The Agitator.

WELLSBORO, PENN'A.

A. F. BARNES, EDITOR.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1873.

REPUBLICAN STATE TICKET.

FOR JUDGE OF SUPREME COURT,
ISAAC G. GORDON, of Jefferson County.

FOR STATE TREASURER,
ROBERT W. MACKEY, of Allegheny County.

REPUBLICAN COUNTY TICKET.

FOR REPRESENTATIVE,
JOHN I. MITCHELL, of Wellsboro.

FOR SHERIFF,
STEPHEN BOWEN, of Morris Run.

FOR COMMISSIONER,
LEVI B. SHEIVE, of Jackson.

FOR AUDITOR,
CHARLES F. VEIL, of Liberty.

FOR JURY COMMISSIONER,
EDWARD A. FISH, of Wellsboro.

FOR CORONER,
GILES ROBERTS, of Knoxville.

The publishers will pay the postage on all copies of the AGITATOR *taken within the county of Tioga, where the subscription is paid up to the first day of January,* 1874, *or beyond that date. The printed address-label on the paper will show each subscriber the exact date to which his subscription is paid.*

We would remind every voter that he must register THIS WEEK or he cannot vote at the election to take place October 14th.

Our readers will notice in the letters of Mr. Micthell's assailants, which we publish to-day, a continued assumption that *their* side of the question is the only side worthy of the least consideration. They talk a great deal about the "4,000 petitioners," but not much about the remonstrants. It is true one of them condescends to sneer at the "mongrel remonstrances"—(and the 7,500 people who put their names to those "mongrel" papers should feel very much obliged to him, no doubt)—but that is all. This single fact is enough to show the worthlessness of their position in the eyes of all fair and candid men.

Bowen—Willhelm.

We clip the following from the Westfield *Index* of last Thursday:

"Mr. J. W. Willhelm, the Democratic candidate for sheriff, called on us yesterday. He is around 'interviewing,' and we hope may be elected, as he is in every sense a gentleman, and, what would seem of the utmost importance to this county, he is a temperance man."

That the editor of the *Index*, being a strong Democrat, should desire Mr. Willhelm's election, even if he had not been favored by a personal "interview" with his candidate, was to be expected; and that he should put forth the strongest arguments he can think of in favor of the nominee of his party is also a matter of course. But, we submit, the arguments made by the editor in behalf of his party friend should not constrain any Republican to vote for Mr. Willhelm. It is claimed that "he is in every sense a gentleman." It is hard to tell just what this phrase means. There are many definitions of a gentleman. In a popular sense the word generally implies, besides many essential qualities of manliness, a certain suavity of deportment, polish of manner, and softness of hand, which are vouchsafed only to the favorites of fortune. If this is what the *Index* means when it says that its candidate is in every sense a gentleman, we must admit [illegible]

No; we don't ask people to vote for Mr. Bowen because he is "in every sense a gen[illegible] silver [illegible] mouth." He was born to poverty, and he has struggled up through a youth of the hardest and most unremitting toil as a miner to manhood and a position of honor and consideration among his fellow-men. His life has been one of hard work, and he has had to win his place in the world by his own hands and brain. We think it is to his credit that, beginning as he did, he has reached the position he now holds in the regards of all who know him. But we don't claim that he is "in every sense a gentleman." And perhaps it is just as well that we don't. It is all right that there should be a candidate of that superfine kind in the field, and there may be some very nice Democrats who will rejoice to vote for him; but for common mortals, like ourselves and the rest of the Republicans, a good, plain, straightforward *man*, like Stephen Bowen, will do very well.

But we are told that Mr. Willhelm is "a temperance man," and upon that point we have a few words to say.

Those leading temperance men in this region who were present at the "Mass Convention" by which Mr. Willhelm was put in nomination fully appreciated the farcical "temperance" character of that assemblage. That a set of men who could not preserve their own countenances when they talked about their "temperance convention" and "temperance ticket" should expect to deceive anybody by the thin temperance gauze which they have tried to cast over their proceedings is remarkable; that they should succeed in deceiving anybody almost passes belief. And yet they are still playing that transparent farce in the face of the people. We ask temperance men to look at the ticket set up by that Convention and then reflect what office it is the Democrats are sure to secure. By so doing they will be able to estimate the hollowness of this Democratic temperance dodge. Is any temperance man silly enough to suppose that he will advance the cause of temperance by electing the Democratic ticket, or any part of it? Why, the Democratic Convention of Dauphin county, at the capital of the State, has just been passing resolutions in favor of the repeal of the local option law. Surely, the net is spread in vain in the sight of any bird.

We admit that Mr. Bowen is not, in the technical sense of the phrase, "a temperance man;" but we do claim that he is a *temperate man.* He is not a teetotaler, neither is he an intemperate man. For this assertion we have the evidence of men who have known him ever since he reached manhood and whose truthfulness is unquestioned.—We have thought it best to be thus explicit in speaking of Mr. Bowen's private character in this regard, because we know that many lies are being circulated about him by the friends of the "perfect gentleman" who is his competitor. Nobody pretends, so far as we know, that Mr. Bowen will not make a good Sheriff, and we believe that long before his term of office expires many men who are now retailing falsehoods to his discredit will be heartily ashamed of themselves.

When the *Index* was enumerating the fine points of its favorite candidate it overlooked one in which many people feel an interest. It forgot to speak of the political complexion of Mr. Willhelm. It forgot to say that he is now and always has been one of the stiffest of Democrats. As everybody knows, there were during the war Democrats of two sorts—the one popularly known as "War Democrats," and the other as "Copperheads." We are informed by those who know him well that Mr. Willhelm *wasn't* a War Democrat. We knew quite a number of "perfect gentlemen" of the Democratic pursuasion who, at that time, when the very life of the nation was in peril, were not War Democrats; and it seems Mr. Willhelm was one of those who didn't believe in coercing our "Southern brethren." Of course he had a right to his opinions then as he has now, and we are not blaming him for them. But it really seems to us that he cannot expect the *Republicans* of Tioga county to reward him for them by the gift of the best office in the county—even if he is "in every sense a gentleman" and "a temperance man."

Some Interesting Correspondence.

It has been evident for some time that several gentlemen at the pretty little village of Tioga were not in the most amiable frame of mind imaginable. During the past year things haven't gone at all as they wished; and they have undoubtedly been ready to exclaim, with all the testiness of the unhappy Prince of Denmark, that "the world is out of joint." It must be admitted that they have at least taken up arms against their little "sea of troubles." They have sacrificed some money and considerable reputation in the attempt to stem the tide of adversity; but, to borrow a word from their own vocabulary, they haven't as yet "affected" much by their efforts.

And it looks as though these unfortunate gentlemen were doomed to continued reverses. For, somehow, their wishes don't appear to coincide exactly with those of the people at large, and they seem to have a fatal facility in always espousing the wrong side of public questions. We regret this, for their continued disappointments and defeats don't seem to improve their tempers or their manners any, and they allow their private organ to snub this place as "a little backwoods hamlet," while it unceasingly chants the praises of their own lovely village. While all this is rather amusing than otherwise, it shows that those who indulge in such little ebullitions of temper are not at peace with themselves. We have appreciated this fact, and so have allowed their out-croppings of spite to pass without notice, hoping that after a little time their "perturbed spirits" would find rest, and submit quietly, if not willingly, to the inevitable. But we begin to despair of that result. These gentlemen are bound that they *will* be uncomfortable to the end of the chapter, and that nothing that the people can do *shall* satisfy them. The people voted for the Crawford County System by an overwhelming majority, and a month afterward their private organ emitted a long and dismal growl over the fact. The Republican County Convention met and discharged its duties harmoniously, and after thinking about it a few weeks the private organ growled about *that.* The Democratic County Convention met and nominated a ticket, and the private organ fairly shrieked with rage. And now that same stupid sheet has learned that Hon. John I. Mitchell has been re-nominated for Representative, and it seems to have gone entirely out of its poor little head.

