

from the slaveholders in Missouri, and that the livery stables were then filled with stolen horses, and yet the conspiracy to do it could not be punished.

Sir, I desire a law that will make it a crime, punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary, after conviction in the United States Court, to make a conspiracy in one State, against the people, property, government, or institutions, of another. Then we shall get at the root of the evil. I have no doubt that gentlemen on the other side will vote for a law which pretends to comply with the guarantees of the Constitution, without carrying any force or efficiency in its provisions. I have heard men abuse the fugitive slave law, and express their willingness to vote for amendments; but when you came to the amendments which they desired to adopt, you found they were such as would never return a fugitive to his master. They would go for any fugitive slave law that had a hole in it big enough to let the negro drop through and escape; but none that would comply with the obligations of the Constitution. So we shall find that side of the Chamber voting for a law that will, in terms, disapprove of unlawful expeditions against neighboring States, without being efficient in affording protection.

But the Senator says it is a part of the policy of the northern Democracy to represent the Republicans as being hostile to southern institutions. Sir, it is a part of the policy of the northern Democracy, as well as their duty, to speak the truth on that subject. I do not suppose that any man would have the audacity to arraign a brother Senator here for representing the Republican party as dealing in denunciation and insult of the institutions of the South. Look to your Philadelphia platform, where you assert the sovereign power of Congress over the Territories for their government, and demand that it shall be exerted against those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery.

Mr. FESSENDEN. Let me suggest to the Senator that he is entirely changing the issue between him and me. I did not desire to say, and did not say, that the Republicans of the North were not unfriendly to the institution of slavery. I admitted myself that I was; I trust they all are. It is not in that respect that I accuse the Democracy of the North of misrepresenting the position of the Republican party. It was in representing that they desired to interfere with the institution in the southern States. That is the ground—that they were opposed to southern rights. That they do not think well of slavery as it exists in this country, I do not undertake to deny. I do not know that southern gentlemen expect us to be friendly to it. I apprehend that they would not think very well of us if we pretended to be friendly to it. We were friendly to the institution, we should try to adopt, we certainly should not oppose it; but what I charged upon the northern Democracy was, that they misrepresented our position. That we were opposed to the extension of slavery over free territory, that we called it a relic of barbarism, I admit; but I do deny that the Republican party, or the Republicans generally, have ever exhibited a desire or made a movement towards interfering with the right of southern men, the States, or any constitutional rights that they have anywhere. That is the charge I made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for what purpose does the Republican party appeal to northern passions and northern prejudices against southern institutions and the southern people, unless it is to operate upon those institutions as no better than polygamist; the slaveholder as no better than the polygamist; and complain that we should intimate that they did not like to associate with the slaveholder any better than with the polygamist. I can see a monstrous lowering of the flag in the Senator's speech and explanation. I would respect the concession, if the fact was acknowledged. This thing of shrinking from a position that every northern man knows to be true, and arraigning men for slander for telling the truth to them—

Mr. FESSENDEN. I know it to be true. Mr. DOUGLAS. You may know it down in Maine, but you do not know it in Illinois. I have always noted that those men who were so far off from the slave States that they did not know anything about them, are most anxious for the fate of the poor slave. Those men who are so far off that they do not know what a negro is, are distressed to death about the condition of the poor negro. (Laughter.) But, sir, go into the border States, where we associate across the line, where the civilities of society are constantly interchanged where we trade with each other, and have social and commercial intercourse, and there you will find them standing by each other like a band of brothers. Take southern Illinois, southern Indiana, southern Ohio, and that part of Pennsylvania bordering on Maryland, and there you will find social intercourse, commercial intercourse, good feeling; because those people know the condition of the slave on the opposite side of the line; but just in proportion as you recede from the slave States, just in that proportion party leaders can impose on their sympathies and honest prejudices.

