I gave him all the profits. In addition I agreed in the article to give him three months to pay me back the $162,36 cash then in his pocket, collected in advance by him, and I claim he owes me much more than which he has collected in advance. I did this at his urgent request, as he said he must have the $600,00 to make up his payment on the Cassville property, and that if I would let him have this money three months it would help him very much and be a great favor. He dare not deny it, as the article and our settlement show this fact, and yet he swears he only got $600,00 for his half. Had I kept back (as I had a right to do) the $162,36 he would not have got $600,00 but $437,64. When I leased to Captain Wilson, I paid him this money and waited on Guss. I wanted to help Guss, and let him have the use of this money for three months, and when they expired he coolly refused to pay me and I sued him, and that matter is now before the court.

I submit this statement of the whole transaction to the public, and challenge Mr. Guss to deny it. Yet are these facts not widely different from his oath? The public must judge of the truth of the oath he makes. Do partners in business often deal as liberally in dividing profits, as I did with Mr. Guss? and why should he complain? I never tried to injure him, but was trying to keep him from injuring himself, and if his oath does not effect his conscience, I must congratulate him. Mr. Guss complains of my interference in the paper. Well, I have had more experience in newspapers than Mr. Guss, and as I was an equal partner, I considered I had a right to one-half the control, and the only mistake I made was in yielding as often to Mr. Guss as I did for the sake of peace. I often remonstrated against his constant abuse of persons and his imprudent course in conducting the paper, which always displeased him. He is in his dealings and intercourse very much like the twelfth juryman, who said the other eleven were the *contrariest* set of fools he ever saw. He would often insist that, notwithstanding he only owned the half, he must control it all, and as I generally try to manage my own business, we could not agree. I regret to having private matters brought before the public, but Mr. Guss has sworn to a statement which compells me to publish an answer. I need not swear to it, as our article of agreement and our settlement papers and the books of our partnership will confirm every statement and figure I have given. The public have both sides and must judge whether I took advantage as Mr. Guss *swears*. Mr. Guss as member of the State Committee, drew $250,00 for this county. I never asked him for any of it. He offered, through a certain gentleman, to send all to me but $75,00, which he said he would keep to pay for his own valuable services. I was Chairman of the County Committee and entitled to it, but I refused to have anything to do with it, and Mr. Guss kept it all but $30,00, so far as I know, and I challenge him to prove that he did not keep the balance. Let us have proof—not his own sworn statements. He is so willing to swear to statements, that perhaps he is not careful enough as to facts. This money was for use of the party, and he kept it all but $30,00, so far as I know. Mr. Guss tried to levy a contribution of $60,00 in addition off Messrs. Brown and Baker, but they were informed that he was already too well paid by the money from the State Committee. I think the public see that Mr. Guss took care of himself when it came to money matters, whether he was dealing with me privately or with the funds of the party from the State Committee. He had better have said less about this matter, as it requires some explanation. He swears I got none of it, and that he did what his wisdom directed with it. So I am clear of that. Wonder he did not swear I stole it, as it would perhaps have been as near the truth as what he does swear.—Guss says I would not let the names of Brown and Baker be put up as our nominees. Capt. H. H. Wilson, Capt. W. H. Patterson and C. B. Horning were elected by the County Convention Representative Conferees, and instructed by the Convention by unanimous resolution to go for a Mifflin county man, but to insist upon an agreement that Juniata should have one members in 1866. I went as Conferee in place of Mr. Horning, who could not go. We read the resolution to the Conference and asked for some understanding, but we were voted down, and told that Juniata must wait two years. Some ignorant persons may say the Conference could not make such a bargain. Nominations are always the result of some bargain in Conference, and most always refer to the next nomination. In 1864 when Mr. Balsbach was nominated, we promised to let Mifflin county have the member in 1865. Such bargains are always made in districts where the representative are less than the number of counties, like ours, and they are generally fulfilled. I had no personal interest in it, and only was trying to get an equal right for Juniata. I was not a candidate myself, and I do not want to be. I know the disadvantage of not having a member from this county, and I think the people found it out this winter. After consultation with someof my friends and with full accord of Mr. Guss, we concluded to wait in the hope of getting the pledge required by the County Convention. Mr. Guss was as anxious as any of us, and did not object as he now swears. I will explain why. He had not then determined to go into the school business, and intended to run for Legislature here this year. He wanted the pledge made so he could be sure of it himself this year. He wanted the Convention last summer to nominate him and got very angry when it was not done.

