The Democrat.

HARVEY SICKLER, Editor.

TUNKHANNOCK, PA

Wednesday, Oct. 21, 1863.

S. M. Pettengill & Co.—No. 37 PARK ROW NEW YORK, & 6 STATE ST. BOSTON, are our Agents for the N. B. Democrat, in those cities, and are authorized to take Advertisements and Subscriptions us at our lowest Rates.

☞ The late "splendid victory of the Government," over the Democrats of Pennsylvania, has cost Gen. Mead a disheartening retreat for 60 miles. His army is now securely posted, under the shadow of the capitol, where it was two and a half years ago—Old abe has called for 300,000 more troops to reinforce our "victorious armies."

☞ The latest election returns from this state, renders it quite certain that Curtin's majority in the state will not fall far short of 15,000—about half the number of voters, admitted by the abolition journals, to have been sent into the state to control the result. Elections in France, under Napoleon, and in the United States, under old Abe, have about the same result, so far as an expression of the will of the people is concerned.

The Fruits of Abolition Rule.

Anterior to 1860, how wonderfull we were developing all the physical, moral, and mental resources of a great nation. What concord reigned, what security for liberty and property. What a magnificent vista ahead of us. Now how changed. The republican party has been in power in the Federal Government not three years. What is the picture? That scene which the great Webster prayed his dying eyes might never rest upon, has come to pass. States are rent with fraternal feuds, and drenched with fraternal blood' Discord has come instead of peace. The land is full of mourning for the loss of the first born; children are weeping for their fathers, and gray-haired men are bowed down with grief for the loss of their boys. Families are severed—cripples tottering along our streets, mute monuments of a bloody strife. Debt, too, has come upon us in gigantic shape, and taxation has laid its heavy hand upon us. Every thing material feels it. Everything that we eat, drink, or handle, from the swaddling clothes of the infant to the shroud of the parents. The Secretary of the Treasury says the debt is but eleven hundred millions. It is twice that, and is growing daily larger. The Government, too, has substituted a Federal currency for the old State currency. It has, in fact, substituted the old French banking system. It has forced upon us money which, outside of the country, is not worth the paper it is printed on, and in the country it is 40 per cent. discount, while the tax is equal to $40 upon every man, woman, and child in the country. But ascending to matters of higher consideration—if it is possible to do so—we see all the rights, safe-guards, and immunities of the citizen—the trial by jury, the habeas corpus, the right of free speech, and free press; indeed, the glorious panoply of the Bill of Rights—our amendments to the Federal Constitution—swept remorselessly away by this Administration.—*Ex.*

Major General McClellan on the Election in Pennsylvania,

ORANGE, N. J., Oct. 12

Hon. Charles J. Biddle, Philadelphia:

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to an article in the Philadelphia *Press*, asserting that I had written to the managers of the Democratic meeting at Allentown, disapproving the objects of the meeting, and that if I voted or spoke it would be in favor of Curtin. I am informed that similar assertions have been made throughout the State. It has been my earnest endeavor heretofore to avoid participation in party politics, and I had determined to adhere to this course; but it is obvious that I cannot long maintain silence under such misrepresentations. I, therefore, request you to deny that I have written any such letter, or entertained any such views as those attributed to me in the Philadelphia *Press*. I desire to state clearly and distinctly, that, having some few days ago had a full conversation with Judge Woodward, I find that our views agree, and I regard his election as Governor called for by the interests of the nation. I understand Judge Woodward to be in favor of the prosecution of the war with all the means at the command of the loyal States until the military power of the rebellion is destroyed. I understand him to be of the opinion that, while the war is waged with all possible decision and energy, the policy directing it should be in consonance with the principles of humanity and civilization, working no injury to private rights and property not demanded by military law among civilized nations. And finally, I understand him to agree with me in the opinion that the sole great objects of this war are the restoration of the unity of the nation, the preservation of the Constitution, and the supremacy of the laws of the country. Believing that our opinions entirely agree upon these points, I would were it in my power, give to Judge Woodward my voice and my vote.

I am very respectfully, yours,

GEO. B. McCLELLAN.

☞ The vote on the proposition for a State Government in Nevada Territory was 8,162 in favor and 1,502 against.

PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION.

Another Call for Three Hundred Thousand Volunteers.

A DRAFT TO BE MADE ON THE FIFTH OF JANUARY.