Sir, I know it is the habit of the Republican party, wherever I have met them, to make the warfare in such a way as to try to rally the whole North on sectional grounds against the South. I know that is to be the issue, and it is proven by the speech of the Senator from New York, which I quoted before, and that of Mr. Lincoln, so far as they are authority. I happen to have those speeches before me. The Senator from Maine has said that neither of these speeches justified the conclusion that they asserted, that the free States and the slave States cannot coexist permanently in the same Republic. Let us see whether they do or not: Mr. Lincoln says:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

Then he goes on to say they must all be one thing or all the other, or else the Union cannot endure. What is the meaning of that language, unless it is that the Union cannot permanently exist, half slave and half free—that it must all become one thing or all become the other? That is the declaration. The declaration is that the North must combine as a sectional party, and carry on the agitation so fiercely, up to the very borders of the slaveholding States, that the master dare not sleep at night for fear that the robbers, the John Browns, will come and set his house on fire, and murder the women and children, before morning. It is to surround the slaveholding States by a cord of free States, to use the language of the Senator; to hem them in, in order that you may smother them out. The Senator avowed, in his speech to-day, their object to be to hem in the slave States, in order that slavery may die out. How die out? Confine it to its present limits; let the ratio of increase go on by the

laws of nature; and just in proportion as the lands in the slaveholding States wear out, the negroes increase, and you will soon reach that point where the soil will not produce enough to feed the slaves; then hem in, and let them starve out—let them die out by starvation. That is the policy—hem them in, and starve them out. Do as the French did in Algeria, when the Arabs took to the caverns—smoke them out, by making fires at the mouths of the caverns, and keep them burning until they die. The policy is, to keep up this agitation along the line; make slave property insecure in the border States; keep the master constantly in apprehension of assault, till he will consent to abandon his native country, leaving his slaves behind him, or to remove them further South. If you can force Kentucky thus to abolish slavery, you make Tennessee the border State, and begin the same operation upon her.

But, sir, let us see whether the Senator from New York did not proclaim the doctrine that free States and slave States cannot permanently exist in the same Republic. He said:

"It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces; and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation or entirely a free-labor nation."

The opposing conflict is between the States; the Union cannot remain as it now is, part free and part slave. The conflict between free States and slave States must go on until there is not a slave State left, or until they are all slave States. That is the declaration of the Senator from New York. The Senator from Maine tried to make the Senate believe that I had misrepresented the Senator from New York and Mr. Lincoln, of Illinois, in stating that they referred to a conflict between States. He said that all they meant was that it was a conflict between free labor and slave labor in the same State. Now, sir, let me submit to that man's candor whether he will insist on that position. They both say the contest will go on until the States become all free or slave. Then, when is the contest going to end? When they become all slave? Will there not be the same conflict between free labor and slave labor, after every State has become a slave State, that there is now? If that was the meaning, would the conflict between slave labor and free labor cease even when every State had become slaveholding? Have not all the slaveholding States a large number of free laborers within their limits and if there is an irrepressible conflict between free labor and slave labor, will you remove that conflict by making the States all slave? Yet, the Senator from New York says they must become all slave or all free before the conflict ceases. Sir, that shows that the Senator from New York meant what I represented him as meaning. It shows that a man who knows the meaning of words, and has the heart to express them as they read, cannot fail to know that that was the meaning of those Senators. The boldness with which a charge of misrepresentation may be made in this body will not give character to it when it is contradicted by the facts. I dislike to have to repel these charges of unfairness and misrepresentation; yet the Senator began with a series of innuendos, with a series of complaints misrepresentation, showing that he was afraid to meet the real issues of his party, and would make up for that by personal assaults and innuendos against the opposite party.

He goes back to a speech of mine in opposition to the Lecompton constitution, in which I said that if you would send that constitution back and let the people of Kansas vote for or against it, if they voted for a free State or a slave State I would go for it without caring whether they voted slavery up or down. He thinks it is a great charge against me that I do not care whether the people vote it up or vote it down. Mr. FESSENDEN. The Senator is mistaken as to the speech to which I referred. It was one of his speeches made on his southern tour, that I referred to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The idea is taken from a speech in the Senate—the first speech I made against the Lecompton constitution. It was quoted all over Illinois by Mr. Lincoln in the canvass, and I repeated the sentiment each time it was quoted against me, and repeated it in the South as well as the North. I say this: if the people of Kansas want a slave State, it is their business and not mine; if they want a free State, they have a right to have it; and hence, I do not care, so far as regards my action, whether they make it a free State or not; it is none of my business. But the Senator says he does care, he has a preference between freedom and slavery. How long would this preference last if he was a sugar planter in Louisiana, residing on his estate, instead of living in Maine? Sir, I hold the doctrine that a wise statesman will adapt his laws to the wants, conditions, and interests of the people to be governed by them. Slavery may be very essential in one climate and totally useless in another. If I were a citizen of Louisiana I would vote for retaining and maintaining slavery, because I believe the good of that people would require it. As a citizen of Illinois I am utterly opposed to it, because our interests would not be promoted by it. I should like to see the Abolitionist who would go and live in a southern country that would not get over his scruples very soon and have a plantation as quickly as he could get the money to buy it.

