



The Democrat.
HARVEY SICKLER, Editor.

TUNKHANNOCK, PA
Wednesday, Oct. 28, 1863.

S. M. Pettengill & Co.—No. 57 PARK ROW
New York, & 6 STATE ST. BOSTON, are our Agents
for the N. B. Democrat, in those cities, and are author-
ized to take Advertisements and Subscriptions
at our lowest Rates.

The official vote at the late Election
as published in the Philadelphia Age, gives
Curtin majority over Woodward as 15,825
and Agnew's over Lowrie as 12,308.

Look out for three more years of plunder-
ing, blundering, and misrule.

The legal advertisements and other
unexpected matter has made it impossible for
us to get in an advertisement of O. S. Mill's
Store and Tin shop of this Borough. Our
friends who are fitting up for cold weather
will find the establishment under the exclu-
sive charge of Mr. Mills whose skill as a
workman, and reputation as a fair dealer is
established.

For the same reason, a notice of the new
Harness shop at Meshoppen is deferred un-
til our next.

The Grand army of the Potomac has
had eight commanders in twenty-four months,
viz: General Scott; General McDowell;
Gen. McClellan; Gen. Pope; Gen. McClellan
(again); Gen. Burnside; Gen. Hooker; Gen.
Meade. This is at the rate of a new com-
mander every three months.

What man ever, successfully, run a saw-
mill, or boot and shoe shop, with as many
changes of boss sawyers or foremen, as this
war for the—what is it? has termed up,
commanders-in-chief?

We commend to our political parsons
the following sentiment, uttered by
Father Byles, the first pastor of the Park
Street Church, Boston, we believe: "I have
thrown up four breastworks, behind which I
have entrenched myself, neither of which can
be enforced. In the first place, I do not un-
derstand politics; in the second place, you
all do, every man and mother's son of you;
in the third place, you have politics all the
week—pray let one day in seven be devoted
to religion; in the fourth place, I am engaged
in a work of infinitely more importance.
Give me any subject to preach of more conse-
quence than the truth I bring you and I
will preach on it next Sabbath."

Bounties for Recruits.

An amended circular has been sent out
from the Provost Marshal General's office, by
which it appears that to every recruit who is
a veteran volunteer, a bounty and premium
amounting to \$402 will be paid. To all other
recruits, not veterans, \$302 for the old or-
ganizations.

The object is to encourage volunteering, as
those who are drafted receive only \$100
bounty. Men enlisting under this order will
select their regiments, which however must
be one of the old regiments in the field.

Just What the Rebels Asked.

The defeat of the Democracy of Pennsylv-
ania and Ohio is just what Jeff Davis and
his rebel leaders asked and prayed for. Their
presses have been, for a long time, saying,
"keep down Vallandigham and his party in
the North—give us, rather, men like Thad-
deus Stevens and Charles Sumner; they cure
the Union and do us in and so do we."

Thus the Abolitionists of Pennsylvania and
Ohio have done just what the rebels asked,
and we have no doubt that the election in
these two States give quite as much satisfac-
tion to-day, to Jeff Davis & Co., in Rich-
mond, as to Abe Lincoln & Co., in Washington.

Remanded Alterations in the Enrollment Act.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 20.—There is talk here
in military circles of an early repeal of one of
the sections of the Conscription Act by the
new Congress—that which provides for tem-
porary exemption by the payment of three
hundred dollars. This will be urged in De-
cember, and it is not improbable that when
the draft is made, should the quotas not
be made up by volunteering, exemption by
the payment of money will be impossible.
Some persons here advocate a new law upon
this subject, which shall fix the price of ex-
emption at a high figure, say as high as six
hundred dollars or even fifteen hundred dol-
lars, and still further providing that in any
given district the drafted persons who go in
to the army shall receive all the money raised
in that district by exemption purchase. I am
told on good authority that this idea
originated with Mr. Chase, and that he urged
it upon the Government some time ago. Let
the man who goes to the war have the
money of the man who will not go. Such a
law would provide that no poor man would
be compelled to leave a family behind with-
out means of support.—Daily News.

