THE COMPILER.

H. J. STABLE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

GETTYSBURG, PA.

MONDAY MORNING, SEPT. 19, 1859

Democratic State Ticket.

For Auditor General,
RICHARDSON L. WRIGHT, of Philadelphia.
For Surveyor General,
JOHN ROWE, of Franklin county.

Democratic County Ticket.

State Senator,
J. W. DOUGLAS, of Franklin county.
Assembly,
FREDERICK DIEHL, of Franklin.
Commissioner,
JAMES H. MARSHALL, of Hamiltonban.
Director of the Poor,
JOSEPH J. KUHN, of Reading.
Auditor,
AMOS LEFEVER, of Union.
County Treasurer,
WAYBRIGHT ZIEGLER, of Gettysburg.
District Attorney,
J. C. NEELY, of Gettysburg.
Surveyor,
JOHN G. BRINKERHOFF, of Straban.

Rally, Freemen, Rally!

DEMOCRATIC MEETINGS.

THE friends of the Union and Constitution—of Equal Laws and Equal Rights,—the enemies of Sectionalism and Proscription—in Adams county, will hold Meetings at the following times and places, viz:

At McSherrystown, on Monday Afternoon, Sept. 26;

At J. E. Smith's (the Lime Factory,) in Mountpleasant twp., on Monday Evening, Sept. 26;

At Heidlersburg, on Tuesday Evening, Sept. 27;

At Littlestown, on Wednesday Evening, Sept. 28;

At East Berlin, on Thursday Afternoon, Sept. 29;

At New Chester, on Thursday Evening, Sept. 29;

At Fairfield, on Friday Evening, Sept. 30;

At Abbottstown, on Saturday Afternoon, Oct. 1;

At New Oxford, on Saturday Evening, Oct. 1.

It is expected that J. W. DOUGLAS, Esq., the Democratic candidate for State Senator in this district, will address a part, if not all of these Meetings. Speeches will be made by Hon. MOSES McCLEAN, F. B. BUEHLER, WM. McCLEAN, J. C. NEELY, W. A. DUNCAN, Esquires, and others.

Friends of Truth—friends of the GOOD OLD CAUSE, Rally to the Meetings!—ONCE MORE TO THE RESCUE!

☞The DEMOCRATIC BRASS BAND of Gettysburg will attend the Meetings, in their magnificent new Band Chariot.

By order of Committee,
H. J. STABLE, *Chairman.*

☞Additional Meetings will be called hereafter.

Sept. 19, 1859.

As We Expected!

The friends of Mr. DURBORAW are beginning to be STAGGERED by the exposure of his votes in the Legislature. They supposed before his re-nomination, that his votes on the "Extra Pay" were all right, especially as he had pledged himself to advocate low pay; and, then, his $200 donation coming in at the heels of the Session, was, in their judgment, calculated to seduce quite enough Democrats into his support to secure his re-election! But, they now suspect "there is something rotten in Denmark," and "smell a mice." They begin to realize that *his votes did not square with his pledges*—that, instead of voting for and advocating the $500 salary, *he voted for* the SEVEN HUNDRED DOLLAR pay, as his vote among the YEAS on the Conference Report shows! And what makes it all the worse for him is their opinion, is, that the *Star* and *Sentinel* will not undertake to open their mouths in regard to his course on the two most important tests, viz: When he DODGED the vote on the final passage of the Bill, and when he VOTED FOR the Conference Report, *both of which continued the Seven Hundred Dollar Salary to Members!* The friends of Durboraw begin to see and *feel* that the *Star* and *Sentinel* ARE CAUGHT—that they *dare not* deny his action on these points, and yet *dare not* justify what he did, because that would be acknowledging what we have charged him with, (and PROVED upon him,) a VIOLATION of solemn WRITTEN PLEDGES.

The dilemma is an unenviable one, but there is no getting out of it. Mr. Durboraw DID vote for the $700, as we have charged upon him, and if silence ever "gave consent" to anything, the *Star* and the *Sentinel* acknowledge that he did that very disreputable thing. If not, why not deny his DODGING on the final passage vote, and his YEA for the Conference Report? THEY DARE NOT DO IT! We repeat, they *DARE NOT!*—They KNOW that page 512 of the House Journal records the one, and page 1095 the other.

We defy Durboraw's organs to face the music on these points. Come, *gentlemen*, how is it about Durboraw's DODGING—about his vote FOR the Conference Report?

SAY, HOW IS IT?

☞Durboraw's $200 BRIBE is recoiling upon him, as it should. He begins to discover that FOUR CENTS A-HEAD will not buy the voters of Adams county, as he and the "Superior Councillors" seem to have supposed. Some of them, realizing the fact that the people see through the miserable trick, are making excuses for the act, and say Mr. Durboraw so disposed of the $200 because they were not his. Whether there be force or not in this plea, all we have to say to it is, that if the money was not his *to keep* it was not his to *give away*.