I have said and repeat that this question of slavery is one of climate, of political economy, of self-interest, not a question of legislation. Wherever the climate, the soil, the health of the country are such that it cannot be cultivated by white labor, you will have African labor, and compulsory labor at that. Wherever white labor can be employed cheaply and most profitably, there African labor will retire and white labor will take its place.

You cannot force slavery by all the acts of Congress you may take, on one inch of territory against the will of the people, and you cannot by any law you can make, keep it out from one inch of American territory where the people want it. You tried it in Illinois. By the ordinance of 1787, slavery was prohibited, and yet our people, believing that slavery would be profitable to them, established hereditary servitude in the Territory by territorial legislation in defiance of our Federal ordinance. We maintained slavery there just so long as Congress said we should not have it, and we abolished it at just the moment you recognized us as a State, with the right to do as we pleased. When we established it, it was on the supposition that it was our interest to do so. When we abolished it, we did so because experience proved that it was not our interest to have it. I hold that slavery is a question of political economy, to be determined by climate, by soil, by production, by self-interest, land hence the people to be affected by it are the most impartial jury to try the fact whether their interest requires them to have it or not.

But the Senator thinks it is a great crime for me to say that I do not care whether they live it or not. I care just this far: I want every people to have that kind of Government, that system of laws, that class of institutions, which will best promote their welfare, and I want them to decide for themselves; and so that they decide it to suit themselves, I am satisfied, without stopping to inquire or caring which way they decide it. That is what I meant by that declaration, and I am ready to stand by it.

The Senator has made the discovery—I suppose it is very new, for he would not repeat anything that was old, after calling me to account for expressing an idea that had been heard of before—that I re-opened the agitation by bringing in the Nebraska bill in 1854; and he tries to put the responsibility of "the crimes perpetrated by his political friends, and in violation of the law, upon the provisions of the law itself. We passed a bill to allow the people of Kansas to form and regulate their own institutions to suit themselves. No sooner had we placed that law on the statute-book than his political friends formed conspiracies and combinations in the different New England States to import a set of desperadoes into Kansas to control the elections and the institutions of that country in fraud of the law of Congress.

Sir, I desire to make the legislation broad enough to reach conspiracies and combinations of that kind; and I would also include combinations and conspiracies on the other side. My object is to establish firmly the doctrine that each State is to do its own voting, establish its own institutions, make its own laws without interference, directly or indirectly, from any outside power. The gentleman says that is squatter sovereignty. Call it squatter sovereignty, call it popular sovereignty, call it what you please, it is the great principle of self-government on which this Union was formed, and by the preservation of which alone it can be maintained. It is the right of the people of every State to govern themselves and make their own laws, and be protected from outside violence or interference, directly or indirectly. Sir, I confess the object of the legislation I contemplate is to put down this outside interference; it is to repress this "irrepressible conflict." It is to bring the Government back to the true principles of the Constitution, and let each people in this Union rest secure in the enjoyment of domestic tranquility without apprehension from neighboring States. I will not occupy further time.

**BEDFORD GAZETTE.**  
Bedford, April 13, 1860.  
B. F. Meyers, Editor and Proprietor.  
FOR GOVERNOR:  
**HENRY D. FOSTER,**  
OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY.

"The principle of the tariff of 1842, as far as related to the manufacture of IRON, of any description, or of every description, was NOT TOO HIGH."—HENRY D. FOSTER.