All this is laughable enough, and hurts nobody. It would be entirely unworthy of notice if the organ did not refer to certain letters which have passed between Mr. Mitchell and some representative Tioga gentlemen with reference to the proposed division of the county last winter. That the people of the whole county may fully understand Mr. Mitchell's position on that question, we print those letters below. The copies we give are set up directly from the originals, and may be relied [illegible] circulation in the pocket organ varies somewhat from the original, as will be seen hereafter.

Although the facts relating to the last abortive effort to divide the county were pretty well ventilated last winter, it may be well to recall a few of them to the minds of our readers by way of introduction to this correspondence. We have the best authority for saying that just before the last session of the Legislature convened Mr. Strang and Mr. Mitchell, the Senator and Representative from this district and county, met a party of Tioga gentlemen at the Rathbun House in Elmira. At that conference, which took place at the request of the Tioga party, the project of dividing the county and removing the county seat was broached, and the two representatives of the people were sounded as to their position on that question. They stated that as to the introduction of a bill for that object they would be guided by the wishes of a majority of the people of the county expressed through petitions and remonstrances. Mr. Mitchell said that he had not been elected upon that issue, and that he could not act in the matter in opposition to the will of a majority of his constituents. And the gentlemen in favor of division agreed at that time that this position was fair and honorable—a conclusion in which we are sure the people of the county will entirely concur.

The sequel is well known. The two representatives went to Harrisburg. The division gentlemen went home and set busily to work getting signatures to their petitions.—After they had been at work a week or more, those who were opposed to the division project got waked up, and started the circulation of remonstrances. Early in February the leading men of both parties went down to Harrisburg with their papers. The division men claimed to have about 4,000 names on their petitions, while those opposed had at that time about 6,200, and afterward procured and sent on about 1,300 more, making in all about 7,500 who were opposed to the scheme. This being the state of facts, the division men asked Mr. Mitchell to introduce their bill, and he declined, because a majority of his constituents were opposed to such a course. Thereupon the division men fell to abusing him for not overriding the will of a large majority of his constituents, and their organ is still abusing him for the same reason. In other words, they blame him for following a course which they themselves beforehand agreed was the only proper one. They blame him for doing what they then knew and now know it was his duty to do as an honest representative of the people—for doing what every fair man, whether in favor of division or not, honors him for doing.

These disappointed gentlemen, some of whom call themselves Republicans, having, after diligent search, failed to find among the Republican thousands of Tioga county one man who would contest Mr. Mitchell's nomination, are now seeking by personal abuse to wreak a personal vengeance upon him. The people of the county well understand their motives and their objects, and will express their opinion of John I. Mitchell and his assailants at the ballot-box.

In the mean time the voters will find the following letters rather interesting. Let them be read carefully, for we may have something to say upon them hereafter.

HARRISBURG, Feb. 6, 1873.

Hon. John I. Mitchell, H. R., Harrisburg, Pa.—Dear Sir:—We, the undersigned, representing a large and respectable portion of your constituents, and having with us the petition of about four thousand more, visit this city for the purpose of procuring the passage of an act of the Legislature giving the people of Tioga county the right to decide by ballot at the next general election the question of the forming a new county out of parts of Tioga and Potter counties, and also the question of removing the county seat of the present county of Tioga to Tioga village, and for bonding the town and borough of Tioga to build the county buildings as by petition. And for the purpose of rendering an intelligent answer to those who sent us—your constituents and ours—we ask you the following questions, and request your answer in writing:

1st. Will you introduce such a bill in the House, and give your influence and aid to pass it?

2d. If you decline this, and it is introduced and passed in the Senate, will you then use your earnest efforts and influence to pass it?

3. If you decline to do either, will you, if introduced by some other member, stand neutral upon the matter, and not in any way oppose it or use your influence against it?

4. If you answer all of the above questions in the negative, will you please inform us if you intend to strenuously oppose it?

We desire your answer in writing that we may know what action to take in the matter, and that we may intelligently report to our constituents. We are truly yours.

F. E. SMITH,
H. H. BORDEN,
S. X. BILLINGS,
A. HUMPHREY,
C. H. SEYMOUR.

Among the signatures to the above letter, as published by Mr. Mitchell's enemies, is the name of T. L. Baldwin. No name other than those above printed is appended to the original letter. Why this attempt to interpolate another name is now made of course we can't say.

But the reason for another change of this letter is more obvious. The last clause of the first sentence is printed by Mr. Mitchell's assailants as follows: "and for the town and boro of Tioga to build the county buildings as by the petition," whereas it does in fact read as above printed: "and for bonding the town and boro of Tioga to build the county buildings as by petition." The reason for this significant change in the words and sense of a document now intended mainly for Tioga circulation must be plain to anybody who reflects a moment upon some of the magnificent promises of certain division gentlemen last Winter respecting new county buildings. We informed the people of Tioga township at that time, that notwithstanding the brilliant promises of these men, their real intention was to mortgage the property of the taxpayers to pay for the proposed new buildings. And here we have the confirmation of our statement over the signatures of five of them.

No doubt this proposition to bond the township and boro will not now be well pleasing in the sight of many taxpayers of that region. The annual interest on the sum required would probably double the taxes of every mother's son of them, to say nothing of the principal which would have to be paid some day out of the taxpayers' earnings. Hence we have this effort to amend the record by toning down that ugly expression about *bonding the town*. It won't work, gentlemen; the cat is under the meal, but her claws are plainly visible.

—Here follows Mr. Mitchell's reply to the above letter:

LOCHIEL HOTEL,
HARRISBURG, Feb. 6, 1873.

Messrs. F. E. Smith, H. H. Borden, and others.—Gentlemen:—Yours of this date stating that you represent a large and respectable portion of my constituents, and that you have with you the petition of about 4,000 more; that you visit this city for the purpose of procuring the passage of an act giving the people of Tioga county the right to decide by ballot at the next general election the question of forming a new county out of parts of Tioga and Potter counties, and also the question of removing the county seat of the present county of Tioga to Tioga village, and for bonding the town and borough of Tioga to build the county buildings, as by petition; and that for the purpose of render the following questions, and request my answer in writing is received.

Questions: 1. Will you introduce such a bill in the House, and give your influence and aid to pass it?

2. If you decline this, and it is introduced and passed in the Senate, will you then use your earnest efforts and influence to pass it?

3. If you decline to do either, will you, if introduced by some other member, stand neutral on the matter, and not in any way oppose it or give your influence against it?

4. If you answer all the above questions in the negative, will you inform us if you intend to strenuously oppose it?

In reply I have to say: 1. I will not introduce such a bill unless I am satisfied that a decided majority of my constituents demand it. I told you this at our first interview, and I have since said the same to those opposing this movement; and now for me to disregard such a pledge would exhibit bad faith to those who I understand have made an earnest effort to satisfy their representatives, by remonstrances of the people, that the popular sentiment of the county is against the movement. I have not examined either the petitions or remonstrances, and of course have not formed an opinion upon them. I feel it my duty to say that I was not elected upon this issue—that I am the representative of all the people, and of no particular section of the county, and that I shall adhere to this course whatever the consequence may be to me personally. I need not remind you that the situation is painful to me, indeed. Still I must accept the responsibility, and shall do so in the conviction that my action is in keeping with the high trust for the time being reposed in me by the people.