The Dewitt-Brownson Controversy.
We lay before our readers in this number,
another letter from Rev. Mr. Brownson,
to J. Dewitt, Esq., written since the removal
of the latter gentleman from this county.—
Complaints have come to our knowledge on
account of our allowance of so much of our
space for the publication of a correspondence
which hitherto has been pointless, and aim-
less, so far as any question is concerned in
which the public can be expected to take an
interest. For this final repetition of the in-
fiction, in a form still more objectionable and
offensive than either of its predecessors, we
feel constrained to state our reasons. This
letter, it must be confessed, is, in point of
merit, of any sort, very far below anything
that we expected to publish when we con-
sented, upon the writers invitation, to open
our columns to a discussion of the Bible as-
pect of the Slavery question. Had we antici-
pated that this proposed discussion would so
speedily degenerate into a mere personal al-
tercation, beginning on part of the challenger
with accusations of falsehood and slander, and
ending with boisterous boasts, idle vapors,
empty assertions, unworthy insinuations and
insults, we certainly would have politely
declined the invitation. But the controv-
ersy having commenced, we were unwilling
to afford to either party just ground of complaint
that he had been denied a hearing; and now,
as this thing must end somewhere (obviously
the sooner the better) for reasons that will
be apparent to all fair minded men, we have
determined to allow to Mr. Brownson the
last word. Nor do we believe that Mr. De-
witt will feel that he is injured by our action
in this behalf; for really, those who have
carefully perused the correspondence thus far
will not have failed to notice that his vindic-
ation of himself from Mr. Brownson's
reckless charge of falsehood and slander was
so complete that it seems now to stand sub-
stantially confessed by that gentleman him-
self; while the new matter introduced in this
number requires no notice at the hands of Mr.
Dewitt. In relation to the new issue of ve-
racity raised by the Rev'd. correspondent,
viz: that involving his assertion that Bishop
Hopkins had misquoted scripture, it is im-
proper for us to say: 1st. that to apply the words
"plant tools" to gentlemen for no cause other
than that they have dared to testify to
their recollection of a single allegation of the
Rev'd. writer in a sermon preached by him in
their presence, is unworthy a gentleman—un-
worthy the writer himself. Whose "plant
tools" are those "gentlemen" who did not
happen to remember the objectionable word?
We do not characterize them as "plant tools,"
nor stoop to the insinuation that they are not
"gentlemen." But does not the writer know
that these negative certificates upon which he
so plumes himself, are of very little value in
opposition to positive testimony? His friends
may not have remembered a single word of
his sermon; but that would not prove that
he preached no sermon. Nor would it prove
that others who do remember certain points
of the discourse, testify falsely in relation to
such points. Those philologists who have
most investigated the sources of truth, as de-
pendent upon human testimony, all agree
that evidence of this sort is of very little val-
ue in opposition to positive testimony. Does
not Mr. Brownson know that his charge
of misquoting scripture was a matter of public
notoriety many days before such charge
became a matter of dispute between him and
Mr. Dewitt—that men went straightway
from his church to their Bibles to see for
themselves whether the Bishop had misquod-
ed, or the preacher had falsely accused?

2nd. The Rev'd. writer has much to say
about "pettifogging;" and his own com-
munications, certainly exhibit much familiarity,
on his part, with that process of argu-
ment that he so characterizes. His criticism of lan-
guage employed by Mr. S. W. Little in his
affidavit, affords the most marked example of
pettifogging that now occurs to us. Mr. L.
very properly declines "to state from memo-
ry, the very words" in which Mr. Brown-
son's charge of misquoting was expressed,
but declares his recollection distinct that
such charge was made. This is the plain
meaning of the affidavit, and it is very plain-
ly and correctly expressed therein. Mr.
Brownson should remember that this poor
quibbling about words is never resorted to
in a good case, and is especially unbecom-
ing a dignitary of the church.

3rd. The writers excuse for resting his
denial upon the unsworn certificates of his
friends is plainly disingenuous. In reference
to human testimony, the law has made an
oath one of the principal tests of truth, and
the public will believe, as we believe, that the
true reason why they were not sworn was
because they had no distinct recollection on
the subject; or at least, not sufficiently dis-
tinct to warrant them in testifying to it upon
oath. We venture the assertion that neither
of them would set up his *gentility* as a reason
why he should not be sworn to a fact of which
he had a distinct recollection. In the history
of this world it will be found that many men,
who were quite as good "gentlemen" as Mr.
Brownson's negative unsworn witnesses,
have verified their words by their oaths,
and in no wise compromised their *gentility* by
doing so. The offensive imputation contained
in this excuse is certainly unworthy of any
gentleman—an imputation to which we would
never consent to give publicity without pre-
serving at the same time this antidote to its
venom. The world is not yet quite prepared
to assume that no man can be a "gentleman"
and differ with Mr. B. either upon principle,
or upon recollection of a fact.