We heard nothing from Brown and Baker and on Saturday before we went to Snyder county Court, I told Guss to put up the names, and he did sett them up, and told me he would leave copy enough to get out the paper with the ticket up while we were gone. He left early on Monday morning and on Monday evening I went to the office and inquired if he left the copy, and was told he did not. When I met Guss in Snyder county, I asked why he did not leave copy and orders to get out the paper with the ticket up. And he said he would not let the ticket be published until he was paid. The names of Brown and Baker were set up, and had Mr. Guss attended to his paper before he left, it would have appeared with the ticket up as usual. It was his own fault and intended too, as the hands in the office know. This was before either Mr. Brown or Baker came here. During our absence all week in Snyder county, Mr. Baker came here and saw their ticket was sett up and knew why the paper was not issued, and went away satisfied. After our return Mr. Brown came down and found it as I say. Then Mr. Guss said he would not support Brown and Baker unless he was paid, and what promise Mr. Brown made I don't know but he demanded of me to be paid of which I refused. My only motive was to see the just claims of Juniata acknowledged while Mr. Guss was working for a nomination this year himself and for all the money he could get off Brown and Baker. We never intended to oppose the election of Brown and Baker, but hoped to get justice for our county, and we put up their names freely for publication before either came here, and through Mr. Guss' neglect the issue of the paper was delayed a week. These are the facts as are well known. In view of the importance of having a member from this county next winter I think every man will say it was right to act as we did to get our rights admitted by Mifflin and Huntingdon counties.

The conversation as related by him as having passed between us is not correct, and the facts as given by him could easily be proved to be gross errors. His whole statement is malicious and untrue. As Mr. Guss thinks he had no chance for Legislature and did not make any money out of Brown & Baker he must charge me with dereliction to party. Well I have proven my devotion to the party and disregard the opinion of any man who charges me with want of it. I will yield to no one on that score, and hurl back with scorn and contempt the charge when it comes from a man like Guss, who a few years ago was not for us but against us.

Let Mr. Guss attend his school. There are reports of one of these Orphan Schools which state that the Principal says he will make $5000 a year by employing incompetent *cheap* teachers, keeping the poor children on molasses and bread. It is said the orphans are suffering from starvation and that a quack doctor employed at the school goes around every night with a mixture in a bucket and makes every poor little orphan take a ladelful to keep them alive. One little fellow writing these facts to his mother was so cruelly beaten by the principal as to occasion several days sickness, yet that man claims to be a christian and a friend of the soldier and the poor orphans.—Shame on such villiany, such half reverened hypocrits! I wish, however, to say I do not mean Mr. Guss or his school as referred to. I regret I have occupied so much of your space, but desire the truth to be known.

JOHN J. PATTERSON.

HORRIBLE MURDER IN PHILADELPHIA.

A Family of Eight Persons Butchered.

The most horrible murder, or series of murders that ever occurred in Philadelphia, or, it would not be going too far to assert, that ever took place in the United States, was brought to light on Wednesday afternoon last. An entire family (excepting an absent son) have been literally butchered.

Mr. Christopher Deering resided with his family in Jones' lane, about one-half mile from the old Point House road, and within five hundred yards of the site of the well remembered Point House, about three miles below the Navy Yard, on what is termed the "Neck." Mr. Deering's family consisted of himself, wife and five children, a relation named Elizabeth Dolan, and a boy who has resided with the family for several years, and known to the neighborhood by the name of Cornelius.

Yesterday afternoon the fearful discovery was made that the entire family, with the exception of the eldest child, a boy named William, ten years of age, who happened to be paying a visit to a relative, named Duffy, in West Philadelphia, were brutally murdered, and their bodies thrown together in the barn, a short distance from the dwelling house. In each instance the heads were knocked in and the throats cut, in some cases to such an extent that they were nearly decapitated. There they lay, a mangled mass of humanity, piled one on top of the other. The father of the family and Mrs. Dolan were found lying side by side in the barn, terribly disfigured, and covered with hay, and in an adjoining sort of corn-crib was found the body of Mrs. Deering, surrounded by four of her children, all so terribly mutilated that identification was almost impossible; the ages of the children ranging from eight years to an innocent babe of fourteen months.

In the stables, near the barn where the bodies were found, three or four head of cattle were found in quite an emaciated condition. When taken out they drank water to such an extent that it was evident they had not received attention for several days. Four horses were also taken from the stables almost in a famished condition for want of food and water, all going to prove that several days have elapsed from the time the murder was committed until the discovery of the same yesterday afternoon.

A gentleman named Antoine Ganther who has been laboring for Mr. Deering is supposed to be the murderer.