2. If such a bill pass the Senate, this fact would deserve consideration at my hands, out of respect to that body and the distinguished gentleman who represents us in that hall. Still I should hesitate to violate the wishes of a majority of my constituents, for the reasons given above.

3. I should not stand neutral while a Representative, in any case. If I believe the people are opposed to any measure, I feel it my duty to give fair expression to their opposition.

4. I shall feel called upon to oppose this movement in any case, if I am convinced that the sentiment of the county is against it.

I have thus answered your questions frankly. Thus much is due you and those you represent. Such questions as these are unrelenting. No matter what may be my action, I am aware that I shall be blamed. So great is sometimes the weight and misfortune of official responsibility. In haste, very respectfully and truly your obedient servant,
JNO. I. MITCHELL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
HARRISBURG, Feb. 26, 1873.

Messrs. F. E. Smith, C. H. Seymour, and others.—Gentlemen:—I was surprised yesterday by the statement made in a letter to me from A. C. Bush, of Tioga, in reference to the excitement over the removal of the county seat, alleging that I "refused to pay any attention to the petitions" of persons favoring that movement at the time of your late visit to this city. The letter further states that I refused even to receive and present the said petitions to the Legislature. The very last words I said to those of your committee who were present when I left your hotel that night were that if they desired to leave the petitions with me I would examine them at my earliest opportunity. I had repeatedly suggested a joint meeting of parties on both sides for a hearing upon the petitions and remonstrances, and at our meeting that evening I said more than once that I had not examined the remonstrances, and that I would act judicially in the matter; that I would consider all the circumstances, and try to arrive at a just conclusion as to which side was supported by the weight of public sentiment in the county. But enough of this.

I now write to say that it will give me pleasure to present any petition from my constituents. Certainly I never intended to deprive any one of them of this high right, much less 4,000 people, among whom I recognize many of my personal friends. Very respectfully your obedient servant,
JNO. I. MITCHELL.

TIOGA, PA., March 11, 1873.

Hon. John I. Mitchell, H. R.—Dear Sir:—Your favor of the 26th of February to F. E. Smith, C. H. Seymour, and others was duly received and its contents carefully noted; and as I am "one of the others," it has been handed me to answer. You say you were very much surprised on receiving a letter from A. C. Bush, Esq., of Tioga, in relation to the removal of the county seat from Wellsboro to Tioga alleging that you refused to pay any attention to our petitions favoring the movement. I am sure you could not have been more suprised than we should have been at any time prior to our late visit to Harrisburg to which you refer, since which time there is hardly anything that would surprise us. But that you should presume or attempt to controvert the statements of five as good, reliable, and trustworthy men as Messrs. Smith, Seymour, Baldwin, Borden, and Billings, to say nothing of myself, who, you more than intimate, treated you in such an ungentlemanly manner, and expect to be credited, surprises almost everybody. Messrs. Smith, Borden, Baldwin, and myself arrived in Harrisburg February 5th, and after a consultation it was decided that Baldwin and myself should call upon you at your room some evening and inform you that we were there as the immediate representatives of over 4,000 petitioners, all your constituents, and all voters or taxpayers, and whose names were written either by themselves or at their request on separate petitions with plain and unmistakable headings, asking for a division of the county on the east line of Shippen township, north and south, and a removal of the county seat from Wellsboro to Tioga, and that these more than 4,000 names had been obtained without misrepresentation or fraud, as each and every petition set out at its head just what the petitioners desired done in the premises by you as their trusted Representative; and we requested that you, at the earliest moment consistent with your other duties, should examine the names, and you promised us you would do so. We also told you that we were credibly informed, and verily believed (our information in some cases being verified by oath) that some of the remonstrants had resorted to various devices and tricks to mislead and deceive others, by pretending that 75 acres of land, on which the present county buildings were located, and also a large portion of the village of Wellsboro, was on ground donated at an early time in the history of the county and prior to the location of the present county buildings at that place, with the understanding and condition that they should ever remain there, and if ever removed to any other point, then the land would revert back to its former estate, and that the county would in such case be liable to an amount varying from half a million to a million dollars. We were also informed, and so stated to you at the time, that non-residents 'and non-taxpayers' and minors' names were put on the remonstrances, some by consent and some otherwise, and that fictitious names were added to swell their list, and names of persons without their knowledge or consent; and that they had openly boasted of obtaining names at fifty cents each, and obtained a large number in this way; and these charges were verified by affidavits, and at the time in our possession; all of which we informed you. We also called your attention to petitions circulated for a half-shire at Mansfield, in order to divert and induce her citizens, who had at three different times unanimously resolved that they were in favor of a division of the county and of the removal of the county seat to some point on the Tioga river, and that that point should be either Tioga or Mansfield—alleging that it was far more convenient and easier of access. To all this you replied that you would be influenced by no other names than the remonstrants to our petition; that names procured on half-shire petitions would be wholly disregarded by you. We assured you we should ask nothing unfair at your hands, that all we desired was a fair expression from the people, and that we proposed to submit the question, to be decided by ballot, at the next general election; and what we wished of you was to introduce a bill, and urge its passage, enabling us to do so, and if we were permitted to vote on such a measure and were defeated we should be satisfied.—But this we asked you to keep to yourself, as we did not wish the proposition to come from us; but if they suggested it, or anything of the kind, you were at liberty to say to them we would accept it; and you faithfully promised to say nothing to the Wellsboro party whatever, either about the number of names or what we intended doing.

You can imagine our surprise the next morning when we learned that Sherwood, from Washington, and Niles and Elliott, from Philadelphia, and others had been with *you* all night, and that Niles and Elliott had returned, and that Sherwood and Wilson were going to Washington, and their entire satisfaction—work all finished, and nothing further to do. Of course we saw at once that [we] were sold out, and if we needed any further evidence, we got it the next morning. But we needed nothing more. We knew very well the thing was fixed, and so well satisfied were we on that point, that Mr. Smith had drawn up the letter for you to answer, that we might take it home to our and your constituents on our return.

All this had been done without any references to either *petitions* or remonstrances, for you distinctly stated that you had seen neither at our last interview in the evening before we left Harrisburg, and yet your mind was fully made up, and, to use your own expression, "nothing could change it, and that you should adhere to it, although you should be crushed between *two mill stones*." At this juncture Mr. Smith handed you the letter he had prepared during the day, that we might report to our and your constituents on our return home; and after you had read it, you again reiterated your determination to have nothing to do with it; and again, still later, and after you prepared and submitted your answer, Dr. Borden asked you if you could do nothing for us—if you would remain neutral, and not oppose us; and you said you would not, and that you should do all you could against us. We then asked you if you should oppose Herdic's bill, and you said you should; that you were not elected on any such issue, and that you should do nothing for either a division or the removal of the county buildings.

It is true, as you assert, you offered to look over our petitions at some convenient time, but on being asked if it would in any way influence or change your mind, you said it would not. Of course we were unable to see any benefit from it to us. It might gratify Judge Williams's curiosity—the only man left of the Wellsboro party—and perhaps yours; certainly there could have been no other object.