☞The Canadians talk of annexing Maine to that country, as the natural Atlantic terminus for Canada. The process of annexation is not improbable, but when it occurs the Canadians may find the dividing line of the two countries removed altogether.

"Old Documents."

The *Adams Sentinel*, of Oct. 4, 1858, charged CHARLES WILL with favoring $700 pay to Members, *because*, among other things, when the Conference Report on the Appropriation Bill, allowing that sum, came before the House, it passed "without opposition, the yeas and nays not being called." Further on in the same article, Mr. Will was charged with "permitting the Bill permanently increasing the salary to $700, to pass without opposition—making a difference to the Tax-payers of the State of over $26,000 a year." And the article concluded with this, *now*, very significant paragraph:

"☞Remember these facts, Taxpayers of Adams county, when you come to cast your ballots for a member of the Legislature. Remember, too, that Mr. DURBORAW, the opponent of Mr. WILL, is publicly PLEDGED AGAINST EXTRA PAY of all kinds—pledged to vote for a Repeal of the $700 Salary Law! Remember these facts, and then vote as your judgments and conscience approve."

The *Star* of Sept. 17, 1858, charged CHARLES WILL with favoring the $700 salary, declaring that he "sat quietly in his seat on the final passage of the bill" "increasing the compensation permanently to $700, without opposing it even by a call of the yeas and nays."

The *Star*, of Oct. 1, 1858, said:

"REMEMBER, Tax-Payers—that this $700 Law, if not repealed, will increase the annual expenditures every year over $26,000, and in ten years amount to over $260,000—which might otherwise go to the extinguishment of the State Debt.

"REMEMBER—That SAMUEL DURBORAW is *pledged* to vote for its REPEAL, while CHARLES WILL sat quietly in his seat without opposing the bill."

This is the way the Know Nothing papers spoke last fall, and we shall give further similar extracts from them hereafter.

Now, voters of Adams, look at the course of Samuel Durboraw in the Legislature, on this question, notwithstanding his solemn pledges, and the *Star's* and *Sentinel's* frequent re-iteration of them, during the canvass of 1858! Charles Will was faulted because the yeas and nays were not called! This was an enormous crime in Mr. Will in the eyes of the *Star* and *Sentinel* editors—a base betrayal of his verbal pledges! *But what has Samuel Durboraw done?* After his published pledges for the repeal of the $700 salary and the restoration of that of $500, we find him, on the 4th of March, (page 512) DODGING the vote on the final passage of the Appropriation Bill, allowing the SEVEN HUNDRED DOLLAR pay to continue, and on the 11th of April (page 1095) voting IN FAVOR of the Report of the Conference Committee, which also allowed the same pay of $700!

These are FACTS—stubborn and incontrovertible—and we ask an honest public, in view of them, whether SAMUEL DURBORAW is worthy of being trusted with the responsible post again? You cannot but answer, NO!—NO!!—NO!!!

Durboraw's Pay.

On referring to the House Journal, we find that Samuel Durboraw received for his services in the Legislature last winter $700 as salary, $22 80 mileage, and $25 *for stationery*. Of this comfortable aggregate of $747 80, he set aside $200 as an Electioneering Fund; but still the sum remaining is very snug compensation for his services, among which may be counted his remarkable feat in DODGING the vote on the final passage of the Appropriation Bill, allowing the $700 salary to continue, and his equally astonishing vote FOR the Conference Report, which also continued the same high pay to the members!—Very well done, Mr. Durboraw. Wouldn't you like the chance to do so again?

A Bungled Ticket.

To realize how egregiously the *Star* managers bungled their ticket, it is only necessary to know that should Mr. MUSSELMAN, their candidate for Director of the Poor, be elected, the Directors composing the Board would be residents of three *adjoining* townships. Mr. WHITE resides in Freedom, Mr. SPANGLER in Cumberland, and Mr. MUSSELMAN in Hamiltonban, directly between the two. Voters of all parties, look at this!—Mr. Musselman's election would leave without a Director the entire north, east and south of the county. Surely such a division cannot be regarded as judicious or fair.

Persons may ask how so glaring a mistake was made. The reason is not hard "to figure out," if a trifle posted in regard to Opposition manœuvring. To carry out the aim of the Professional Office-seeker on the Commissioner's Clerkship, it was necessary that he should have Mr. *Jacob Resser* as the candidate for Commissioner, and nobody else. A candidate taken from the upper side for that office might, (*if elected*, let it always be remembered,) be favorable to somebody else for *the Clerkship*, and that would "spoil" the oracle's "whole kettle of fish." Mr. Resser was, *therefore*, taken from the lower end, in preference to a far more popular candidate from the upper end, Mr. JAMES MARSHALL, of A., and to satisfy Hamiltonban, Mr. Musselman was given the Director candidacy.—Such is the sum total of a very singular transaction—such the secret of the nomination of a "temporary resident" for the important office of County Commissioner.

