

The Nominations—Sketches of the Democratic Candidates.

HORATIO SEYMOUR.

Horatio Seymour, the Democratic candidate for President of the United States, was born in Pompey, Onondaga county, New York, in the year 1811, and is consequently 57 years of age. The family to which Mr. Seymour belongs is descended from Richard Seymour, who was one of the original settlers of Hartford, Conn. Major Moses Seymour, the fourth lineal descendant, served in the Revolutionary War, and subsequently represented Litchfield in the Legislature of Connecticut for seventeen years. Of his five sons, Henry Seymour, father of Horatio, was born in 1780. He removed to Utica, New York, served in the State Legislature with signal ability, and was for many years Canal Commissioner, occupying a prominent position in the politics and legislation of the State. One of his brothers was a distinguished member of the United States Senate from Vermont for twelve years. Hon. Origen S. Seymour, for some time Representative in Congress from the Litchfield District, of Connecticut, was the son of another brother named Ozias. The maternal grandfather of Mr. Seymour, Colonel Forman, served through the Revolutionary War in the New Jersey line.

Mr. Seymour received a liberal and thorough education in the best institutions of the State. His instincts and preferences naturally led him to the study of the law, which he pursued with great vigor and industry. He was admitted to the bar when only a little more than twenty years of age, and at once commenced the practice of his profession in the city of Utica. The death of his father, however, soon afterwards devolved upon him so great responsibilities in connection with the settlement of the family estate, as to require the most of his time and attention, obliging him, much against his wish, to relinquish the practice of his profession. The death of his wife's father, the late John R. Blocker, occurring about the same time, added to his numerous cares in the adjustment of important property interests. Some of the best years of Mr. Seymour's life were absorbed in this work, but no doubt his mind was being schooled, as it could not otherwise have been, for the graver responsibilities and duties that were to come in after life. Up to this time Mr. Seymour had acted no prominent part in political life, although from his youth, as were his ancestors before him, he had always been strongly attached, through sympathy and taste, to the Democratic party. In the fall of 1841, when not thirty years of age, Mr. Seymour consented to the use of his name as a Democratic candidate for Member of Assembly. Although the Whigs were of that time largely in the ascendancy in Utica, Mr. Seymour was triumphantly elected by a large majority. In the Legislature Mr. Seymour at once took a commanding position upon the great questions involving the interests of the State, engaging in the leading debates with great fervency and assisting largely in shaping the legislation of the session. Among his legislative associates were John A. Dix, Michael Hoffman, David R. Floyd Jones, George R. Davis, Lemuel Stearns and Calvin T. Hulburd. The Democrats at that time were in the ascendancy in both branches of the Legislature, and the great measure of the session was Michael Hoffman's bill in relation to finance, which was supported and passed by the Democrats. In the success of this measure, which was destined to restore the depreciated financial credit of the State, Mr. Seymour took an active and sympathetic interest, displaying for the first time the forensic ability and oratorical power that have since distinguished him.

In the spring of 1842 Mr. Seymour was elected Mayor of the city of Utica, despite the continued hostility and opposition of the Whigs. In the fall of 1848, he was again elected a member of the lower House of the Legislature, and was re-elected to, and served in the same position during the sessions of 1844 and 1845. The session of 1844 was an important and exciting one, the Assembly being agitated with acrimonious contests, chiefly springing from contemplated opposition to the administration of Governor Bouck. The leaders in the debates of the session were Mr. Seymour and Mr. Hoffman, the recognized leader of the Legislature in 1842, and a formidable antagonist in debate, but Mr. Seymour appears to have won not only the plaudits of his political associates but the praises of his constituents likewise. The session of 1845 opened with a changed spirit, based on the victorious election of Mr. Polk to the Presidency. At the outset of this session Mr. Seymour was induced by his friends to enter the contest for Speakership, to which position he was triumphantly elected, despite a violent factional fight, which seriously threatened his prospects. One of the prominent and important events of this session was the election of Daniel S. Dickinson to the United States Senate, in which Mr. Seymour took a leading and active part. He also engaged with fervent spirit in the discussion relative to the call for a convention to amend the Constitution, but voted against the bill providing for that measure. With this session Mr. Seymour's legislative career was brought to a close.

For the succeeding five years Mr. Seymour was not prominent in public life, having resumed the practice of law in the city of Utica. By the action of the Legislature of 1850, providing for the enlargement and improvement of the Erie Canal, and appropriating the revenue of the State in contravention to the provisions of the constitution, Mr. Seymour again assumed a leading position in State politics, and most earnestly resisted this effort to override the provisions of a constitution so recently adopted. On account of his known opposition to that measure, he was that year (1850), for the first time, placed in nomination for Governor of his State, in opposition to Washington Hunt. The result of the election was, for Seymour, 214,852 votes; for Hunt, 214,614. Mr.

Seymour having been defeated by 262 votes.

In 1852, Mr. Seymour was again placed in nomination by the Democratic party, in opposition to Washington Hunt (Whig) and Minthorne Tompkins (Free Soil) with the following result:

Seymour, 244,121 | Tompkins, 19,399
Hunt, 239,736

Mr. Seymour was triumphantly elected over two competitors as the chief executive officer of the State. His administration of State affairs, as generally conceded, was marked by ability, tact and good judgment. While occupying the gubernatorial chair in 1852, he vetoed the notorious Maine law, and the correctness of his views as to the power of the Legislature to pass summary laws was subsequently fully established by a formal decision of the Court of Appeals.