Mr. Brownson's beautiful allusion to the
terrible scathing that his opponent is assum-
ed to have sustained at his hands, would have
been in better taste if his readers had been
able to make the discovery from the corre-
spondence itself, rather than from the word
of the supposed scather; and in still better
taste if it had been made by some other per-
son, rather than himself; and better still, had
it not been made at all. Unquestionably, his
readers would never have been able to see it
without his assistance. We suspect that

this scathing will have to be taken on trust
until the Rev. gentleman shall be able to pro-
cure some more certificates; which may also
turn out to be of a negative character.

The Rev. letter writer, instead of com-
mencing the argument, as he, being the chal-
lenging party, might fairly be expected to do,
resorts to the poor subterfuge that Mr. D.
has refused to discuss the question with
him.

The simple truth is that Mr. Dewitt did
not refuse to discuss the question with Mr.
Brownson; but, on the contrary, distinctly
accepted his challenge, stipulating only
that the latter, as the challenging party,
should commence the discussion. Now, all
this quibbling about "affirmative" and "nega-
tive propositions" is, to say the very least of
it, disingenuous. The question, as stated by
both parties, was substantially the same, and
if Mr. Brownson honestly desired to dis-
cuss it, we can imagine no sort of reason for
his refusal to begin. He, certainly, ought to
be as competent to deal with Bible questions
as his opponent, and, as the challenging party,
he should have promptly acquiesced in the
condition requiring him to open the argument.
From his refusal to do this after his tantum
ing challenge, those who have perused this
precious correspondence can draw but one in-
ference deriving additional strength from his
present effort to represent his opponent as
the party declining the controversy. If Mr. B.
offered his challenge in good faith, (a fact
that we had a right to assume and did
assume) justice to himself demanded that
he should not shrink from the discussion
because the challenged party imposed, in his
acceptance of the challenge, a condition re-
quiring him to open the argument, after de-
clining to accept a condition so reasonable
and just, the effort to represent Mr. D. as the
party refusing the discussion can but be
regarded as unmanly and dishonest.

The whole correspondence is before our
readers. From its perusal, better than any-
thing that we can say, they can judge of its
merits and demerits.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For The Democrat.
To J. Dewitt.

Sir:
I have read with little
disappointment your scurvy and ridicu-
lous letter to me in the Democrat of the 21st
inst. I expected that the recent scathing
which I gave you, and the political victories
achieved by the loyal people of the North,
would make you hiss, squirm, and wriggle.
Keep cool, friend Jacob, your friends, if you
have any, will respect you just as much, for
coolness, as for the skill and honesty which
you have exhibited in your letters to me.

You are unquestionably looked upon as a
full grown snake among the "varnishes,"
and it is probable that they suppose that
you have gobbled me up; but I can assure all
concerned, that I am alive, and right side
up with care.

You have most signally failed in all your
attempts at conviction and refutation. You
have substituted sophistry for argument,
quibbling for reasoning, bold assertion for
proof, and the pettifogger for the lawyer.

You remark that I do not seem disposed
to consider any of the issues raised. Will
you have the effrontery to assert this, when
I have invited you several times to the dis-
cussion of the question of American Slavery?
If I supposed that our readers were as noto-
rious for ignorance, as you are for substituting
brass for brains, and impotence for cor-
rect statements, I would devote time in re-
plying. I respectfully ask the readers of
the Democrat to compare our letters; and
to their verdict I am willing to submit.

You ask why I did not publish my ser-
mon? Well sir, I am not in the practice of
parading my sermons before the public in
print, I do not seek notoriety in that way.
There are other reasons, the sermon was not
written; only a part of it was devoted to
Bishop Hopkins's letter, and finally if you
dared to accept the my invitation to discuss
the question of slavery, I should have antici-
pated the subject.