It seems strange to us that the people have no rights that you as their Representative are bound to respect, or otherwise to say what they want, or entitled to an opportunity to express their wishes through the ballot box. But I am not going to argue the matter farther. If you are satisfied, we will try to be, for the present, at least.

Trusting this will reach you safely, and refresh your memory on some of these points, I remain your obedient servant,
A. HUMPHREY.

The undersigned, who were at Harrisburg with Judge Humphrey, understand the facts as he has stated them, particularly where reference is made to either of us; and farther, that you distinctly and unequivocally refused to have anything to do with the matter unless you could be thoroughly convinced that a decided majority of the county desired the change, and at the same time virtually admitting you could not be convinced. The feeling manifested by you led us to conclude you did not desire to be convinced, and hence it was a hopeless task to convince you against your will. It is absurdly idle to offer to present our petitions, when you refused to present a bill to which the petitions would apply, and declared you would oppose it if presented by any one else.

F. E. SMITH,
H. H. BORDEN,
C. H. SEYMOUR,
T. L. BALDWIN.

F. E. SMITH'S LAW OFFCE,
TIOGA, Pa., March 15, 1873.

Hon. John I. Mitchell.—Dear Sir:—Yours of the 26th ultimo was duly received. I thought at first I would pay no attention to it, fearing that my annoyance at the course you had taken might make me do you injustice. But lest my silence may be construed into a tacit admission of your position, I will briefly and plainly, but I hope fairly, reply. Without regarding anything you had said before, any promises you had made and encouragement given, I state this simple proposition—that the petition of over four thousand of your constituents was presented to you, simply asking that all the voters in the county—not you—might decide by their ballots, in a legal and orderly way, the question of the division of the county and the removal of the county seat. This was the only way such a thing could be fairly and honestly decided. It raised no political or partisan issue, it effected [*sic*] no principle, but was simply a local question which the people were fully competent to decide, had a right to decide, and ought in all justice and fairness to have been permitted to decide. It relieved you of all responsibility, and left it just where it ought to have been left. But you peremptorily refused to introduce a bill yourself for this purpose, and declared you would oppose a bill if introduced by any one else, unless you were thoroughly convinced that a majority of the voters in the county desired it; and when we pointed out to you the impossibility of deciding it, or of your being convinced from the petitions and mongrel remonstrances, you admitted it. And then, when we urged that this was the only way to arrive at a decisive expression of the people upon the question, you replied with much feeling "that your mind was made up, and that you should not do it; that you had promised the opponents of the measure that you would not, and that you would not, let the consequences be what they might. You foolishly, as we thought, complained of our placing you in an embarrassing position, while we all tho't we were relieving you from all embarrassment and responsibility. You may therefore judge somewhat of our indignation.—The reasons you gave for this course were, first, the expense of the election; second, that there was no such issue in your election; third, the excitement it would cause; and fourth, your promises to the other party. To which we replied that the expense would be nothing, as we proposed to vote upon it at the next general election; that the excitement would necessarily continue until the question was decided, and this was the proper, easiest, and quickest way to allay it; and that, though the question was not in issue during your election, it had now arisen, and as a faithful and intelligent representative you were bound to meet it, as you have other questions not then in issue. If there was anything in this reason, you would have no business to take either side, but sit like a "bump on a log" and let it run, while you remained dumb. Your last reason we left with you, unanswered. What surprised us, was that you, the simple servant and representative of the people, should refuse to listen to the prayer of over four thousand of those who had made you what you are in your present position, and whose wishes you promised to respect, and whose interest you promised to represent, by accepting the position you hold. It is true you proposed to us to leave our petitions with you, and you would examine them at your leisure; and when asked if it would avail anything, or probably change your views, you replied that you did not know as it would. Was there any object then in leaving them with you? Would you have left any matter to such a foster father, and then returned to those who sent you? Your proposition now to present our petitions, while refusing to present the bill to which the petitions apply, is, probably without intending it, an insult to our intelligence, too patent for argument or explanation. It is unnecessary to go farther, or speculate upon the motives which induced your strange action. It is enough that several respectable men, personal friends and constituents of yours, asked of you a thing which they had a right to ask, a thing which could not compromise you, and which placed you fairly before all the people of your county, and you refused, without any sufficiently apparent reason, and the responsibility must rest with you, and cannot now be shifted by your proposing to go through with the idle farce of presenting petitions for a local object without any such project before the Legislature. I think I have thus briefly and plainly, but fairly and kindly, stated the matter as it looks to the great number who by their petition sought your action. I am very truly, &c.,

F. E. SMITH.

HARRISBURG, PA., April 4, 1873.

F. E. Smith, Esq.—Dear Sir :—This is the first opportunity I have had to answer your letter of the 15th of March in reply to mine of the 26th ultimo.

Sir, my whole crime in reference to the question of the division of Tioga county and the removal of the county seat to Tioga, lies in my determination to adhere to the rule which Senator Strang and myself laid down in the beginning at the request of yourself and others who favored the movement, as the proper criterion for our government as the chosen representatives of our constituents. I never sought to influence any person upon this subject. I felt it to be my duty to leave the matter entirely to the people, and if you have failed with them it is your fault or theirs and not mine. For you have not even left the petitions of the people favoring the movement with me for examination; and yet you claim that I have denied them the right of petition! This is as if a plaintiff, having a witness to testify to his claim but refusing to put him on the stand, should lay the blame of his failure to make matter in issue between the plaintiff and defendant. By every rule of law and equity you have suffered judgment to go against your clients by your own default; if you have the evidence to make good your allegation that a decided majority of the people favor the project in issue, you should produce it. I told you I would examine the petitions fairly, and be controlled by my judgment of the weight of sentiment; this was a decision in favor of the competency of your evidence, leaving its effect to be judged of when produced; and how, I ask, could I judge of its effect, unless it were produced for my examination? It will not suffice for you to answer that you had a majority with you; that is *ex parte* and a begging of the question; for those remonstrating claimed they had the majority on their side—a much larger number than you claimed; for you claimed rising of 4,000 names and they over 6,000. So there I was between the 4,000 and the 6,000, and I did just what you or any fair minded man would have done in like circumstances. I thought that here is a difference between two neighbors; they cannot agree upon their line fence, so to suppose; one says it should be here, the other, there, and very high words pass between them. I say, come before me with your evidences of title; I know the land pretty well, for I was born in the one place, lived there till I grew to manhood, striving to do my share of the work, not going often to the village, but spending all my spare time in the little attic under the paternal roof, trying to fit myself for usefulness when I should leave it; while the other, though my adopted home, has been made congenial to me by expressions of neighborly interest; so that I felt competent to decide the dispute impartially.