**RATIFICATION MEETING!**  
A grand Mass Meeting of the Democracy of Bedford County, will be held at the Court House, in Bedford, on MONDAY EVENING, APRIL 30th, for the purpose of ratifying the nomination of HON. HENRY D. FOSTER, and of endorsing and approving the proceedings of the recent State Convention at Reading. Foster men, to the rescue!

By order of the Dem. Co. Com.  
O. E. SHANNON, Chairman.  
April 5th, 1860.

**Money Wanted.**  
We must and will have our accounts settled up to the time of the dissolution of the late firm of Meyers & Bedford. We have treated our delinquent friends leniently, thus far, but there is a time when forbearance ceases to be a virtue. If you cannot pay the whole of your bill, pay half of it. If you cannot pay half of it, pay as much as you can. If you can't pay at all, let us know, so that we mark you "complimentary."

**THE TARIFF IN THE STATE SENATE.**  
Inconsistency of the "Opposition."

The leaders of the Opposition in such parts of this State as are particularly interested in the increase of duties on imports, are in the habit of making a great ado about a revision and reconstruction of the Tariff. Their object in making this outcry for a Tariff, is simply to hood-wink voters; nothing more, nothing less.—Their abandonment of the principle of the Tariff of '42, (so ably advocated by HENRY D. FOSTER,) their support of DAVID WILMOT, for Governor, a man whom they had denounced as a "British Free Trade Tory," and the reduction of the Tariff of '46 by their party in the Banks Congress, would alone suffice to fix upon them the charge of insincerity. But if further proofs are wanted, the action of the present Opposition Congress and the conduct of the Opposition members of the late State Senate, are sufficient to convince any reasonable man that they (the politicians of the Opposition) are not true friends of an increase of the Tariff.—Congress has been in session over four months, and yet the first effort to pass the Tariff bill was made but a few days ago. To have heard the Opposition prate about the Tariff, before the last Congressional elections came off, one would have supposed that that would be the very first subject of legislation by Congress, if they obtained control of that body. But no. The spoils were more precious in their eyes than the Tariff or Pennsylvania Coal and Iron.—They must first dispose of the "public plunder, and then," thought they, it will be time enough to attend to the wants of Pennsylvania. And now, the rumor is that the Massachusetts "Republicans" will oppose an increase of the Tariff. Such is the Congressional aspect of Opposition friendship for the interests of Pennsylvania.

When we come nearer home, we find the Opposition members of our State Legislature, all professedly Tariff men, doing all in their power to retard the passage of a higher Tariff. Under the pretence of recommending such a Tariff, they strive to kill it, by making a low

fling at President Buchanan, the consistent and life-long advocate of specific duties. By doing this they hope to drive off Democratic Congressmen from the support of the Tariff Bill, so as to enable them to raise another hue-and-cry against the Democracy. They want the Tariff question for future use. They want it for pabulum for the "Woolly Horse," during the coming Presidential contest. In the State Senate the resolutions on the Tariff, took the naked shape of hatred of the President. After having slept in Committee, during the whole session, they were called up shortly before the adjournment. These resolutions contain a clause charging the President with hypocrisy in his views on the Tariff, and this clause was all that the Opposition Senators cared anything about, as is proven by their voting down the substitute offered by Mr. SCHELL, for which they had voted unanimously one year ago, and which is a strong recommendation of an increase of the Tariff. Every Opposition Senator voted for the resolutions offered by Mr. SCHELL, when they were before the Senate in 1859.—Now every Opposition Senator votes against those resolutions, thus reversing their position one year ago and virtually voting against an increase of the Tariff. They can vote for Tariff resolutions only when they contain a fling at the President. Such is Opposition consistency on the Tariff question.

The following is Mr. Schell's substitute, for which all the Opposition Senators voted last year, but against which they all voted this year:

WHEREAS, The experience of the past and present most fully demonstrate that it is a wise and beneficial policy of the General Government which dictates the imposition of duties on such products of foreign nations as come in such direct contact with those of our own country, as to injure and prostrate the trade of our own soil, and among our own citizens.