I protest again, against your unqualified
assertions that I have refused, or that I
"had no intention of discussing the question
proposed." Why do you not state that I
have refused to discuss the question propo-
sed by you? Instead of this you unques-
tionably design to convey the false impression,
that I have refused, or had no intention to
discuss the question proposed by myself.

I am thankful that you have placed me in
such dignified and honorable company as
that of Bishop Potter. The Bishop, sir, can
take care of Bishop Hopkins. I have read
Hopkins's reply to Potter and others, it is of
the same character of his letter. I am satis-
fied that such an apology for the infamous
system of American slavery, would not have
been published by him twenty years ago.

Dr. Elliott in the late number of the Moth-
er Quarterly, remarks. That prior to
1835 no member of the M. E. Church ever
uttered a word for slavery. The first
public utterance for slavery was by Rev. S.
Durwoy in 1835, in a sermon before the
South Carolina Conference. The same argu-
ment in our hearing, was used by him in
1836, in Cincinnati, before the General Con-
ference. Many of the southern members
held down their heads in shame at the so-
phistry of the pleader for sin. His argu-
ment was, that God sent Hagar back to her
mistress and therefore slavery was right.—
The blundering sophist forgot that the ser-
vitude of Hagar ended with her own person,
as Ismael and his descendants were all free;
so that the child followed the condition of
the free father, and not of the servile moth-
er. So it was with the four sons of Jacob
by the servile mothers. The case of Joseph
is the true type of slavery and the enslaved
Israelites in Egypt. Abraham was an eman-
cipator, not an enslaver. The law of Moses
prohibited slavery to the Jews and the New
Testament only repeats the law of Moses.

He says: "He that stealeth a man, and sell-
eth him, or if he be found in his hand, he
shall surely be put to death." Paul classes
men-stealers, that is, those who buy, sell, or
hold men as slaves, except to free them, with
murderers of fathers and murderers of ingh-
era."

Bishop Hopkins and his abettors of Amer-
ican slavery, are welcome to the company
with which Paul classes them.

Yes, sir, the public will judge of the merit
of our relative positions, they will pass their
verdict upon the character of the man who
has neither the courage nor the frankness to
give his "private opinion or belief on the
slavery question."

The new dodge of "declining either to
censure or approve" the system of slavery,
"until the arguments are considered," and
at the same time refuse to consider the ar-
guments, is worthy of the man of your posi-
tion!

I still insist upon it, that you ask me to
give a negative, and your reference to Mills
logic does not disprove my position. Why
did you not show from his logic that the
word "inconsistent" is affirmative in sense?
Your supposed analogy does not relieve you
from your embarrassment.

"I care not, therefore," you remark, "if
Bishop Hopkins was attempting to prove a
negative," &c. The legitimate inference
from the words is, that the Bishop really
does attempt to prove a negative. But does
he? In my last letter I showed most conclu-
sively from the Bishop's own language
that he does not. And if you did not pos-
sess more vanity than honor, you never
would have made the foregoing remarks.

I beg here to introduce additional testi-
mony, that the Bishop's argument is affirma-
tive and not negative.

Dr. Thompson in the Christian Advocate
and Journal of the 15th inst., in referring to
Bishop Hopkins letters, says: "Some months
since Bishop Hopkins of Vermont published a
tract to prove slavery a divine institution."
Bishop Potter and a large number of his
ministers in their "protest" employ the
words, "in defense of Southern Slavery."
Rev. M. Van Bant, who has some to the
aid of Bishop Hopkins, remarks: "He," that
is, Bishop Hopkins, "also proves conclusively
by abundant authority both sacred and
profane, that slavery is an institution that
has been recognized in all ages of the
world, established by positive law in the
Old Testament, and admitted as an institu-
tion from God, by our Saviour and all the
apostles."

Will you now have the honor to confess
that the Bishop does not attempt to prove a
negative?

I do not profess to be a jurist, but I am
inclined to the opinion that with all your le-
gal lore the veriest tyro in the science would
be ashamed of your skill in attempting to ex-
pound it.

I do not claim that the sanctity of my
cloth exempts me from just criticism, but I
do insist upon it that if you had any self-
respect, or high regard for truth, you would
not charge me with being an abolitionist as
that term is technically used.