☞We understand, from various sources, that the Opposition candidates, especially Messrs. DURBORAW, RESSER, MCCLELLAN and FAHNESTOCK, are very actively canvassing for votes among Democrats. The friends of the GOOD OLD CAUSE need only bear in mind that not one of these gentlemen would, under any circumstances, vote for a Democrat, because all of them are violent Know Nothing and Black Republican politicians, who, in their hearts, regard the Democratic party with hatred. Democrats will hardly be verdant enough to vote for these leading Dark Lanternites simply because they may *condescend* to ask them for their votes.

Five "Dollars a Day and Roast Beef!"

The *Sentinel* endeavors to prove that Mr. DURBORAW redeemed his pledge because he voted to make the pay of members five dollars *per day*. This won't do. He was not sent there to vote in any such manner. Five dollars a day is a very different thing from $500 a session—because the session may be run out to any indefinite length, and the five dollars a day go on all the time, making the pay for the session probably ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS! The last session was of one hundred and five days' duration. The session of 1857 lasted from January 6th to May 22d, four months and a half, or about 135 days, which, at $5 per day, would have run the pay, *exclusive* of mileage, &c., to six hundred and seventy-two dollars! Let it be recollected, however, that these were *salaried* sessions—had the pay been *per diem*, both would have been longer.

Further, before the vote was taken on the $5 a day proposition of McClure, speeches were made by a number of the members, in which it was repeatedly declared that this mode of compensation would certainly tend to prolong the sessions, and therefore increase the pay over $500. Mr. Durboraw, PLEDGED AS HE WAS, should have heeded these warnings and voted *against* the proposition, because of its dangerous tendency; but, no, he saw fit to follow McClure, the advocate of high pay, and voted for five dollars *a day*. This is carrying out his pledge with a vengeance!

In his reply to the Resser letter, a year ago, Mr. Durboraw promised to vote "for the restoration of the $500 compensation." No man, with a particle of regard for consistency, can say that he redeemed that pledge by voting for a pay of $5 *a day*, when it is notorious that *per diem* sessions invariably, without exception, have run far beyond one hundred days.

Try some other tactics, Mr. *Sentinel*. That vote won't relieve Mr. Durboraw of a scintilla of the odium which he has incurred by BREAKING HIS SOLEMN PLEDGES.

Bear it in Mind!

The *Star* managers and their minions are endeavoring to make votes among Democrats for Durboraw by representing him as a good neighbor, and as having deposited *that* $200. This game is very transparent. If they could succeed in having him re-elected they would claim it as a *party* triumph—as the success of Know Nothingism joined with Black Republicanism, over Democracy. They put forth such a claim upon his election last fall—they would do so again. But the opportunity will not be given them. Adams county is not for dark lanternism, as she will demonstrate by beating one of the deepest dyed Know Nothings within its borders—Samuel Durboraw.

Voters, BEAR IN MIND, that every vote cast for Samuel Durboraw will be claimed by the Opposition as so many votes for their *party*—their proscriptive and dis-union mongrel organization!

Watch the Movement!

A somewhat prominent Know Nothing incautiously remarked, the other day, "If only we can manage to have Kuhn beaten!" meaning Col. JOSEPH J. KUHN, the Democratic candidate for Director of the Poor. This confirms a suspicion we have entertained a week or two, that the Opposition would make a desperate effort to defeat him *quietly*—for the time being not abusing the Catholics in their papers or otherwise openly, in order that Durboraw, Fahnestock, and others—reeking with the stench of Dark Lantern dens—might with smooth words upon their tongues approach Catholics for their votes! Let all opposed to Know Nothingism closely watch this movement. It is a dark but characteristic plot, and must be blown to the four winds.

☞DID

SAMUEL DURBORAW, or not, VOTE FOR the Conference Report on the Appropriation Bill, *continuing the Seven Hundred Dollars Salary to Members?* Will the *Star* answer? Will the *Sintinel* answer? If Mr. Durboraw did not, as they try to make an unsuspecting public believe, violate his pledge, did he conform to it by *voting for* a Bill allowing the $700? As you, gentlemen, seem to be entirely deaf on these points, allow us to yell it in your ears—D-I-D H-E?

☞Durboraw's oath in the Mountjoy Council of Know Nothingism, to proscribe Foreigners and Catholics, is a sore subject with the *Star* managers. They know there's no getting round the fact, and, therefore, must "grin and bear it." Their situation is an uncomfortable one, but they have only themselves to thank for it, because they were the originators of the infamous organization here, and at the time expected to get plenty of county offices through it—Mr. Durborow being among these aspirants for Know Nothing favors.