By the President of the United States,

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, The term of service of part of the volunteer forces of the United States will expire during the coming year; and

Whereas, In addition to the men raised by the present draft, it is deemed expedient to call out three hundred thousand volunteers, to serve for three years or the war—not, however, exceeding three years:

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States and commander-in-chief of the army and navy thereof, and of the militia of the several states when called into actual service, do issue this my proclamation, calling upon the governors of the different states to raise and have enlisted into the United States service, for the various companies and regiments in the field from their respective states, their quotas of three hundred thousand men.

I further proclaim that all the volunteers thus called out and duly enlisted shall receive advance pay, premium, and bounty, as heretofore communicated to the governors of states by the War Department, through the provost-marshal general's office, by special letters.

I further proclaim that all volunteers received under this call, as well as all others not heretofore credited, shall be duly credited and deducted from the quotas established for the next draft.

I further proclaim that, if any state shall fail to raise the quota assigned to it by the War Department under this call, then a draft for the deficiency in said quota shall be made in said state, or on the districts of said state, for their due proportion of said quota, and the said draft shall commence on the fifth day of January, 1864.

And I further proclaim that nothing in this proclamation shall interfere with existing orders, or with those which may be issued for the present draft in the states where it is now in progress or where it has not yet been commenced.

The quota of the states and districts will be assigned by the War Department, through the Provost-marshal general's office, due regard being had for the men heretofore furnished, whether by volunteering or drafting; and the recruiting will be conducted in accordance with such instruction as have been or may be issued by that department.

In issuing this proclamation, I address myself *not only to the governors of the several states, but also to the good and loyal people thereof, invoking them to lend their cheerful, willing, and effective aid to the measures thus adopted, with a view to reinforce our victorious armies now in the field, and bring our needful military operations to a prosperous end, thus closing forever the fountains of sedition and civil war.*

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this seventeenth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty three, and of the independence of the United States the eighty eighth.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WM. H. SEWARD, Secretary of State.

☞ Drafted men, who are perfectly "loyal," but who have a constitutional dislike to "villainous saltpetre," are referred to Billy Button of the *Republican*, who having had a thorough and successful experience in playing the sneak, in this line, will no doubt give them the *modus operandi*, by which a man with no physical disability or deformity—except a monstrous beet-colored nose—can evade the draft by creeping out of a small hole. Billy has crawled clear through, and has come out as "loyal" as ever. We can see no reason why his abolition friends, who have no nasal "bust," could not do the same thing, under his instructions.—"Loyal Leaguers," give him a call.

INFLUENCE OF NEWSPAPERS.—Daniel Webster once said; "Small is the sum that is required to Patronize a newspaper, and amply rewarded is its patron, I care not how humble and unpretending the paper he takes. It is next to impossible to fill a sheet with printed matter without putting into it something that is worth the subscription price. Every parent whose son is away from home at school should supply him with a newspaper. I well remember what a marked difference there was between those of my school-mates who had not access to newspapers. Other things being equal, the first were always superior to the last in debate, composition, and in general intelligence.

ABOLITION AND SECESSION THE SAME.—"The Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," said Mr. Lincoln. "A Union between free States and slave States is impossible," responded Jeff Davis. Now, rebs, if we put down all such of our fellows as think with Old Abe, and you put down all such of yours as think with Old Jeff, no doubt you and we will be able to get along very well together again. Let's try it —*Louisville Journal.*

THE TRIBUNE ON THE WAR DEBT.—The Tribune in speaking of the war debt says:

"It has saddled us with a debt that will take bread from the mouth of every laboring man's child for generations, and send millions hungry to bed!"

☞ The receipts of money paid by drafted men now amounts to nine millions, which it is expected will be increased by one or two millions more. The whole of this sum is to be appropriated to recruiting under the new Proclamation of the President.

OFFICIAL VOTE
OF
Wyoming County, for 1863.