If however preaching against slavery, and
calling it *sinful* and *heinous* expropriation,
constitute me one, then I glory in the name.
I am not very particular as to what I am
called, if I am only on the side of truth and
righteousness.

The denunciations uttered, and the threat-
enings made by you and those of your stripe
against us ministers, are impotent to deter
us from what we conceive to be our duty.—
I am thankful that we are not dependent upon
traitors for life, or the means of living.—
I am grateful that there are loyal men enough
in the North—democrats and Republicans—to
support the Gospel. But if we cannot be
supported unless we compromise our princi-
ples—truckle to politicians, or obey the be-
hests of pro-slavery tyrants; then we will
follow some other vocation, or starve. We
wish it to be distinctly understood, that we
are free men in the pulpit, that we are nei-
ther to be frightened or gagged. That game
sir, is being pretty well played out, in this,
and other places.

I was not taken by surprise when I saw
the so-called testimony in your letter, in the
which you attempt to prove that I charged
Bishop Hopkins with misquoting scripture.
I deemed it probable that either you, or
some of your plant tools, would have no
scruples of conscience about swearing to the
above. I knew that I was dealing with an
unscrupulous lawyer, who would stoop to al-
most anything to carry his point right or
wrong.

Well sir, have you convicted me of false-
hood? Let us see. The only reply which
I have made to your charge is in my last let-
ter, namely, "you are mistaken when you
say that I charged the Bishop with misquod-
ing scripture." Now sir, does the word
"mistaken" include or convey the idea of
falsehood? I have never affirmed, or denied
in my letters, that I did, or did not say that
the Bishop misquod scripture. You have
therefore most signally failed in convicting
me so far as the issue is between us. I had
hoped that the simple announcement that
you were mistaken would have been suffi-
cient: But you have deemed otherwise.—
You undoubtedly supposed that you had the
advantage of me, and could make some cap-
ital out of it, by giving you the appearance
of victory. But you were sadly mistaken as
a consequence, and you have made a shame-
ful failure. You have sought to drive me to
the wall, you shall now suffer the consequen-
ces of your temerity and folly.

I shall not charge Messrs. Little, Harding
and Young, with having wilfully perjured
themselves, I shall simply say that they
were mistaken, and that, to the very best of
my knowledge I did not affirm, that Mr.
Hopkins had misquod the Bible. If I had
charged the Bishop with misquoting, I should
not have employed the phraseology "mis-
quod the Bible."

When you first made this charge against
me, I did not know but I might have said it
through mistake—as public speakers are li-
ble to make mistakes. To satisfy myself, I
consulted my notes which I had before me at
the time of preaching, and I did not find the
word misquod in them. I also conferred
with the Rev. L. Peck and others who were
present at the time, and they assured that I
employed no such language.

I exonerate the Bishop from misquoting
scripture, but I do not exonerate him from
sophistry, misinterpretation and ignorance of
scriptural facts. And when I assert this, I
find myself in good company, as the follow-
ing extract from the Christian Advocate and
Journal of yesterday will show.

The Bishop commences his "Bible view
of slavery" by citing, "Cursed be Canaan; a
servant of servants shall he be to his breth-
ren." Gen. 9. 25, and remarks: "The
heartless irreverence, which Ham, the father
of Canaan, displayed toward his eminent pa-
rent, whose piety had just saved him from
the deluge, presents the immediate occasion
of this remarkable prophecy, but the actual
fulfillment was reserved for his posterity."
Again: "But in regard to the slavery of
Ham's posterity he issues his commands dis-
tinctly."

"Now there is little truth and much de-
ception in this language. The curse of Noah
was not pronounced upon Ham and his pos-
terity at all. It was Canaan and not Ham
that was denounced a servant. Ham and his
sons, Cush, Mesriam, and Phut, and their
posterity, were neither cursed nor enslaved.
Canaan was the victim of this malediction,
and not Ham and his posterity. Three
fourths of the posterity of Ham had no par-
ticipation in this imprecation whatever, and
that three fourths includes the African na-
tural."

The descendants of Canaan, who alone were cursed, were not Afri-
cans, nor were they negroes. The bishop
entirely misses his object when he attempts
to sanction American negro slavery by vir-
tue of the curse of Noah. Just as well
might Southern kidnappers enslave Bishop
Hopkins and his posterity as the negro un-
der that authority. The bishop exposes his
utter ignorance of scriptural facts when he
attempts to justify American negro slavery
by the Noticus curse on Canaan.