But you would not listen. Like Robert Faulkner when his grandmother prayed for his lost father, and that he might be saved from the fires of Satan if it were the Father's will, you would not have an "if" about it. I said, No; I will not be overcome even by my natural love for my native place, which still is so strong that none other equals it, but not strong enough to betray me into a breach of public trust. These, sir, be the "millstones" to which I never referred in this connection, and not any "agreement" with Wellsboro people or others, for I have made none such; I made no agreement, but simply told all, as I had you, that I should endeavor to be controlled by the voice of the people. I expressly told you that I could not allow my action as a representative to be controlled by any local interest, feeling that I was the representative of the whole and not any particular part of the people. All you asked at first was a submission to a vote of the people, if demanded by a majority of them. You could not ask more than that, for you proposed to take more than one-tenth of the population of the county by the division as set forth in your petition, and the constitution requires a vote in such a case. The question in issue, then, upon your petitions was, Shall there be a vote? Against this the Wellsboro people remonstrated, and they had as much right to remonstrate as you had to petition for it. Suppose the tables were turned, that the county seat were at Tioga, and that the Wellsboro people should petition to have it removed to Wellsboro, Would you have no right to remonstrate against it? And would it be right, in such a case, for a representative to pass a law submitting the question to a vote, if you had a majority against it? You know it would not, and yet that is just what you ask me to do when I have 6,000 remonstrances against it as claimed, and but 4,000 for it, and you seem to presume upon my natural attachment to Tioga to seduce me into a breach of duty. I acknowledge the attachment, but refuse to be misled by it; and you should respect me none the less for this.

But you will say that the true sentiment of the people could not be ascertained in this case from the petitions and remonstrances, and you say I admitted this. I admitted that such evidence is many times uncertain, but distinctly stated that I thought I have no difficulty in deciding from them whether a decided majority demanded the passage of the law. I told you I was pretty well acquainted throughout the county, and that I would try to arrive at a correct decision, and that I would take into consideration all the facts of alleged frauds and misrepresentations on both sides. But you saw fit to go home without leaving any of your petitions with me, and thenceforth sought to throw the responsibility of the failure on me, without giving me any opportunity to ascertain what the strength of the movement was. I leave it to all fair-minded men to say whether this is a compliance with the golden rule on your part.

You say that I said my "mind was made

up.'" I did say my mind was made up upon the *rule* that I ought to be controlled by the voice of the people, but expressly told you in my first letter that my mind was *not* made up as to the *fact* whether you had a majority or not: for I had not examined either of the petitions or remonstrances, and so stated in my letter. This was right, for it was the rule you yourselves invoked, and it was all you said you could ask, in the beginning. But when you came here with your petitions you insisted that it should be submitted to a vote as the only proper way to decide the matter. To say this is to deny the right of the people to remonstrate, which is equal to the right of petition, and this I would not do. If you had not a majority, in fairness to me you should have said to the petitioners that this is not my fault, and not sought to cast the blame upon me without leaving the petitions with me.

You say that my "proposition now to present the petitions, while refusing to present the bill to which the petitions apply, is, probably, without intending it, an insult to your intelligence, too patent for argument or explanation." And yet you say in substance what I admit, that a representative must meet issues not involved in his election. This is correct; and yet one of your questions to me in your first letter is, "If you decline to do either (that is to introduce a bill myself, or pass it if it should come from the Senate) will you, if introduced by some other member, stand neutral upon the matter and not in any way oppose it, or use your influence against it?" My answer was: "I should not stand neutral, while a representative in any case. If I believe the people are opposed to any measure, I feel it my duty to give fair expression to this opposition." A neutral represents nothing, and to such a cipher you might aptly say he sits "like a bump on a log," but not justly of me. I think it is an insult to the intelligence of a representative to say he should submit a bill with every petition he receives. If some petition and others remonstrate, how stands the case? Can a representative (not a "neutral" as you would have had me be) say yea and nay at the same time? A petition or remonstrance is the act of the people; a bill is the act of a representative; and I hold that a representative should not present a bill unless he intends to pass it, and that he should not pass it, unless he believes a majority of the people desire him to do so. I desired to present your petitions; and I was never more surprised than I was the morning you all left without leaving them with me. You have yourselves denied the right of petition to those you were sent here to represent, and some of them, I know, will hold you responsible, and not me.

I have answered your letter at much greater length than I intended, and have done it frankly. I cannot now particularly answer all your points, some of which, not noticed, place me in a false light; but I am willing to be judged by my record, and shall not suffer myself to be misrepresented where I can prevent it. Bacon among his apophthegms relates the following: "Philip of Macedon was wished to banish one for speaking ill of him. But Philip answered: Better he speak where we are both known, than where we are both unknown."

You speak of those who made me what I am in my present position. I acknowledge my obligation to those who elected me to this office, and have striven to represent them fairly and creditably. I should be glad to do anything for them which I can conscientiously do; but I think most of them will not unjustly blame me, and feel that they cannot justly do so. I have the honor to be very respectfully yours,

JOHN I. MITCHELL.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Jacques Costa, the celebrated French naturalist, is dead.

The British steam yacht Deerhound and crew have been released by the Spanish authorities.

The Ontario Government is notified of the successful negotiation in London of the £2,000,000 sterling five per cent. loan for the Inter-Colonial Railroad at an average premium of 4½ per cent.

Gen. Schofield has issued an order for the execution of the Modocs on the 3d day of October, at Fort Klamath.

The Brazilian cable expedition has reached Madeira, and the shore end of the line connecting that island with Portugal was successfully laid on Monday week.

The property of the National Iron Company at Danville, Pa., was sold last Tuesday at auction, by order of the assignee, for [illegible] D. C., was the purchaser.

By a terrific explosion last Tuesday on the steamer Broomhaugh, one hundred miles from [illegible] killed and many more scalded, some fatally.

It is rumored that one of the objects of King Victor Emanuel's visit to Prussia is to have an understanding with the Emperor for joint action against possible French aggressions and to prevent the election of a French Ultramontane to the Papacy.

Chief Justice Cockburn has fined the editor of the Cheltenham *Chronicle* $750 for publishing criticisms on the conduct of the trial of the Tichborne claimant, and threatens him with imprisonment if the offense is repeated.

Here is a pretty little story from Independence, Missouri, brought by the telegraph last week: "James J. Chiles met Deputy Marshal James Peacock on the street and slapped him in the face. A fight ensued, during which a pistol fell from Chile's pocket, which was picked up by his son, fourteen years of age, who shot Peacock in the back, inflicting a dangerous wound. Peacock then shot Chiles through the head, killing him instantly. A son of Peacock then shot young Chiles, wounding him fatally. City Marshal Farrow, who came up to stop the fight, was slightly wounded in the breast, but by whom is not known."

It is officially stated that the situation of the Carlists in the north of Spain is precarious. Desertion from their ranks is increasing, and demoralization is spreading. The discipline of the Republican troops is vastly improved.

Gen. Garibaldi, in a letter to Senor Castelar, tenders his sword in the service of the Republic. The President replies, thanking the General for his noble offer, but declaring that Spain now needs no assistance.

The New York Court of Appeals has reversed the decision of Surrogate Hutchins in the celebrated Taylor will case, involving millions, and decides, contrary to the Surrogate, that the signature, James B. Taylor, was, as claimed by the plaintiff, Kate B. Howland, a rank forgery. The case will now go to a jury.

Henry C. Bowen last week applied for an injunction restraining the *Christian Union* from advertising that it has a larger circulation than the *Independent*. The motion was denied, on the ground that if an injury has been done the remedy is by action for damages.

The Bank of France has agreed to advance 100,000,000 francs to the Spanish Government.

In consequence of the financial crisis, orders for locomotives for three months ahead at the Rogers Locomotive Works at Patterson, N. J., have been canceled, and five hundred and eighty-five workmen have been discharged. It is feared that five hundred more may be discharged at the same works, and several hundred at the Danforth and the Grant Works.

The custom journeymen shoemakers of Philadelphia are on a strike.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company have reduced the hours for laborers and roadmen to eight per day, and the pay rolls will be reduced accordingly. The laborers threaten a strike against the new rule.