BOROUGHS & TOWNSHIPS.		Governor.		Judge S. Court.		Representatives.				Sheriff.		Prothonot'y & C.		Regist'r & Record'r		Commissioner.		Auditors.				Coroner.		
		GEORGE W. WOODWARD.	Andrew G. Curtin.	WALTER H. LOWRIE.	Daniel Agnew.	GEORGE D. JACKSON.	JOHN C. ELLIS.	Michael Whitmyer.	Samuel Bodeman.	AHIRA GAY.	S. W. INGHAM.	H. S. FORGERSON.	Ziba Lott.	O. L. PARRISH.	Sinton Williams.	EDWIN STEPHENS.	Alexander Vanluyle.	H. NEWCOMB, 3 years.	E. D. FASSETT, 1 year.	S. Harding, 3 years.	F. B. High, 1 year.	J. C. BECKER.	J. W. Rhoads.	
Braintrim	24	78	27	72	30	30	65	65	27	50	21	28	21	30	25	26	27	28	67	66	30	67	67
Exeter	28	17	28	17	28	28	17	17	28	50	28	17	28	30	28	16	28	28	117	117	30	17	17
Eaton	64	132	64	133	64	64	132	132	64	50	21	62	21	62	60	65	61	61	129	129	32	132	134
Clinton	132	64	132	64	64	64	129	129	132	133	62	133	62	131	131	135	33	33	41	41	129	129	41
Falls	31	128	31	128	30	30	32	32	31	137	29	129	29	128	60	120	129	129	129	129	32	129	129
Forkston	147	42	146	42	145	145	42	42	145	144	146	40	146	43	145	43	145	145	68	68	146	168	42
Lemon	50	70	51	69	53	53	67	67	53	51	53	74	53	69	53	69	53	53	53	53	53	53	67
Meshoppen	140	69	140	66	142	142	66	66	142	40	139	71	139	68	144	66	39	39	66	66	144	66	53
Meshoppen	70	127	70	126	72	72	125	125	72	46	70	125	70	126	73	125	72	72	126	126	72	125	53
Monroe	64	103	67	100	67	67	97	97	67	137	67	98	67	94	66	100	67	67	99	99	67	97	97
Nicholson	166	116	168	114	167	167	116	116	167	99	167	116	167	116	189	92	167	167	113	113	168	116	116
Northmoreland	111	88	111	87	110	110	88	88	110	166	111	88	110	88	110	88	111	110	68	68	110	88	88
North Branch	43	31	43	30	48	48	30	30	48	40	48	30	48	30	49	30	48	48	30	30	47	30	40
Overfield	56	13	56	13	57	57	13	13	57	13	56	13	57	13	57	13	57	56	13	13	57	13	13
Tunkhannock Borough	81	83	82	71	83	83	76	76	83	76	83	76	83	76	83	72	83	83	76	76	83	76	76
Tunkhannock Township	150	64	146	69	153	153	66	66	153	80	139	75	152	76	150	65	153	143	64	64	154	65	66
Washington	77	82	77	81	77	77	81	81	77	76	72	83	76	83	77	82	77	77	82	82	76	82	81
Windham	76	81	77	81	75	75	80	80	75	77	76	89	91	77	80	78	75	76	78	77	78	83	80
Total	1418	1379	1431	1355	1441	1441	1343	1343	1485	1335	1377	1403	1423	1363	1469	1315	1426	1426	1338	1338	1450	1331	
MAJORITIES	39		76		98	98			123			26	60		144		83	88			119		

Democrats in SMALL CAPS, Republicans in Roman.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For The Democrat.

REV. H. BROWNSCOMBE.

SIR:

You say, in your last communication, that your "first impression of perusing mine of the 7th inst., was to treat it with silent contempt." You doubtless thought that would be your safer course; and you may yet come to the conclusion that first impressions are best.

You will hardly succeed either by your silly twaddle or your sneaking attempts to cast your slime upon democrats through a democratic paper, in diverting attention from yourself; and it will be time to consider the "eulogy" to which I am entitled for proving "a man's no horse," when I attempt it; it is sufficient for the present that I prove a minister worse than an ass.

I wish now, sir, briefly to remind you and the public of the history of this controversy. I reviewed a sermon of yours, in which you professed to reply to a letter of Bishop Hopkins—showing that your sermon consisted of charges of *misquoting* the scriptures on the part of the Bishop, and of misrepresentations throughout. This you concede I had a right to do, as sermons are "public property." You then challenged me to a discussion of this question: "Is American slavery consistent with the Bible or with christianity." I accepted the challenge, so changing the statement of the question, however, as to put you on the affirmative, as the challenging party. You then came out in a long article, not in discussion of the question proposed, but in reference to things in the review of the sermon that you deemed personal to yourself—charging me with falsehood and slander in the caption of the review—this being the only exception that you took to the article, I then replied to your gentlemanly charges of falsehood and slander—proving that when I spoke of your sermon as an "abolition sermon." I said no more than you had impliedly confessed, again and again. It is difficult to say what you do discuss in your last, further than that you do not seem disposed to consider any of the issues raised.