☞The Superior Councillors are in a sad plight. DURBORAW's votes they find cannot be successfully defended, and Capt. DIEHL cannot be successfully assaulted. In regard to the latter, they could only "intimate" that he did not vote the whole Democratic ticket last year, but his character as a man and a Democrat is too high to be injured by such a petty attack. Beside this, honest FRANK WILL has volunteered a card, certifying that he saw Capt. Diehl vote an open full Democratic ticket at the time alluded to.—Thus all the calculations of the *Star* managers are, one after another, being "knocked into a three-cocked hat." Thus their visions of success, to be accomplished through humbug and deception, are dissipating—fleeing far away!

Messrs. Managers, we might feel inclined to ask the people to sympathize with you, if we did not know that they feel it a duty to keep on giving you and your supple instruments terrible drubbings at the polls.

☞The Chambersburg *Transcript*, McClure's organ, in an article grossly misrepresenting Mr. DOUGLAS, the Democratic candidate for the Senate, says that Mr. MYERS, of this county, "was not pressed by his Conferees," We are authorized to pronounce this assertion entirely false, as the Conferees went there resolved to secure Mr. Myers's nomination, if possible, and voted for him on every ballot. But they were out-voted, and of course, like good Democrats, yielded to the majority. So much is due the Conferees.—The *Transcript* will make nothing for its favorite, McClure, by misrepresenting them.

☞Alex. Hay, of York, has purchased the celebrated trotter, "Flora Temple," at $6,000.

Hand Over the $100!

The *Star* managers, or "Superior Councillors," are reduced to the desperate expedient of resorting to high-sounding, windy assertions, to relieve Mr. DURBORAW from the dilemma he has placed himself in by a violation in the Legislature of the pledges which he made to the people of the county before last fall's election. THE FACTS are all against him, and the managers begin to see, that, twist and distort as they may, they cannot wipe out the least significant of them. Mr. Durboraw declared, in his reply to the Resser Letter, that if elected he would vote for "the repeal" of the $700 salary, and "use his influence to have the old compensation of $500 restored."

This "$500 compensation," mark it, reader, had reference to $500 *per session*. Now, let us examine the Journal of the House to see how he comes out on this point. On page 455, it is recorded that he VOTED FOR the McClure amendment, fixing the pay of Members at $5,00 PER DAY! The last session continued 105 days, and had the pay been *per diem*, the days would have numbered 135 or 140. He was pledged to vote for *a definite sum*, and here we find him sustaining a measure which would have made it in the highest degree *indefinite*—which would have run it far above the $500, as was demonstrated by more than a dozen of the members, in earnest speeches, on the floor of the House, at the time the vote was taken. *Did Durboraw in this instance adhere to his "obligations?"*

On page 512 of the House Journal the vote on the final passage of the Bill—the Bill *continuing the* $700 *Salary to Members*—is recorded, but the name of DURBORAW *is not found in the list of yeas and nays upon it!* Here he found it convenient to DODGE, although his name occurs immediately previous and soon after in the Journal. *Was this adhering to his "obligations?"*

On page 1095, ☞SAMUEL DURBORAW is recorded as voting IN FAVOR OF the Report of the Conference Committee, which Report CONTINUED THE $700 SALARY TO MEMBERS!!!☜ Was this voting to "repeal" the $700 law? Was this "using his influence to have the old compensation of $500 restored"?

The *Star* managers, forced to the wall, and without a chance of escape, tremblingly offer to "give to any person one hundred dollars who will prove that Samuel Durboraw, in a single instance, violated the above obligation."

We here PROVE such violation, in THREE "instances," *from the Journal*. Will the *Star* managers hand over the $100? Of course, not—but they will DODGE, as they and their favorite, Durboraw, are accustomed to do. The honest and intelligent voters of the county, however, will decide the matter for themselves, and remind Mr. Durboraw, in a crushing voice, at the Polls, of the old addage: "You cheat me once, that's your fault; you cheat me twice, that's *my* fault!"

☞A Chance to Make ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS!☜

The Journal of the House of Representatives proves that Samuel Durboraw voted *against* a proposition to make the daily pay of Members $1,50, with expenses going to and returning from Harrisburg.

The same Journal proves that Samuel Durboraw voted *for* a *proposition* to make the pay of Members $5 *per day* and mileage.

The same Journal proves that Samuel Durboraw *dodged* the vote on the final passage of the Appropriation Bill, which allowed the salary of Members to continue at $700 per session.

The same Journal proves that Samuel Durboraw voted *for* the Conference Report, which continued the $700 salary to Members.

These facts were stated in our last, and we re-state them now for the purpose of offering ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS to the *Star* managers, or others, who will prove them to be untrue—the Journal of the House, of course, being taken for the testimony. What say you, Messrs. Superior Councillors—guilty, or not guilty?

From the Valley Spirit.

McClure's Record.

MR. EDITOR:—In looking over the "Legislative Record" of the last Session of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, my attention was inadvertantly directed to the "House bill, No. 333,"—as it is generally called,—entitled: "An Act to prevent frauds at elections," published on pages 512 and 513 of said Record. Among other stipulations laid down in that Act, the first Section provides, that no person shall be entitled to vote, who, having been an alien has not been naturalized, in conformity with the laws of the United States, *at least six calendar months before the election*, &c."