A proclamation has been issued by the President of Spain suspending the constitutional guaranties, establishing a rigorous censorship over the press, and prohibiting the carrying of arms by civilians.

The King of Italy took leave of the Emperor Francis Joseph on the 21st, and left for Berlin, where he arrived next day, and was received with marked cordiality by the Court and with great enthusiasm by the people.

News from Santo Domingo is to the effect that the revolution against the Government of President Baez has assumed alarming proportions, and there is every prospect of its speedy termination. The towns of Monte Christe and Guayabin are in possession of the revolutionists, who are also in close proximity to Porto Plata. Great confusion exists in that town, and numerous families are preparing for flight. Martial law has been proclaimed, and an attack from the revolutionists is momentarily expected. This sudden change in favor of the revolutionists was caused by Gen. Garcia, of the Baez party, espousing the revolutionary cause with six hundred men. The cry of the revolutionists is, "Down with the Samana Convention and Baez!" There is every reason to believe that the rising will not injure business, as the revolutionary party promise to abstain from persecuting any one, and say their only object is to secure the removal from power of President Baez.

A dispatch from Teheran announces the return of the Shah of Persia to his capital. The whole population turned out to escort him to his palace. The Shah in a brief speech stated that he had visited the parliaments and principal institutions of Europe, with the special object of introducing what he saw good in them into the administration of his own Government.

Democracy and the Tariff.

The one practical question in which Pennsylvania is just now more interested than any other is the Tariff question. In the settlement of that she has a direct and palpable interest. The continuance of her present prosperity and her future growth depend on it. Her hold upon the iron market, in which she is just beginning to displace her British competitors, and which is just beginning to strengthen and tighten, depends on it. The development of her untold wealth and the employment of her tens of thousands of workers depend on it. In fact, her very life is wound up in that issue. Yet, upon that one all-absorbing, overshadowing, and controlling subject the Democracy of Pennsylvania has not a word to say. It pretends to be a Pennsylvania party, yet cannot say a word for Pennsylvania! It asks for the support of Pennsylvania, but has not the pluck to utter a word in her behalf. It has opinions upon "monopolies," but none on domestic industry. It can denounce railroad combinations, but is silent on Free Trade; it can acquiesce in the results of the war, but it cannot recognize the results of protection; it can resolve upon all kinds of national abstractions, but has no opinion to express on the one practical question of the hour. It is nominally a Pennsylvania party, but has nothing of Pennsylvania about it; and with a vision that can see afar off, it has no eyes for the interests that lie around it. How can such a party ask Pennsylvania to stand by it? How, in fact, can any true Pennsylvanian stand by that party?. A party that is too cowardly to express its opinions on a leading and important question and one in which the people of the State have so clear and well defined an interest, is too craven to live and too impotent to accomplish anything if it was possible for it to succeed. There are some eunuchs who were born so from their mother's womb, and there are some which were made eunuchs of men, but here is a party which has emasculated itself —*Pittsburgh Commercial.*

The State Treasury.

The Democratic press of this State, as well as of New York, are incessantly talking about the "plundered State Treasury of Pennsylvania." They talk as if Mr. Mackey and the Sinking Fund Commissioners had robbed the State of millions, and were keeping it up from day to day—pocketing the public funds as fast as they are received. Of course all this is done for the purpose of reflecting upon the Republican party of our State, and to aid the Democracy in the ensuing campaign. Now, we respectfully suggest that the Democratic press, just for a change, abandon the policy of indulging in mere empty charges, and get at something substantial. Let them point out when, by whom, and to what amount the Treasury has been "plundered." Let them show that a single dollar of the people's money has not been accounted for, or is not accounted for now, and their charges would have some weight. The most bitter opponent of Mr. Mackey cannot truthfully assert nor show that he has not managed the Treasury in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law. He has satisfactorily accounted for every dollar of the money paid into the Treasury. If the public money has not been economically expended, it is because the Legislature made extravagant appropriations, for which Mr. Mackey is not to be held accountable. That the State Treasury has been "plundered," or that the public funds are unaccounted for, even to the extent of a dollar, at this time, as is so flippantly charged by the Democracy, is utterly false, and those who make the charges cannot establish the truth of what they say. Mere assertions in regard to the management of the State Treasury will not answer any longer. If the Democracy have any *facts* to substantiate their charges, let them out with them at once, or stand confessed falsifiers.—*Scranton Republican.*

Examination of Teachers.

EXAMINATIONS for those desiring to teach during the year, will be held at the following places:

Union, (Ogdensburg),	Tuesday,	Sept.	23,	1873.
Blossburg,	Wednesday,	"	24,	"
Covington,	Thursday,	"	25,	"
Mansfield, (School House),	Friday,	"	26,	"
Tioga,	Saturday,	"	27,	"
Mainsburg,	Monday,	"	29,	"
Rutland,	Tuesday,	"	30,	"
Jackson, (Millertown),	Wednesday,	Oct.	1,	"
Lawrenceville,	Thursday,	"	2,	"
Farmington, (O. C. S. H.,)	Friday,	"	3,	"
Nelson,	Saturday,	"	4,	"
Clymer, (Sabinsville),	Monday,	"	6,	"
Gaines, (Vermillyea's),	Tuesday,	"	7,	"
Delmar, (Stony Fork),	Wednesday,	"	8,	"
Wellsboro,	Thursday,	"	9,	"
Charleston, (Whitneyville),	Friday,	"	10,	"
Chatham, (Shortsville),	Saturday,	"	11,	"
Brookfield,	Monday,	"	20,	"
Westfield,	Tuesday,	"	21,	"
Knoxville,	Wednesday,	"	22,	"

And at Knoxville the two following Saturdays.

Examinations to commence at 9 a. m.

Teachers will provide themselves with foolscap paper, pen and ink. School Directors and others are earnestly invited to attend. Our Annual Institute will be held in Wellsboro upon the week commencing Oct. 13.

E. HORTON,
County Superintendent.

Sept. 9, 1873-6t.

BOARD AND ROOMS.—The subscriber has several well furnished rooms which will be let to single gentlemen or ladies at reasonable rates; board will also be furnished, a good table being set. Apply at my residence on Pearl street, a few doors from the school house, in this village. MRS. BUSH.

Wellsboro, Sept. 16, 1873.-3t.

ADJOURNED SALE

OF REAL ESTATE.

Estate of A. P. CONE, Deceased.

IN pursuance of an order of the Orphans' Court of Tioga county made the 5th day of June, 1873, the undersigned, Administrator of said estate, will, at the Court House in Wellsboro, in said county, on

Saturday the 25th day of October, 1873,

at ten o'clock a. m., expose to sale and sell the following described real estate:

No. 1.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, Tioga county, Pa., bounded on the northwest by Water street, northeast by R. G. White, southeast by Main street, and southwest by Wain street; being 120 feet on Main street, and 250 feet on Water street; known as the CONE HOUSE lot.

No 2.—Also a lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the northwest by lands formerly of L. I. Nichols, northeast by O. F. Ellis, southeast by Water street, and southwest by other lands of said estate, (No. 3); the same being 60 feet wide on Water street.

No. 3.—Also a lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the northwest by lands formerly of L. I. Nichols, northeast by other lands of said estate, (No. 2), southeast by Water street, and southwest by lands in possession of R. B. Webb; the same being 59½ feet on Water street; together with an alley 12 feet wide leading from this lot to the highway leading from Water street by Durif's tannery to Nichols street.