Now, sir, if the review of your sermon did you injustice, why did you not publish the sermon, as you have since implied that it was written, though I had no idea that it was? In this way, if your sermon was what you would have us believe it was, you would have not only answered the Bishop, but also have vindicated yourself against the review. The question would then have been fully open for discussion at the same time. You thus had an opportunity of vindicating yourself and your side of the question.—This you have not seen fit to do, but have proposed a question, in a form that you, at least ought to have known, would not be accepted, merely to get my name, as it seems, for the purpose of raising a personal altercation—commencing with charges of falsehood and slander.

It is evident that you had no intention of discussing the question proposed—like your protesting brother, Bishop Potter, you much prefer protesting to argument. And, to show you that I am not ashamed of the company of Bishop Hopkins, I call your attention to his reply, which I understand is to be published in the same issue of the *Democrat* with this communication, to such protesting gentlemen as you are, who do not see fit to argue the question. You seem really pained that I do not declare my convictions on the question. The public, sir, will judge of the merit of our relative positions; you protesting against and denouncing an institution, while you shrink from the consideration of the question, whether or not that institution is condemned or sustained by the Bible; I declining either to censure or approve, until the arguments are considered. Well, I repeat, may your endorser, in the *Republican*, declare that "there are men who dare act without first inquiring what God has decreed." I know that you claim that you are asked to prove a negative; but you are not quite so weak as not to know that this claim is all fudge. If you do not, and are really sincere in this palaver, let me refer you to Mill's system of logic, page 27, where he explains how it is, that words positive in form are negative in sense, while others, negative in form, are really positive. "Inconvenient," he cites, as an example of the latter—having the *positive* signification of "*discomfort* or *annoyance*." How plain the analagy between this and the word *inconsistent*, about which you quibble so much, as denoting *disagreement* or *conflict*. The public have seen at a glance how vastly more easy it is to prove a conflict between slavery and the Bible, if there is any, than to show that there is no conflict. I care not, therefore, if Bishop Hopkins was attempting to prove a negative, this would hardly justify you, as the challenging party to a discussion, in declining, in the first instance, to attempt to prove a positive or an affirmative. Of a piece with your pettifogging on this point, are your remarks about the laws protecting men in eating and drinking. Did you ever know of any law to protect individuals in the enjoyment of eating and drinking what they please?" If you know any thing about the very first principles of the law, you would have known that the law expressly declines to interfere with the *absolute duties* of men, or such as affect themselves individually. They may therefore be drunken and gluttonous as they please, so long as they do not offend against public decency, the law neither protecting or restraining them. As there is no law upon the subject, no legal implication can possibly arise The law has nothing more to do with the slave trade, until it prohibited it; implying thereby that it was wrong, while up to that time, there was no legal implication on the subject.

But, sir, to come to the only point that I shall consent to have any words with you about. After charging me with falsehood and slander, the charge having been crammed down your own throat, you now, like a whipped spaniel, ask: "Was it *generous*, was it *gentlemanly*, on your part, to equivocate and pettifog for the purpose of trying to make me appear a falsifier, after I had positively denied that I was an abolitionist, and defined what I understood by the term?"

Sir do you mean that the sanctity of your cloth entitles you to make false charges of "falsehood and slander" and also exempts you from the legitimate consequences of *proof* that such charges are false? are you licensed to deal in false accusations with absolute impunity? Was it "*generous and gentlemanly*" to show you a "falsifier"? Yes sir *it was* if such was the fact; and *the fact* you do not deny, but complain of me for proving so conclusively that you do not attempt to answer it, that your own effort to prove your assertion that you you are not an abolitionist proves with precisely the same conclusiveness that you are not a methodist—that you are not *anything* "right or wrong, legal or illegal, constitutional or unconstitutional"—and this in your "gentlemanly" way, you call pettifogging. You have a very easy way sir, of throwing yourself on the defensive; a way that indicates long practice in that very mode of argument that you so characterize. Certainly it is much *easier* to accuse your opponent of *pettifogging*, when you find yourself hard pressed with plain facts, than to meet such facts fairly, face to face.

I have no doubt but a man of your liberal notions, regards it as very ungenerous that, in vindicating myself against your charges of falsehood, I should necessarily convict you, not only of falsehood, but of being an abolitionist, notwithstanding that wonderful definition you had devised as a means of escape. You say, however, that you have nothing to retract. Permit me to say that I expect nothing of the kind from you. To do this would require, at least, *one* characteristic of a gentleman. The ingenuities displayed in framing that remarkable definition of an abolitionist, showed no such intention from the outset. But, sir, you do improve in one respect. You do not see fit to charge me with falsehood and slander, in charging you with having falsely accused Bishop Hopkins of *misquoting* the scriptures. You very meekly say I was "*mistaken*;" and I think it required a very great effort for you to do this. It was not half as easily done as your precious charge of falsehood and slander. I think you regretted the necessity that compelled you to it. It is too late sir, for you to sneak out now by talking of mistakes, after having made charges of falsehood.