The second Section of the Act prescribes that "as the only evidence that such alien has been naturalized as aforesaid, he shall produce a certificate thereof, &c.," "except such person shall have resided in the ward, district or township, for *ten years* or upwards next preceding such application to vote, which residence must be known to at least one member of the board of election officers." The 3d, 4th and 5th Sections respectively require, that a known qualified elector shall make oath "that the applicant to vote is the identical person named in such certificate of naturalization;" and that "the inspectors of elections shall not permit any person so naturalized, to vote *without the production* of such certificate" unless "he has resided in the district for ten years," and further, the inspector shall retain such certificate "until 12 o'clock meridian of the next day succeeding such election," when it shall be returned to the owner thereof, unless there should be "reason to suspect that such certificate of naturalization is forged," when it shall be the duty of the inspectors to retain the said certificate until an investigation can be made."

The whole bill contains 12 Sections. On the final action upon the bill, a motion was made by Mr. Gritman, of Luzerne county, a Democrat, to postpone the further consideration of it. The Yeas and Nays were required by Messrs. Gritman and Evans, and the result was as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Bertolet, Boyer (Clearfield,) Boyer (Schuylkill,) Broadhead, Burley, Custer, Dismant, Dodds, Evans, Fearon, Fleming, Foster, Galley, Goeppe, Graham, Gritman, Hill, Hottenstine, Irish, Jackson, Ketchum, Laird, Lawrence, (Washington,) Mehaffey, McDowel, Miller, Nill, Oaks, Pughe, Quigley, Rohrer, Rose, Smeads, Smith (Berks,) Stephens, Stewart, Thompson, Thorn, Walker, Warden, Wigton, Wilcox, Williams (Bedford,) Williams, (Bucks,) Wilson, Withrow, Woodring and Zoller—47.

Nays—Messrs. Abbot, Acker, Balliet, Barnsley, Bryson, Campbell, Church, DURBORAW, Eckman, Ellmaker, Gratz, Green, Harding, Kensegy, Kinney, Man, Matthews, McCLURE, Neal, Patterson, Pierce, Proudfoot, Ramsdell, Shaler, Sheppard, Styer, Walborn, Witman, Wiley, Williston and Lawrence (Dauphin,) Speaker—31.

It will be seen from the above, that *all* the Democrats and 24 Republicans voted *for* postponing this subject, and those *against* it are *all* Republicans, including Col. McClure.

Now, Mr. Editor, there is not a man living, who despises and condemns frauds—no matter *where and by whom they may be committed*—more than my humble self, nor do I deny that there are no frauds practiced. Frauds at elections are a calamity; they are a death blow at our liberal Institutions, and should be frowned down by all good citizens who cherish within their bosom the precious privileges which we enjoy. It is a lamentable fact that some men will "stoop to conquer," and that too, just so that they gain their selfish ends.

But, notwithstanding all the facts staring us in the face, it cannot be denied, that the cloven foot of Know Nothingism is not sticking out in the bill above alluded to. And how so? it may be asked. Let us see. The Constitution and laws as they *now* stand, allow a naturalized voter to vote as *soon as he is naturalized*. According to this bill, however, he must *wait six months before he can vote!!* Yes, Mr. Editor, he must wait *six months* before he can vote, even *after he is naturalized!* That sounds very stange; but so it is given in the bill alluded to, and, as already shown, *for* this bill—this gentle hit—Col. McClure voted. Now, this shows very plainly, that the Republican party of Pennsylvania is leaning towards having the same contemptible laws enacted here as are in existence in Massachusetts—a State where a Negro is put on a level with white men. It is absurd for them to talk about "equal rights" after such an attempt to disfranchise a large number of our naturalized citizens of their votes. Who can tell what step the Opposition party will take next? In regard to Col. McClure, I would only ask will he *now* ask the naturalized citizens to vote for him, after voting *against* their rights? Will he ask *them* for their suffrages when he is going hand in hand with such men as Keneagy, Abbott, Hardin and others?. We shall see.

FRANKLIN.

☞It will be observed that the name of Mr. DURBORAW is also found among the nays—among those who were in favor of keeping a foreign-born citizen SIX MONTHS OUT OF HIS VOTE AFTER BEING NATURALIZED. This was but carrying out the infamous oath he took in the Mountjoy Know Nothing Council, to MARK and PROSCRIBE Foreigners and Catholics. Will any one of them now so unman himself as to vote for him? Certainly no one can with the slightest degree of consistency do so.

From the Chambersburg Valley Spirit.

The Rule that Won't Work Both Ways.