Let this suffice as a reply to a portion of
the so-called "review" of my sermon by
you.

I submit the following certificate with
names attached as proof that I did not say
what Little, Harding and Young have sworn
to.

"We the undersigned do hereby certify,
that we were present and heard the sermon
preached by the Rev. H. Brownson in the
M. E. Church of this place on the Sab-
bath of August 16th, 1863; and that to the
best of our knowledge he did not state that
Bishop Hopkins "misquod the Bible" in
his letter—"Bible view of slavery."

SIGNED,
T. A. MILLER, J. W. RHOADS,
T. L. ROSS, SINTON WILLIAMS,
Wm. BARNES, A. F. EASTMAN,
P. M. OSTERHOUT, L. H. STEPHENS.

This testimony of these gentlemen will be
taken without the formality of an oath.
The absence of Rev. L. Peck from home,
accounts for the omission of his name.

But let us examine the oath of Little and
Co. Mr. Little swears he "will not attempt
from memory to repeat the very words used"
by me, and yet he does have the hardihood
to swear that his "recollection is distinct,
that" I "did affirm that Mr. Hopkins had
misquod the Bible."

This is swearing with a vengeance—it is
swearing to a thing and not swearing to it
after all—swearing that he will not attempt
to repeat the very words used by me, and
yet he does swear that I did use the very
words—"that Mr. Hopkins had misquod
the Bible and misrepresented what he had
quoted." Harding and Young swear to the
same.

No one sir, save a man destitute of the
first principles of honor, magnanimity, and
self-respect, would have reported by such a
mean and contemptible subterfuge, when his
own character was not involved, You may
think that you have won laurels by this ap-
parent legal strategy, but every honorable
man will view it in a different light. It will
not tend to multiply your friends in your
new location. The loyal people of Bradford
County have respect for ministers if you
have not.

My only reply to that prominent member
of my church at Meshoppen is, that I did
not at the Brick chapel, speak of Democ-
rats generally as copperheads." The Rev.
G. Westfall who was present and heard me
at that time, has authorized me to say for
him, that I said no such thing.

It is a fact that there are those who are
so sensitive, and who are so addicted to mis-
representing the statements of ministers,
that it is very difficult for them to speak the
truth in reference to them. This is to be
expected of those who have thrown their
principles to the wind, and who do not scrup-
le to spend Sabbaths in employering;—
who drink whiskey and employ it for the
purpose of making political capital, who de-
nounce Sabbath Schools, and ministers, and
all others save those of like sentiments and
affinities with themselves. But let me say
to all such, that they make a grand mistake
when they join issue with the ministers of
the Gospel. The American churches have
not so far derogated in piety and in intelli-
gence, as to have lost confidence in the piety
and integrity of their ministers. And they
will continue to stand by them and sustain
them, despite the opposition raised against
them by heartless professors of religion, and
wicked and unprincipled demagogues, and of-
fice seekers. Mark that prediction my dear
sir.

Your apology to the public for the abusive
language which you have employed in your
correspondence with me, was perfectly gra-
tuitous. They are competent to judge of the
animus of your articles. In conclusion I re-
mark,

1. That you have refused to discuss the
question of slavery as proposed by me.
2. You have failed to prove me an aboli-
tionist.
3. Your attempts at conviction of falsehood
have been a failure.
4. You have positively refused to give
your own private views and belief on the
slavery question.

It is not necessary that I should tip the
scales, as you have already taken a slide.
As it is not in my heart to cherish unkind
feelings even towards an enemy, I therefore
wish you honorable success in your new field
of labor.

Thanking the Editor of the Democrat for
his courtesy, I bid you adieu.
H. BROWNSON.
Tunkhannock, Oct. 28, 1863.

To the North Branch Democrat.

Editors having been current for some
weeks past, in the neighborhood of some of
the Soldier's Aid Societies of this County, cal-
culated to prove damaging to their usefulness,
to the effect that the husband of Mrs. Grier,
one of the most active and efficient officers of
the Woman's Pa. Branch of the U. S. Sanitary
Commission, is in the Rebel army. I have
thought it due to the Commission, whose ser-
vant I have the honor to be, and to the cause
in which its efforts have been so earnestly
and beneficially employed, to request the
publication of the following extract from a
letter written by Mrs. Bloomfield Moore, the
corresponding Secretary of said Pa. Branch,
in reply to one addressed by me to her upon
that subject. Respectfully, &c.,

HARRIET E. LITTLE,
Associate Manager for Wyoming County,
EXTRACT FROM THE LETTER OF MRS. MOORE.