The artisans and laborers in many departments of trade are compelled to abandon their accustomed pursuits—especially do our own coal and iron interests suffer; therefore,  
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in General Assembly met, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to labor for the passage (at the present session) of such an act as will not only tend to increase the revenue by the imposition of duties, but afford ample encouragement to all the interests of the country, injured by the productions of the cheap labor of other nations; but more especially to urge an increase of duties on coal and iron, in which a portion of our own people are deeply interested.

Resolved, That the views of the President expressed in his late message in reference to the advantage of definite or specific duties over ad valorem duties, as more uniform, less liable to frauds, and affording the most certain and uniform amount of revenue, meet our hearty approbation.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to forward to each of our Senators and Members of Congress, a copy of the above preamble and resolutions, informing them of their adoption.

**Crow, chanticleer, crow loud and long!**  
The Right has triumphed over Wrong!



The spring crop of Black Republicanism has entirely failed. Our exchanges are lined with accounts of brilliant Democratic victories.—First on the list is the "land of steady habits," GLORIOUS CONNECTICUT, in which, according to the last accounts, the Black Republican candidate for Governor has only about 500 majority, a Democratic gain of over 9,000 since 1856, when Fremont and Fillmore combined, had upwards of 10,000 majority over Buchanan. This is a moral victory for the Democrats and will enable them to carry the State in the fall. Next comes GALLANT RHODE ISLAND!

In which WILLIAM SPRAGUE, the candidate of the Democrats, is elected Governor, by 1500 majority over Seth Padeford, "Republican." The Legislature of this State, is also largely against the "Republicans."—Rhode Island has given us a victory unparalleled in all the annals of political triumphs.—For seven years she has steadily and largely voted with our opponents. In 1856, her vote stood for Buchanan 6,680; for Fremont, 11,467, giving Fremont a majority of nearly 5000; whilst last year the "Republican" majority, was 5392! Thus, it will be seen that the erewhile solid phalanx of New England "Republicanism," is broken. Rhode Island and Connecticut will never again cast their ten electoral votes for a sectional candidate.—For this auspicious result, we have to thank the conservative men of these states, who magnanimously buried former party affinities, and like the glorious Old Line Whigs of 1856, enlisted under the banners of the Democracy. All honor to them for their noble conduct!

Of the town and city elections that have recently taken place, nine out of ten, have resulted in favor of the Democracy. We append accounts of some of them.

In CINCINNATI, the Democrats have made a clean sweep, electing their whole city ticket,

by from 600 to 700 majority. The "Republican" majorities in 1858 and 1859, in this city, were 2000. Democratic gain, 2600!

In MILWAUKEE, Wisconsin, the Democratic Mayor is elected by 1000 majority.

In ELMIRA, N. Y., the entire Democratic ticket is elected.

In BROOKLYN, the Democrats have succeeded by a vote of two to one.

In ROME, CATSKILL, and SCHENECTADY, formerly "Republican" towns, the Democrats have carried their tickets, with the exception of the Mayor in the last named.

In KENOSHA, Wisconsin, and Freeport, Illinois, the Democrats are successful.

In PORTLAND, (hitherto largely "Republican") Warren, Searsmont, Appleton (hitherto "Republican") Gorham (last year "Republican") and Buxton (last year "Republican") towns in Maine, the Democrats have elected their nominees.

In CAMDEN, N. J., (formerly largely Opposition) the Democrats have elected the Mayor.

In CARLEISLE, which last year gave a considerable "Republican" majority, the Democracy are victorious.

In CONNELLVILLE, the Democrats have elected their ticket by an average vote of 75 to 35.

**Local and Miscellaneous.**

—We publish in this issue the speech of Senator Douglas, on the subject of the Harper's Ferry intension. Will not the Opposition newspapers in this region copy it from our columns? It is but a short time since they were very fond of publishing Judge Douglas' speeches.—We hope they have not grown tired of him already. His speech on the Harper's Ferry business, we know, would be relished by their readers. If you conclude to publish it, Messieurs "Republicans," please print in capitals that part of it which says that "the Harper's Ferry crime was the natural, logical and inevitable result of the doctrines and teachings of the Republican party." What say you, "Bedford inquirer?"