The great embodiment of political infidelity who cracks himself up as a "head and shoulders taller than any other man in his party," has the consummate audacity to travel over this Senatorial District and preach up fidelity to party. This comes with a bad grace from one who has himself voted against the best men in his own party, and been unfaithful to it in its most trying hour of need. It may do for those who are not constantly up before the people for office, as McClure has been, to occasionally vote for a personal friend in preference to a political one, but for an inveterate office seeker to maliciously scratch his ticket, to further his own selfish ends, is not to be overlooked or pardoned in a party. This is the game McClure has been playing and it is time that his party and the public should know it, and he be made feel the consequences of his own dastardly acts. The rule works very well so long as it works to the interest of McClure, but when an independent member of his own party, who has become disgusted with corrupt politicians, applies the rule to him, he considers it most unpardonable, and pronounces him "a contrary d——d fool."—He seems to think that he is *the party*—that the voters have no privileges but what he allows them—that he may preach one thing and practice another, but it is a political sacrilege to vote against him.

It will require but a very slight examination of his political record to show his unfaithfulness to his party, and his corrupt character as a politician. In 1853, when Dr. David Mellinger was the candidate of his party for Senator in this District, McClure *treacherously voted against him*. McClure is now the candidate of the same party, in the same district, for the same office, and he expects the party to stand faithfully by him. Will they endorse his perfidiousness and vote him *into the very office* that he voted to *keep out* the previous nominee of his own party? He did not stand up for Dr. Mellinger and yet he has the assurance to ask the party to stand up for him. The friends of Dr. Mellinger in Adams county will remember his treachery.

Again, in 1855, he voted against the ticket of his own party for Assembly, on which was placed the name of that excellent man James Crawford, of Guilford township. The bare idea of such a corrupt politician as McClure scratching the name of as honest a man as James Crawford from the ticket he helped to form, has something in it so base that every honest mind must shudder to think of it.

Again, in 1856, his political perfidy seems to have reached it climax. He voted against B. Laporte, for Surveyor General; Joseph Pumeroy, for Congress; Washington Crooks, for State Senate; and L. S. Clark, for District Attorney. He almost made a clean sweep of his whole ticket. Thus did he sacrifice his party to further his own selfish purposes.—Here for the *second time* did he vote against the nominee of his own party, Washington Crooks—a better man socially, morally and intellectually than ever McClure dare be—for the *very same office* he is now asking the support of that outraged party. His friends may felicitate us on having his valuable support for our candidates—well, we did somewhat admire the treason but we heartily despised the traitor.

Again, in 1857, he voted *per arrangement* against Washington Immel, for Director of the Poor. Thus was Mr. Immel sacrificed by the *friends* in his own household. He, too, will be expected to hide the wound he received in the dark, and vote for the assassin who inflicted the stab!

It will be observed that he has never voted, since he resided in the county, for the nominee of his own party for State Senator, but invariably against him, and yet he has the barefaced, unblushing impudence to ask the party he has deceived and outraged, again and again, to vote for him for State Senator! It will not be done. Every principle that is decent in human nature revolts at the idea of honoring a man who is forever dishonoring himself.

☞DID

SAMUEL DURBOBAW, or not, DODGE the vote on the final passage of the Appropriation Bill, allowing *Seven Hundred Dollars* to each of the Members? Will the *Star* answer?—Will the *Sentinel* answer? Don't keep the crowd waiting, gentlemen—TALK OUT!

☞The *Star* managers know that of itself their party cannot elect anybody in the county to the smallest office, and hence their lying efforts to impose upon Democrats, to get them either to vote for some of their candidates or stay away from the polls altogether. Democrats, disappoint the office-seeking tricksters by going to the election and handing in full Democratic tickets, and nothing else.

Local Affairs.

Commencement Week.

The exercises connected with the closing of the Summer Session of the College and Seminary at this place attracted a large number of strangers—probably more than any similar occasion previous. For days before, the cars came crowded with passengers from all parts of the country—many from points far distant—contributing to give our streets a very lively appearance. Limited space prevents us from giving more than a running sketch of the week's doings:

On Sabbath morning Dr. BAUGHER pronounced the Baccalaureate Discourse.

On Tuesday evening, Rev. A. C. WEDEKIND, of Lebanon, delivered the Address before the Seminary Alumni—subject "The Modern Pulpit."

On Wednesday morning, the Junior exhibition took place. The following are the names of the young men who compose the class, and who acquitted themselves on the occasion in a very creditable manner—all winning applause, whilst a number were honored with showers of boquets from the ladies: J. W. Tyron, R. Weidensall, J. M. Rice, J. R. Groff, A. A. Lechlider, J. B. Fox, J. F. McCreary, J. B. Weidle, W. V. Gotwald, B. F. Apple, C. H. Shaffer, A. H. Groh, M. H. Richards, W. H. Dill, J. Q. Waters, H. J. H. Lemeke, and D. L. Tressler.

On Wednesday afternoon, the Address before the Phrenakosmian Society was delivered by Prof. Coppee, of Philadelphia, and the Address before the Linnæan Association by Dr. Stille, of Philadelphia.