"Our noble Mrs. Grier, is the wife of Mr. M. B.
Grier, one of the editors of the Presbyterian, pub-
lished here. He was settled in Wilmington, N. C.,
when the war broke out. Never hesitating to preach
boldly in behalf of the Union, his enemies at length
outnumbered his friends, and he and his wife were
obliged to flee for their lives as he was, leaving their
property behind them, even their silver on
their breakfast-table, so sudden was their flight. Up-
on reaching this city, she devoted herself to hospital
service, and at the time of the seven days battle,
went down in a transport to assist in taking charge of
the wounded. I wish you could hear Mrs. Grier, give
some account of the loyal people that she left behind
her, who more politic than herself, hid away the dear
flag until the day should arise, when our Government
should be able to maintain its supremacy, when its
folds will once more be spread to the breeze."
(Signed.) Mrs. Bloomfield Moore.

PULMONARY CONSUMPTION A CURABLE DISEASE?

**A CARD
TO CONSUMPTIVES.**
The undersigned having been restored to health in
a few weeks, by a very simple remedy, after having
suffered several years with a severe lung affection,
and that dread disease, Consumption—is anxious
to make known to his fellow-sufferers the means of
cure.

To all who desire it, he will send a copy of the
prescription used (free of charge), with the direc-
tions for preparing and using the same, which they
will find a sure cure for CONSUMPTION, ASTHMA,
BRONCHITIS, COUGHS, COLDS, &c. The only object of
the advertiser in sending the Prescription is to bene-
fit the afflicted, and spread information which he con-
ceives to be invaluable; and he hopes every sufferer
will try his remedy, as it will cost them nothing
and may prove a blessing.

Parties wishing the prescription will please address
REV. EDWARD A. WILSON, Williamsburg
Kings County,
New York.
3312-4m.

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

- EXETER.—Robt. Waters.
- WASHINGTON.—Daniel Carney, M. F. Allen.
- MESHOPPEN.—Wm. H. Cortright, Robt. Dunlap,
John Bunnell 2nd, N. P. Dunlap, N. Overhill.
- NORTHMORELAND.—James Bescher, Robt. Eaton.
- WYOMING.—Royal Gary, Henry W. Fankel.
- EATON.—Wm. Hunter, E. Borden, O. W. Benjamin.
- MESHOPPEN.—A. Ben Furman, Albin Russell.
- BRAINTON.—Lynard Kennedy.
- TUNKHANNOCK TOWNSHIP.—D. Z. Michael, Frank-
lin Decker.
- OVERFIELD.—T. W. Smith.
- CLINTON.—W. W. Carpenter.
- TUNKHANNOCK BOROUGHS.—M. W. Dewitt,
Nicholson.—Hiram Kelly.

PRET JUDGES.

- WASHINGTON.—Geo. Jenkins.
- CLINTON.—Peter Baker, Wm. Belcher.
- WINDHAM.—Rowell Gary.
- MESHOPPEN.—O. H. Leomis, P. C. Clayton, Wm.
Blackmar, Jas. N. Kelly, Warren Brewster.
- BRAINTON.—Ezra Keeney, Simon B. Keeney.
- EATON.—Milton Wheeler, Wilnot Carpenter, An-
drew Frutchy, Peter Strub, Damon Stevens, Geo.
Ney, Chauncey Brown.
- NORTHMORELAND.—Geo. Brungess, Jacob Rhodes,
H. H. Brown, Thos. Plender.
- FORKSTON.—Calvin Robinson, John Hitchcock.
- NORTH BRANCH.—Henry Champin, Gilbert G. Ad-
ams.
- MESHOPPEN.—J. L. Hahn, Geo. Barrowcliff, John
B. Ploas, A. K. Farr.
- TUNKHANNOCK TOWNSHIP.—John Corish.
- LEMON.—John Cyphers.
- NICHOLSON.—Hollow