I said that when you charged Bishop Hopkins with misquoting the scriptures, you lied in your very throat. You now say:—"I will add that *you are mistaken when you say that I charged Bishop Hopkins with misquoting scripture.*" In reply to this I introduce the following testimony:

WYOMING COUNTY SS:

Stanley W. Little, being duly sworn, doth depose and say that he was present at the Methodist Church in Tunkhannock, on the occasion of *Rev. H Brownscombe's* reply to the letter of BISHOP HOPKINS, entitled "Bible view of Slavery;" that having then recently read said letter, he gave very careful attention to Mr Brownscombe's remarks upon that subject—that while depoeont will not attempt from memory to repeat the very words used by Mr. Brownscombe, his recollection is distinct that said B. did affirm that Mr. Hopkins had *misquoted* the Bible, and misrepresented what he had quoted.

STANLEY W. LITTLE.

Sworn and Subscribed, this 16th Oct., 1863, before me, DANIEL BALL, J. P

WYOMING COUNTY, SS:

James W. Harding, being duly sworn, saith that he was also present on the occasion above stated, that his recollection is also distinct that Rev. Mr Brownscombe remarked as above stated in reference to Bishop Hopkins' letter.

JAMES W. HARDING.

Sworn, and Suberibed, this 16th Oct., 1863, before me, DANIEL BALL, J. P.

WYOMING COUNTY SS:

James Young, being first duly sworn, says that he was present on the occasion abov estated, and that his recollection is also distinct that Rev. Mr. Brownscombe remarked as above stated in reference to Bishop Hopkins' letter.

JAMES YOUNG.

Sworn and Subscribed, this 17th Oct., 1863, before me, M. W. DEWITT J. P.

I also charged you with having denounced democrats as copperheads from the pulpit.—You now say: "I have never denounced democrats as *Copperheads*." I made this charge, sir, upon the distinct statement of a prominent member of your church at Meshoppen, that you did, at the Brick Chapel, speak of *democrats, generally, as copperheads.* Having proved you false in one instance, I do not deem it necessary to produce evidence on this point. I leave it between you and the members of your church, merely adding the maxim of the law, *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*; false in one thing, false in everything.

Now, sir, it will hardly be expected that I should have any further words with *you*, on this or any other subject; I must add, however, that your very facetious remarks, about my conscription in the army, are in keeping with the gentlemanly(?) and christian(?) spirit, that you have uniformly manifested in this controversy.

To the public, I have only to say, in justification of the language I have used, that it was unavoidable in bringing a vacillating and unscrupulous foe to any point, where he could be held until he was duly unmasked.

Now, sir, I tip the shovel and let you slide.

J. DEWITT.

☞ The expenses of the present Abolition Administration are nearly two millions of dollars per day. This enormous sum is lavished upon shoddy contractors, Government officials, and political demagogues.—Thousands of dollars of it have been spent in Pennsylvania, during the present campaign, to defeat the will of the people and aid in the election of Curtin. The Treasury has been plundered and the masses have been robbed of their hard earnings by the corrupt and faithless men in power.

☞ The printer wants money. Pay up.

The $300 Clause in the Conscription Act.

FALLS, Oct. 14th, 1863.

FRIEND SICKLER:

Will you inform me and others in like situation, through the columns of the *Democrat*, whether the payment of the $300, exemption money, by a drafted man, will save him from future liability for three years—the term for which he is drafted? The question to many of us who can barely raise that amount of money, and who have families dependent upon us for support is an important one; and to no one, more so than your friend and subscriber.

A SOUND CONSCRIPT.

We would cheerfully answer the question asked in the above note, if we could do so with any assurance that our answer would prove correct, but we confess we cannot.—We will, however, give the writer, and others in like situation, the benefit of all we know or have heard upon the subject.

Provost Marshal General James Fry, in a circular which purports to be an *authorotative* opinion from the war Department at Washington, dated July 12th 1863 says:

"Any drafted person paying $300 under section 18th of the enrollment act, is thereby exempt from further liability under *that draft*, but not from any subsequent draft."