No. 4.—The undivided one-half of a lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the northwest by Water street, northeast by D. P. Roberts, southeast by Main street, and southwest by Wright & Bailey; being 60 feet on Main street and 250 feet deep; known as the "Bowen & Cone Block" lot.

No. 5.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the northwest by lands of James Kelley, northeast by C. L. Wilcox, (formerly D. L. Deane,) southeast by Main street, and southwest by Israel Richards; being 60 feet on Main street; known as the Stevens lot.

No. 6.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the northwest by Main street, northeast by Jacob Broadhead, southeast by other lands of said estate, and southwest by the Norris lot, (No. 7); being 127 feet on Main street and 250 feet deep; known as the residence of said decedent.

No. 7.—The undivided four-fifths of a lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the northwest by Main street, northeast by other lands of said decedent's estate, (No. 6), southeast by other lands of said estate, and southwest by Laugher Bache; being 90 feet on Main street and 250 feet deep; known as the "Norris House" lot.

No. 8.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the north by lands of said estate, east by B. T. Van Horn, south by East Avenue, and west by S. B. Warriner; being 78 feet wide on East Avenue and 200 feet deep.

No. 9.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the north by other lands of said estate, east by lands of William Bache, south by East Avenue, and west by lands of F. D. Fletcher; being 240 feet on East Avenue and 200 feet deep, and having four frame dwelling houses thereon. This lot will be divided and sold in parcels, each 60 feet wide on East Avenue.

No. 10.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the northwest by lands of L. Bache, A. P. Cone, Jacob Broadhead, Nathan Niles and Joseph Riberolle, north by Joseph Riberolle and lands formerly of Erastus Fellows, east by William Bache, south by lots fronting on East Avenue owned by A. P. Cone, F. D. Fletcher, Margaret Henry, Charles Fisher, C. F. Austin; Elizabeth Maxwell, B. T. Van Horn, A. P. Cone, S. B Warriner, Hugh Young, Mrs. D. H. Smith, and said East Avenue; containing about four acres. This lot will be divided and sold in parcels to suit the convenience of purchasers.

No. 12.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the north by lands formerly of Erastus Fellows, now Jos. Riberolle, east by lands formerly of Caroline Austin, south by Austin street, and west by Bache street; containing two acres of land, and comprising lot 5 on Austin street and lots 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 on Bache street, according to the allotment of said Cone lands in Wellsboro; excepting therefrom lots Nos. 4 and 6, sold by said A. P. Cone to Margaret Reese, situate at the corner of Bache and Austin streets; and being each 60 feet on Bache street and 200 feet deep.

No. 13.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the north by lands sold by said Cone to Lester Butler, now Walter Sherwood, east by Bache street, south by Thomas Davis, and west by William Bache; being lot No. 9 on Bache street, and being 60 feet wide and 180 feet deep.

No. 14.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the north by Thomas Davis, east by Bache street, south by the west extension of Austin street, and west by lands of S. T. Roberts and Frank Smith; being 79 feet on Bache street and 180 feet deep.

No. 15.—A lot of land in Wellsboro, bounded on the north by the west extension of Austin street, east by Bache street, and south by lands contracted to P. R. Williams; being 51 feet on Bache street and running back to an angle.

No. 17.—The undivided one-half part of all that lot of land situate in Delmar township, in said county, bounded on the north by warrant No. 1,578, east by the west line of Charleston township, south by warrant No. 1,582, and west by warrant No. 1,639; being a part of warrant No. 1,579; containing 600 acres; excepting 100 acres owned by D. L. Deane.

No. 18.—A lot of land in Delmar, bounded north by William Donner, east by the Stony Fork road, and south and west by Avery Gleason; being eight rods on said road and running back 20 rods; containing one acre.

No. 21.—A lot of land in Wellsboro; bounded on the northwest by Main street, northeast by Samuel Dickinson, southeast by John N. Bache, and southwest by Philena Saunders; being 20 feet on Main street and 61½ feet deep; known as the Sherwood lot.

No. 24.—A lot of land in Delmar, bounded on the north by the north line of warrant No. 4,219 and lands called the Johnson lot, east by said Johnson lot and S. S. Packard, south by J. W. Ingerick and unseated lands, and west by unseated lands; containing 53.8 acres, a part of warrant No. 4,209; known as the S. B. Warriner lot.

No. 25.—A lot of land situate in Delmar, beginning at the southeast corner of the W. S. and L. S. Butler lot; thence along a warrant line south 64 rods; thence along S. S. Packard west 144 rods; thence by the Warriner lot north 26 rods, west 30 rods, and north 31.6 rods; thence east 168 rods to the beginning; containing 61 acres; being a part of warrant No. 4,219.

No. 26.—A lot of land in Delmar, beginning at the northwest corner of the W. S, and L. S. Butler lot; thence by the same south 173½ rods; thence by other lands of said estate west 93 rods; thence by lands of Lucinda Sabin north 74 rods; thence by Darius Ford east 64 rods, and north 86 rods; thence by Leonard Palmer east six rods, north 13½ rods; thence by Jerusha Palmer east 27 rods to the beginning; containing 65 acres; a part of warrant No. 1,543.

No. 27.—A lot of land in Delmar, bounded on the north by the H. E. Simmons lot and F. Butler, east by the E. R. Allen lot, south by A. P. Cone, and west by lands formerly of James Coles and H. E. Simmons; containing 50 acres; part of warrant 4,219; called the Ensley Simmons lot.

No. 28.—A lot of land in Delmar, bounded on the north by Ira F. Butler, east by the Ensley Simmons lot, southwest by the West Branch and Stony Fork creeks, and west by the Austin Lawton lot; containing 17½ acres; called the H. E. Simmons lot; being a part of warrant No. 4,219.

No. 33.—The undivided three-fourths of a lot of land in Delmar, beginning at a beech, the west corner thereof; thence by lands of William Eberentz north, 45½ degrees east, 27 rods to a post in the south side of the King road; thence along said road south, 72¼ degrees east, 93 rods; thence along the new Stony Fork road south, 57½ degrees west, 70¼ rods; thence by Hector Horton north, 45¼ degrees west, 26 rods; thence by William Eberentz 41 5 rods to the beginning; containing 21.4 acres; known as the Delmar Cheese Factory.

No. 37.—The undivided one-half of a lot in Middlebury, bounded on the west and north by lands formerly of Aaron Niles, east by William Dennison, and south by Philander Niles; containing 43 acres; known as the Asa Bullock lot.

No. 38.—A lot of land in Elkland, in said county, bounded north by Main street, west and south by T. B. Coates, and east by O. P. Babcock; containing one-eighth of an acre.

No. 39.—A lot of land in Gaines township, bounded on the north by the north line of warrant No. 1,635, east by David Rexford, south by the south line of said warrant, and west by lot No. 21 of Dent's lands in said township; containing 58.5 acres, and being lot No. 22 of Dent's lands in said township.

No. 41.—A lot of land in Morris, containing 56 acres, known as the A. C. Williammee lot, bounded by Wm. Emmick William Bache and John Williammee.

No. 42.—A lot of land in Clymer township, in said county, containing 140 acres, part of warrant No. 2,291, known as the Hunt lot; beginning at the northwest corner of said warrant; thence east 145 rods; thence south 148 rods; thence west 145 rods; thence north 148 rods to the beginning.