On Wednesday night, the Address before the Alumni of the College was delivered by Rev. W. M. Baum, of Winchester, Va.

On Thursday morning the Commencement Exercises proper came off—addresses being delivered by the following gentlemen, members of the graduating class:

F. B. Wolf, G. M. Brickerhoff, J. W. Ebbert, W. R. Eyster, A. L. Guss, Theo. Heilig, Wm. Keckler, T. S. Warren, A. J. Weise, J. G. Goettman.

D. J. Benner, J. H. Moore, and F. C. H. Lampe, were unavoidably absent, and T. B. Blauvelt died a few weeks ago.

The Latin Salutatory was awarded to F. B. Wolf, and the Valedictory to J. G. Goettman.

The speakers acquitted themselves very handsomely, and made highly favorably impressions on the minds of their numerous hearers.

The Degree of A. B. was conferred upon the graduating class. The Degree of A. M. on the class of 1856—composed of the following persons: S. Aughey, J. S. Cutter, T. W. Dosh, W. Eichelberger, S. M. Firey, Wm. Hay, Adam Hoy, E. B. Kramlich, H. W. Kuhns, G. W. Leisher, G. A. Long, D. R. Miller, E. P. Muhlenberg, J. C. Neely, W. M. Riley, J. W. Schwartz, E. H. M. Sell, R. L. Sibbet, W. Murry Weidman, Jacob Weidman and B. D. Zweizig.

The Honorary Degree of A. M. was conferred on Rev. Geo. Butler, of Washington, and Rev. J. Alleman, of Hanover. The Degree of D. D. on Rev. J. A. Seiss, of Phila., Rev J. A. Brown, of N. Carolina, Rev. C. A. Hay, of Harrisburg, and Rev. E. Groenewaldt, of Easton.

The exercises were all attended by large and fashionable audiences, and everything passed off pleasantly.

Among the most attractive features of the occasion was the music, which was furnished by the celebrated Blues' Band of Baltimore, under the leadership of Prof. HOLLAND. This Band has the reputation of being one of the best Bands in the country,—a reputation which they fully sustained while in our midst. They won golden opinions from our citizens by their gentlemanly conduct, and placed them under obligations for a number of night serenades.

The Alumni Dinner came off in Sheads, Buehler & Kurtz's large Hall, on Thursday afternoon, and was one of the most pleasant features of the week. The company consisted of about one hundred, and the Dinner, we are told, was capital, as was to have been expected under Dr. Weaver's supervision. Sentiments were replied to on the occasion by Rev. Dr. Schmucker, Hon. M. McClean, Rev. Dr. Baugher, Rev. Dr. Sheffer, of Germantown, David Wills, Esq., Rev. Dr. Kranth, jr., Dr. Wagonseller, S. A. Holman, Prof. Stover, Rev. R. Hill, Dr. Stille, Dr. Morris, Rev. M. Passavant and others.

On Thursday evening, the Commencement Promenade took place. Such a display of beauty and fashion was probably never before witnessed in Gettysburg, and the occasion afforded much pleasure to all participating. In "beauty's circle proudly gay," there was but one thing lacking to make the enjoyment all it could have been, and that was a chasing

——"of the glowing hours with
flying feet"—

or, in plainer English, a lively, joy-inspiring, whole-souled *dance!* Will the Committee "make a note?"

State Fair.

We are requested to announce that the Gettysburg Railroad Company will issue Excursion Tickets to Philadelphia and return, good from the 25th of Sept. to 1st of Oct. inclusive, to persons wishing to visit the State Agricultural Fair, to be held there on the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th inst., and in addition two tickets of admission to the Fair Grounds, at the following rate, being half the regular fare:

From Gettysburg at	$4 75
" Oxford at	4 45
" Emmitsburg at	5 45

It is hoped that many of the citizens of this county, interested in the promotion of Agricultural and Mechanical pursuits, will avail themselves of the opportunity now offered of attending the exhibition, when it will cost them comparatively so little.

Arm Broken.

We are sorry to hear of an accident which happened our friend, Mr. PETER MACKLEY, of Straban township, on Wednesday last. Whilst engaged in threshing with a machine, a strap ran off one of the wheels, and in the attempt to get it back again whilst the machine was in motion, one of his hands was suddenly caught in the strap, and, before he could extricate it, the arm was broken. He is getting along under the misfortune as comfortably as could be expected.

☞The Winter Session of the Female Seminary will commence on the second Monday of October. The School is under the efficient control of Rev. Mr. EYSTER and his estimable lady. Under their care the Institution is gaining a high reputation, and has the full confidence of the community. We take pleasure in commending it to the attention of parents who desire to have their daughters receive a complete and thorough education.

Adams County Fire Insurance Company.

The Board of Directors of the Adams County Mutual Fire Insurance Company organized on Monday last by the re-election of the old officers, viz: President, George Swope; Vice President, S. R. Russell; Secretary, D. A. Buehler; Treasurer, D. McCreary; Executive Committee, Robert McCurdy, Andrew Heintzleman and Jacob King.