—ANOTHER CITIZEN GONE.—It becomes our mournful task to announce the death of Mr. JOSIAH D. SHUCK, which took place at his residence, in this place, on Monday morning last. Mr. Shuck was a valuable citizen and was much beloved and respected. His loss will long be felt by our community. May he rest in peace!

—The Legislature adjourned on Tuesday of last week, having done nothing to benefit any body, but we fear a great deal that will work injury to the people. Corruption evidently ruled the legislative roost, and "Republicanism" was as cheap at Harrisburg as Fillmore editors in '56. (No allusions to Bucher Swoppe.)

—The Helpertes still deny that Esq. Oldham was peddling for them on Court week.—We are informed that there were two persons, both "Republicans,"—for both defended "Republicanism"—in town, last Court week, selling Helpert. One of them we are informed, hailed from Blood Run, and one of them was taken for Esq. Oldham, by our informant, who is a gentleman in every respect, and whose word is as good as his bond any day. If Esq. Oldham will come to our office when he visits Bedford, we promise that we will introduce him to our informant. As to our receiving a letter from said Oldham, desiring us to withdraw our charges against him, that is an unqualified falsehood, no such letter having ever reached us.

—The Abolition organ endeavors to figure up gains for its party in this county. In our table of week before last, we gave the official vote, which made the Democratic majority 78 more than it was, on an average, last fall.—Our Abolition friends shun the official tables, and give their own estimates. As an instance of their incorrectness, they say that the Opposition candidate for Judge was elected in Napier township by 4 votes; whilst the official returns show that the Democratic candidate was elected by 6 votes. This is a base slander on the Democrats of Old Napier and will but incite them to renewed energy during the coming contest.

—Heavy rains have fallen in this neighborhood, during the last week, swelling the waters far beyond their usual bounds. Fences and gardens are submerged and houses in the West end of town are partially inundated.

—The "N. Y. Tribune" is "down on" John Covode. Greely thinks that Covode is running his "investigations" into the ground. Is Horace afraid that the tables will be turned?

—Hon. W. P. Schell has returned from Harrisburg. The session which has just closed was the last of his term as Senator. Mr. Schell proved himself an able, faithful and efficient representative, and the people of this Senatorial District will be fortunate, indeed, if they can secure the services of a man of his stamp during the next three years.

—The bill for the sale of the Poor House, published in our paper some time ago, has passed both houses of the Legislature, having, however, been amended so as to require the Commissioners to sell, to be appointed by the Court, the sale to be public and subject to the approval of the Court, the clauses of limitation as to the distance of the location of the new Poor House, from the Borough and the Turnpike, having been stricken out. The bond of the Commissioners is also to be subject to the approval of the Court, or a judge thereof.

—Hon. Wm. H. Bissell, Governor of Illinois, died a few weeks since, after a protracted illness. Lieut. Gov. Wood is now the occupant of the executive chair.

—John Boor and J. P. Hysung were elected Inspectors in Londonderry township, at the late election. Joseph Burns was named as one of them in the list published some time ago, which was a mistake.

**MEETING OF THE BUCHANAN CLUB.**

Pursuant to previous notice, the members of the Buchanan Club, assembled at the Court House, on Saturday evening last, 7th inst.—The Club was ably addressed by Hon. W. P. Schell and O. E. Shannon, Esq. The subject resolutions were unanimously adopted, after which the Club adjourned to meet at the call of the President. After the adjournment three cheers were proposed and given for the gallant little State of Rhode Island, which has just wheeled into the Democratic column.

Resolved, by the Buchanan Club, and the Democracy of Bedford borough now assembled, that we hail with lively satisfaction the nomination of HENRY D. FOSTER, of Westmoreland county, as the Democratic candidate for Governor at the ensuing election. His record on the Tariff question, as well as every other question affecting the interests of Pennsylvania and the Union, merits our entire approval and should receive the hearty endorsement of every right-minded and patriotic citizen. We pledge ourselves to use every honorable effort to promote his election, and beg leave to assure our Democratic brethren elsewhere that Old Bedford will do her whole duty by "Harry of the West."

Resolved, that we cordially approve of the proceedings of the late Democratic State Convention at Reading, and especially do we commend the platform of principles adopted by that body, believing them to be eminently sound, conservative and just.