No. 43.—A lot of land in Clymer township, beginning at the southeast corner of the Hunt lot, (No. 42); thence north 44½ rods, east 34 rods, south 207.8 rods, west 114 rods, north 163 rods, and east 80 rods to the beginning; containing 122 acres, being part of warrant No. 2,291; known as the McNiel lot.

No. 44.—The undivided three-eighths part of a lot of land in Blossburg or Bloss, containing 120 acres, on warrant survey in the name of Aaron Bloss.

No. 46.—The undivided one-half part of a lot of land in Charleston township, bounded on the north and east by lands of Martin Bennett, south by J. G. Dartt, and east by Asa Wilkinson; containing 30 acres.

No. 47.—A lot of land in Clymer township, bounded on the north by Amy Schoonover, west by lands claimed by —— Fox, south by E. Pier, and east by Stephen Stiles; containing 25 acres; known as the William Schoonover lot.

Terms made known at time of sale.

J. HARRISON, Administrator.

Wellsboro, Pa., Sept. 30, 1873.-4t.

General Election Proclamation.

WHEREAS, by an act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, entitled, "An act to regulate the General Elections of this Commonwealth," enacted on the 2d day of July, 1839, it is enjoined on me to give public notice what officers are to be elected—therefore I, E. A. FISH, High Sheriff of Tioga county, do hereby make known and give this public notice to the Electors of Tioga county, that a General Election will be held throughout the county on the 2d Tuesday of October next, being the fourteenth day thereof, at the several districts within said county, namely:

Bloss township, Arnot school house.
Blossburg borough, Union school house.
Brookfield, South Road school house.
Charleston, Dartt Settlement school house.
Clymer, Sabinsville school house.
Chatham, Chatham Center school house.
Covington, hotel of Thos. Graves.
Covington borough, hotel of Thos. Graves.
Delmar, Court House.
Deerfield, Cowanesque House.
Elkland borough, Sandy Stinson.
Elk, Smith school house.
Fall Brook borough, Fallow school house.
Farmington, Gee school house.
Gaines, H. C. Vermilyea's.
Jackson, house of E. L. Boynton.
Knoxville borough, Eagle House.
Lawrence, Slosson's Hotel.
Liberty, Sheffer's Hotel.
Mansfield borough, Model school house.
Mainsburg borough, P. Doud's Hotel.
Middlebury, Holidaytown school house.
Morris, house of Geo Crist.
Nelson, house of Charles Goodrich.
Osceola, H. & J. Tubbs's Block.
Richmond, Hotel of Royal Fuller.
Rutland, house of Elmer Baker.
Sullivan, P. Doud's Hotel.
Shippen, Big Meadow school house.
Tioga, Hotel of Elias M. Smith.
Tioga borough, Hotel of Elias M. Smith.
Wellsboro, Court House.
Westfield, E. G. Hill's Hotel.
Westfield borough, E. G. Hill's Hotel.
Ward, house of William L. Thomas.
Union, house of John Irvin.

At which time and place there will be elected the following State and County officers:

One person for Justice of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

One person for State Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

One person to represent Tioga county in the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

One person for Sheriff of Tioga county.

Two persons for Jury Commissioners of Tioga county.

One person for Coroner of Tioga county.

One person for Commissioner of Tioga county.

One person for Auditor of Tioga county.

And it is further directed by the said law that the return Judges of the said election districts, shall meet at the Court House in Wellsboro, Pa., to make out the general returns, on the first Friday succeeding the said elections, being the 17th day of October.

I am by said act further directed to give notice that every person, except Justices of the Peace, who shall hold office or appointments, of trust or profit under the government of the United States, or of this State, or of any city or incorporated district, whether a commissioned officer or agent, who is or shall be employed under the legislative, executive or judiciary departments of this State, or of any incorporated district; and also that every member of Congress, and of the select or common council of any city, commissioners of any incorporated district, is by law incapable of holding or exercising at the same time the office or appointment of judge, inspector, or clerk of any election of this Commonwealth, and that no inspector, judge, or any other officer of any such election shall be eligible to any office then to be voted for.

And the law of 1866 directs:

"The qualified voters of the several counties of this Commonwealth at all general, township and borough and special elections, are hereby required to vote, by tickets written or printed, or partly written and partly printed, severally classified as follows: one ticket shall embrace the names of all Judges of Courts voted for, and to be labelled outside 'Judiciary;' one ticket shall embrace the names of all the State officers voted for, and be labelled 'State;' one ticket shall embrace the names of all the county officers voted for, including office of Senator, member and members of Assembly, if voted for, and members of Congress, if voted for, and labelled 'County;' one ticket shall embrace the names of all township officers voted for, and be labelled 'Township;' one ticket shall embrace the names of all borough officers voted for, and be labelled 'Borough;' and each class shall be deposited in separate ballot-boxes."

For instructions in regard to the organization of boards of election, etc., see laws of 2d July, 1839, pamphlet page 219, and also pamphlet laws of 1869, page 49, furnished to the said several election districts.

WHEREAS, By an act of the Congress of the United States, entitled "An Act to amend the several acts heretofore passed, to provide for the enrolling and calling out the national forces, and for other purposes," and approved March 3d, 1865, all persons who have deserted the military or naval service of the United States, and who have not been discharged, or relieved from the penalty, or disability therein provided, are deemed, and taken, to have voluntarily relinquished, and forfeited, their rights of citizenship, and their rights to become citizens, and are deprived of exercising any rights of citizens thereof:

And whereas, Persons, not citizens of the United States, are not, under the constitution and laws of Pennsylvania, qualified electors of this Commonwealth:

SECTION 1, *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same*, That in all elections hereafter to be held in this Commonwealth, it shall be unlawful for the judge or inspectors of any such election to receive any ballot, or ballots, from any person, or persons, embraced in the provisions, and subject to the disability, imposed by said act of Congress, approved March 3d, 1865, and it shall be unlawful for any such person to offer to vote any ballot, or ballots.

SECTION 2 That if any such judge and inspectors of election, or any one of them shall receive, or consent to receive, any such disqualified person he, or they, so offending, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, in any court of quarter sessions of this Commonwealth, he shall, for each offense, be sentenced to pay a fine of not less than one hundred dollars, and to undergo an imprisonment, in the jail of the proper county, for not less than sixty days.

SECTION 3. That if any person deprived of citizenship, and disqualified as aforesaid, shall at any election, hereafter to be held in this Commonwealth, vote, or tender to the officers thereof, and offer to vote, a ballot, or ballots, any person so offending, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof, in any court of quarter sessions of this Commonwealth, shall, for each offence, be punished in like manner as is provided in the preceding section of this act, in the case of officers of election receiving such unlawful ballot, or ballots,

SECTION 4. That if any person shall hereafter persuade, or advise any person, or persons, deprived of citizenship and disqualified as aforesaid, to offer any ballot, or ballots, to the officers of any election, hereafter to be held in this Commonwealth, or shall persuade, or advise, any such officer to receive any ballot, or ballots, from any person deprived of citizenship, and disqualified as aforesaid, such person, so offending, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, in any court of quarter sessions of this Commonwealth, shall be punished in like manner as is provided in the second section of this act, in the case of officers of such election receiving such unlawful ballot, or ballots.

And in the above elections the polls shall be opened between the hours of six and seven o'clock a. m., and closed at seven o'clock p. m.

Given under my hand at Wellsborough this 23d day of September, 1873.

E. A. FISH,
Sheriff of Tioga county.