The Annual Report of the Executive Committee, which is subjoined, exhibits a highly gratifying degree of success on the part of the Company, the losses having all thus far been paid without resorting to assessments, with a handsome balance still on hand:

ADAMS CO. MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.—*Annual Statement for year ending Sept. 5, 1859.*

Amount of cash on hand Sept. 6, 1858,	$673 52
" Notes bearing int. " "	3,035 75
Premium cash received during the year,	874 91
Borrowed from Bank of Gettysburg, to pay loss by fire,	700 00
Interest on notes, " "	175 93
	$5,459 67
Cash paid out during the year, as per report of Treasurer, $144 43	
" Hon. Daniel Sheffer, loss by fire, 1 80	
" H. G Carr, loss by fire, 5 12½	
" Ephraim Miller, " 1300 00	
" Henry J. Kuhn, " 366 00	
" Repaid Bank of Gettysburg, (loan,) 700 00	
" D. McCreary, Treasurer, 50 00	
" D. A. Buehler, Secretary, 50 00	
Funds invested, bearing int., 2617 25	
Cash in hands of Treasurer and Managers, 225 17	
	$5,459 67
Am't of Premium Notes, Sept. 6, '58,	$80,645 94
" " " received during year,	18,266 01
	$98,911 95
Expired & surrendered during the year,	9,079 79
Premium Notes, Sept. 5, 1859,	$89,832 16
Am't of property ins'd Sept. 6, '58,	$1,129,750 76
" " " dur'g the year,	263,180 29
	$1,392,931 05
Exp'd & surrendered du'g the year,	127,612 63
Amount insured, Sept. 5, 1859,	$1,265,318 42
No. of Policies in force Sept. 6, 1858,	719
" " issued during the year,	199
	918
Surrendered and expired during the year,	94
No. of Policies in force Sept. 5, 1859,	824
AVAILABLE FUNDS.	
Funds invested,	$2,617 25
Cash in hands of Treasurer,	225 17
Cash fund,	$2,842 44
Premium Notes uncollected,	89,832 16
	$92,674 58

The Executive Committee, in submitting the foregoing statement, renew their congratulations to the Board by reason of the continued prosperity of the Company. During the nine years of the Company's operations, by husbanding its resources, it has been able to pay the losses and expenses from year to year, without assessment upon the members. The losses last year amounted to nearly $1700, which have been paid in full, leaving a handsome fund in the Treasury, which must all be exhausted in future losses before resorting to the Premium Notes.

A. HEINTZELMAN,
R. McCURDY,
JACOB KING,
Ex. Committee.

Attest—D. A. BUEHLER, *Sec'y.*

"Home Again."

We had the pleasure, on Thursday last, of taking by the hand, our esteemed friend W. W. WRIGHT, Esq., who recently returned from Europe, where, especially in London, he had been spending a number of months on business connected with the contemplated Honduras Railroad, in Central America, the survey and location of which was completed under his supervision a year ago. He is in excellent health and spirits, and bids fair to live long enough to be at the very top of the Civil Engineering profession of the country, a distinction he is rapidly and surely attaining. His native county of Adams may well be proud of him.

Mr. Wright has been appointed Chief Engineer in the construction of the Railroad alluded to, at a salary of $12,000 per annum. The work will probably be commenced in the spring, and may require five years to complete it, the distance being two hundred miles—estimated cost $15,000,000. Our best wishes always attend him.

Communicated.

☞At a meeting of the members of the Bar and officers of the Court, held at the Prothonotary's office, on Saturday, the 10th instant, convened to adopt appropriate action in regard to the death of J. K. MCILHENY, Esq., late a member of the Bar, Hon. DAVID ZIEGLER was appointed chairman, and A. J. COVER, Esq., Secretary.

After a few pertinent remarks by R. G. McCreary, Esq., the following gentlemen were appointed a committee to draft and report resolutions expressing the views of the meeting: Wm. McClean, R. G. McCreary and D. Wills, Esquires. The Committee submitted the following preamble and resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Whereas we have heard with profound sorrow of the death of our esteemed friend and professional brother, J. K. McIlheny, whom if has pleased Divine Providence to cut off in his youth, in the midst of usefulness and at the very moment when years of mental toil had introduced him to membership in an honorable profession, in which, by the possession of an active, vigorous and cultivated mind, he was well qualified for success; and whereas our respect for his memory and his many virtues render it proper that we should give formal expression to our sentiments in regard to this mournful event. Therefore

Resolved, That in the decease of J. K. McIlheny, Esq., the bar has lost one who bade fair to become one of its brightest ornaments—whose many virtues had justly endeared him to all who knew him, and whose intelligence, activity and public spirit, evidently qualified him for general, as well as professional, usefulness.

Resolved, That while we deeply sympathize with the bereaved family of the deceased in their loss of an affectionate, obedient