We understand it to be the opinion of Caleb Cushing, one of the most eminent lawyers of the country, as we think it is, of nine out of every ten of all others, that the plain meaning, spirit, and intention of the words in the act, allowing the payment of the $300 as a commutation for personal service, is and was, that it should operate as an exemption, in favor of the person paying it, for the full term of three years, for which the draft was made. This we also understand to be the opinion of Thadeus Stevens a leading member of the Republican party, one who helped in Congress to pass the act.

The question of course has not been *judicially* settled, unless "the powers that be," treat the mere dictum of Provost Marshal General Fry as the ultimate decision on the subject. It is not impossible that they will so treat it. When we reflect that mere proclamations by the great Tycoon at Washington, are given all the force and effect of law—that by a single dash of his pen, he has "suspended," set aside, annulled the great writ of *habeas corpus*—a writ by which a person in a second draft, and who alledged that he was illegally and unjustly detained or imprisoned, might on application to the judges of the laws of the land, have the question settled. When we reflect that all this has been done; that the most sacred rights of the citizen have been and are constantly violated by this great Tycoon, and his shoulder strapped satraps and minions, we have but little to hope or expect from them. If this question is ever *judicially* decided, it will be, not because those interested have the *right* to have it decided; but because the caprice or *magnanimity* of our rulers *will* it so to be.

What we have said, or can say, to our friend, the conscript, will leave him as much in doubt as before. He may, even after paying his hard earned $300, and depriving his family of the comforts and protection it would afford them, be obliged to pay it over and over again, or on failure so to do, be forced to leave them to the lot and fate of the soldier's widow and orphans. But this is only one of the beauties of the conscription act, which to speak of, as harsh or unjust, offends the "loyal,' ears of the "shoddy aristocracy."

☞ The patriots of the Revolution are fast passing away, and soon the last will be summoned to his final resting place. The youngest of them now is about ninety-four years of age. On the 1st of July, 1862, there were but sixty-two of them living, since which time over one third of the number have died.

☞ Our subscribers, who can, would do us a favor to send in their subscriptions by men who are coming to town. We will send receipts back for all monies received. Our expenses are heavy and money comes slow.

☞ The scathing rebuke of Bishop Hopkins to Bishop Potter, on our first page will be read with interest by all. The letter is a reply to a protest of the latter, which was published in our last.

LIST OF PERSONS DRAWN TO SERVE AS GRAND JURORS FOR NOV. TERM, 1863.

EXETER.—Robt. Winters.

WASHINGTON.—Daniel Carney, M. F. Alden.

MESHOPPEN.—Wm. H. Cortright, Robt. Dunlap, John Bunnell 2nd, N. P. Dunlap N. Overfield.

NORTHMORELAND.—James Besteder, Robt. Caton.

WINDHAM.—Royal Garey, Henry W. Fassett.

EATON.—Wm. Hunter, E. Bordman, O. W. Benjamin.

MEHOOPANY.—Allen Furman, Albin Russell.

BRAINTRIM.—Lyman Keeney.

TUNKHANNOCK TOWNSHIP.—D. Z. Michael, Franklin Decker.

OVERFIELD.—T. W. Smith.

CLINTON.—W. W. Carpenter.

TUNKHANNOCK BOROUGH.—M. W. Dewitt.

NICHOLSON.—Hiram Kelly.

PETIT JURORS.

WASHINGTON.—Geo. Jenkins.

CLINTON.—Peter Baker, Wm. Belcher.

WINDHAM.—Roswell Garey.

MESHOPPEN.—O. H. Loomis, P C. Clayton, Wm. Blackmar, Jas. N. Kelly, Warren Brewster.

BRAINTRIM,—Ezra Keeney, Simeon. B. Keeney.

EATON.—Milton Wheeler, Wilmot Carpentor, Andrew Frutchy, Peter Stroh, Damon Stevens, Geo. Ney, Chauncey Brown.

NORTHMORELAND.—Geo. Brungess, Jacob Rhodes, H. H. Brown, Thos Pinder.

FORKSTON.—Calvin Robinson, John Hitchcock.

NORTH BRANCH.—Henry Champin, Gilbert G. Adams.

MEHOOPANY.—J. L. Hahn, Geo. Barrowcliff, John B. Place, A. K. Farr.

TUNKHANNOCK TOWNSHIP.—John Corish.

LEMON.—John Cyphers.

NICHOLSON.—Holloway Stephens.

MONROE.—David Montanye.

OVERFIELD.—H. H. Walter.

EXETER.—Hanford Smith.