Resolved, that the result of the recent elections in Connecticut and Rhode Island, demonstrates most emphatically that the sectional and fanatical dogmas of the so-called "Republican" party, are becoming decidedly unpopular and that the prospects of the Democracy are growing brighter day by day.

Resolved, that we have undiminished confidence in the administration of JAMES BUCHANAN, and that the persistent effort of vindictive partisans and disappointed office-seekers, to blacken the character of our venerable Chief Magistrate, for the purpose of making political capital against the Democratic party, is too transparent a humbug to mislead any reflecting mind, and we look upon it as a shallow trick of the shallowest of demagogues.

**THE RHODE ISLAND ELECTION.**  
Triumph of the Democracy—Election of Mr. Sprague as Governor.

After one of the most exciting contests ever known in Rhode Island, Col. Wm. Sprague, the candidate of the Democracy and the Union men, has been elected Governor by a majority of 1,500. This splendid victory shows an astonishing revolution in sentiment when we consider that the Republicans carried the State last year by 5,392 majority. Following immediately after the great Democratic gains in Connecticut, nothing could be more cheering to the Democracy of the Union.—Connecticut shook the solid phalanx of Republican States in New England, but Rhode Island has broken it. Glorious Rhode Island! She is nothing more than a small strippling, but she has gone to battle with the Republican Giant and slain it.

Thus, on the very threshold of the Presidential contest, have the Republicans sustained a serious repulse in two States heretofore counted as certain for the Republican candidate for President. The majority in Connecticut, dwindled down from thousands to a few hundred, carries alarm instead of encouragement into the Republican camp. And now Rhode Island has deserted them—has defeated the Republican candidate for Governor, and utterly routed the irrepressibles. The Republican party may as well close business and make an assignment, when it is defeated in New England.—Patriot and Union.

[From the Hartford Times.]

**THE RESULT.**

In the contest no quarter was asked or given. It was a square stand up fight, and the steady charges of the National Democracy caused the ranks of the sectionalists and abolitionists to waver, and in many places to give way. Their comparative strength is weakened, till their superior numbers, only sustained at all by money, false representation, unfair means at the boards and especially by forcing laborers to vote against their own convictions, are no longer large enough to give them confidence. They are reduced to just about an even thing. In 1856 the vote in this State

For Fremont was	42,715
" Buchanan	34,995

Fremont over Buchanan	7,720
Fillmore's vote was	2,615
Opposition over Democratic	10,335

Now the entire opposition majority over the Democrats cannot be over 500, the gain being 9,000 on the part of the Democrats in less than four years—and this on the largest and fullest vote the present year, ever given in "Connecticut. Well may we say, "Forward the Ninth!" The black citadel of the opposition must soon fall. The point has already been gained by the Democracy, that a full vote is no longer a guaranty of victory to the opposition.

**HOLLOWAY'S PILLS.**—The de plus ultra Remedies for Scrofula, Scurvy, &c.—When all else have failed these famous pills will effect a speedy and thorough cure—the blood is the seat of Scrofula, and their kindred disorders. By their direct action on the circulation Holloway's pills purify the blood of those humors which infect or vitiate it.—Thousands have been cured by them after they had tried all other means without success. On the stomach, the liver and the lungs their effect is marvellous.—Let each one judge for himself by procuring a box and following the directions to the letter, and we will guaranty a speedy and effectual cure. All who have the slightest doubt of scrofula should use these medicines—don't hesitate—purchase a box.

**MARRIED.**

On Tuesday evening, March 20th, by the Rev. Wm. M. Destrick, Mr. Samuel W. Clark, of Westmoreland county, Pa., to Miss Adeline R., second daughter of Mr. Wm. Young, of Hopewell township, Bedford co.

On Thursday, March 29th, by the same, Mr. Ezekiel Cook, Jr., of West Providence tp., to Miss Matilda, eldest daughter of Mr. Wm. Young, of Hopewell township.

At the Methodist Parsonage, in Bedford, March 21st, by Rev. S. Barnes, Mr. John S. Brown to Miss Emily Drenning, both of Cumberland Valley.