STILL LATER.—A thrill of austere pleasure passed over the entire community yesterday morning, when it was made known upon the bulletin boards of the newspapers that a man, captured by three regular policemen, had been identified as Antony Probst, alias Ganther, the man employed by Mr. Deering, and supposed to be the murderer of the entire family. The policemen in question observed him walking along Market street, near to Nineteenth street, going toward the bridge. They concidently suspected him as a character anything but respectable. They observed that one of his thumbs was missing, and that under his ear was a mole, nature wen or wart, matters that were parts of the description given of the detested object of so much diligent search. The policemen followed him for a few paces, when Dorsey quickening his pace until he passed the skulking Probst, turned and confronted him:

"You are a German, are you not?" the officer asked, rather more with a view to forcing him to speak than for the value of what he might say.

"No, I am a Frenchman," was the reply of the man, who shrinkingly halted, in such broken English as no Frenchman ever uses, and the full force of which the intelligent policeman immediately understood. He and his comrades at once took the prisoner to the station house. The patrolmen had been directed to reconnoitre, if not to challenge every person in the streets whose appearance was at all suspicious, and this was the result of the scrutiny.

During the examination by the Mayor the prisoner stated that he had murdered the boy, but that he had an accomplice, whom he described, who killed all the rest. He stated that they had made their plans beforehand, and it was arranged that each one should be killed by a blow with the axe, and their throats cut afterward. Further, he said the accomplice got all the money, amounting to $300 with the exception of three dollars. Both of them went to the house and ate some bread and butter after committing the crime. According to his statement they did not leave the place until evening, though the murders were committed early in the day. The mother and children were murdered outside of the house, and then dragged into the barn. Mr. Deering and his neice were killed immediately on their arrival which was between one and two o'clock. All were dispatched in the same way, by striking them with the axe on the back of the head.

It is believed by the authorities that within a few days the murderer will make a full confession. When searched at the station there was nothing of value upon him. No money was found upon him. What were the avails of the robbery are not known.

The authorities are of the opinion that the man is a notorious falsifier, and beyond his statement that he killed the boy Cornelius, they believe nothing that he said. The entire eight murders were evidently the work of the one hand.—The same axe severed the throats of all.

"Will Congress Act?"

Congress has acted twice, during the present session, on matters of vital consequence to a proper readjustment of the Union. In each case its action was calm and deliberate. In both instances great efforts were made to act in harmony with the President. He was consulted. The measures were so framed as to meet his approval. Further modifications would cheerfully have been made to secure his cooperation. He gave assurances that he was satisfied. Yet, as soon as those bills were passed, he applied the veto to them. With what grace can the justifiers or apologists of the President insist that Congress shall take promp action on other matters? The President, by his acts, has placed himself in such a position that neither Congress nor the people can take his word. Of what avail is it for Congress to adopt measures to suit the declared purposes of the Executive, so long as his habit is to say what he does not mean?

New Advertisements.

REVOLUTION IN PITCHING HAY.—The undersigned has received a lot of Randell's First Premium Horse Pitch Forks—one of the greatest machines ever invented for unloading hay. All forks are warranted perfect or the money refunded. A boy 12 years of age can work them on a wagon with ease. Call at my store, in Patterson, and examine them—it will cost you nothing for calling.

J. B. M. TODD.

Mr. Emanuel Moyer, of Milford township, says: I purchased a Randells Horse Pitch Fork last spring from J. B. M. Todd, and found it to be the lightest and most perfect fork I ever used. A boy 12 years of age can use it and I unloaded two tons of hay from a wagon in 7 minutes time, by the watch.

NOTICE FOR SETTLEMENT.—The books of the late Medical Firm of D. M. Crawford and T. M. Leight, are in my hands for collection. All persons indebted to the same are requested to call and settle their accounts without delay, on the Wednesday and Saturday afternoons of each week after the first of May, 1866, and those having claims against said firm to present them duly authenticated for settlement.

Those having individual accounts against T. M. Leight, (against whom the firm may have an second,) will be allowed a credit on the books, to the amount of T. M. Leight's interest in the same.

apr. 18-4t. D. M. CRAWFORD.

CRAYBILL & CO.,

WHOLESALE DEALERS IN

Cedar, Wood & Willow Ware,

OIL CLOTH, WINDOW SHADES,

Brooms, Mats, Brushes, Cotton Laps,

Buckets, Twines, Wick, &c.,

345 NORTH THIRD STREET,

PHILADELPHIA.

[April 18, 1866.]