In 1851 Mr. Seymour was nominated by the Democracy for re-election, with Myron H. Clark (Republican), Daniel Ullman (American), and Greene C. Bronson (Hard Shell Democrat) as opponents. The following was the result of the election:

Seymour, 156,493 | Ullman, 172,282
Clark, 156,804 | Bronson, 33,850

Although this election resulted in Mr. Seymour's defeat, it demonstrated very satisfactorily his unwaning popularity with the people, and his certainty of success with the party united and working for one candidate. At the conclusion of this contest, Mr. Seymour again resumed the work of his profession at Utica. In everything appertaining to the success of the Democracy he took an active and sympathetic interest. He attended National and State Conventions with great regularity, and was always accorded a leading position in the councils of the same. At the National Democratic Convention at Charleston, in 1860, he was proposed by the Southern delegates as a compromise candidate between Douglas and Breckenridge, but owing to the opposition of the New York delegation his name was withdrawn.

In 1862 Mr. Seymour was the fourth time placed in nomination for Governor of his State by the Democracy, against General Wadsworth, the Republican nominee. The result of the election was as follows:

Seymour, 306,449
Wadsworth, 295,397

Mr. Seymour was thus for the second time elected Governor of this State by the handsome majority of 10,752. After an able administration of two years he was, in 1864, nominated for re-election, this time against Reuben Fenton, by whom he was defeated.

At the National Democratic Convention held in Chicago in 1864, Mr. Seymour was with great unanimity chosen its president, and how ably and efficiently he discharged the duties and responsibilities of that important position, the records and history of the Convention will indisputably show. Since that time Mr. Seymour has delivered many powerful Democratic speeches in various parts of the country, entering each successive campaign in his State with his accustomed vigor, fearlessness and efficiency.

At his home in Utica, as well as throughout the State, he is esteemed and respected with that fervor that springs only from true friendship. He has been from early boyhood a faithful and energetic member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the interest of which he has labored earnestly to promote, both as an individual member and a leader in her legislative councils. He takes special interest in educational establishments, and in the Sunday school, whose usefulness and influence he labors zealously to promote and advance.

FRANCIS PRESTON BLAIR, JR.

The gallant soldier and statesman who has been nominated for the office of Vice President of the United States by the National Democratic Convention, and who will certainly fill that office, was born in the quaint old town of Lexington, Ky., February 19, 1821, and is now in his forty-eighth year. In his twentieth year he graduated at Princeton College, and removed to St. Louis, Missouri, and there began the study of law, in which profession he made rapid progress. In 1845, being then in his twenty-fifth year, he made a journey to the Rocky Mountains with a party of trappers for the improvement of his health, which had failed somewhat, owing to close pursuit of his studies; and on the breaking out of the Mexican war Blair joined the force under Kearney and the gallant Doniphan in New Mexico, and served as a private soldier until 1847, when he returned to St. Louis and resumed the practice of his profession. In 1848, like his father, Francis P. Blair, Sr., he gave his support to the Free Soil party, and in a speech delivered at the Court House in St. Louis, contended against the extension of slavery into the Territories of the nation. In 1852 he was elected from St. Louis county, Missouri, to the Legislature as an avowed Free Soiler, and he was re-elected in 1854, though Thos. H. Benton, the Congressional candidate of the Free Soilers, was beaten. In 1856 Mr. Blair was returned to Congress from the St. Louis district over Mr. Kennet, who had defeated Col. Benton two years before. In 1857 he delivered an elaborate speech in the House of Representatives in favor of colonizing the black population of the United States in Central America. Mr. Blair was also an editor and writer on the Missouri Democrat at one time. The father of General Blair was a firm and fast friend of Andrew Jackson; and the General, when a child, was wont to play on the knees of Andrew Jackson in the White House. His father was at that time editor of the *Osage* at Washington.

In 1860 Mr. Blair contested the seat in Congress of Mr. Borrett, from St. Louis District, and soon after was returned to the house, after which he resigned his seat. In 1860 General Blair made a speech in Brooklyn in favor of Lincoln for the Presidency, and also delivered a speech at the Metropolitan Hotel, in this city, in June, 1861, in favor of strong war measures, a fitting that General Scott was rather a slow campaigner. Mr. Blair was very zealous in raising volunteers in St. Louis, and was the first volunteer of the State of Missouri. He raised the first regiment of Missouri volunteers, and acted as its Colonel, although he did not hold a commission as Colonel of the regiment. A difficulty arose between Colonel Blair and General Fremont, and Colonel Blair was unjustly placed under arrest by that officer, who

was commander of that department. This arbitrary measure of General Fremont's aroused great excitement in St. Louis, where General Blair was universally known and respected, the journals of that city taking part in the quarrel at the time. President Lincoln ordered Colonel Blair to be released from arrest in September, 1861, thereby causing a great feeling of relief to the numerous friends of Colonel Blair in St. Louis. He was again arrested by General Fremont, but finally released after considerable trouble and newspaper discussion by both parties. Colonel Blair rapidly rose as a soldier and became one of the most skillful Generals in the Western armies. On the 22nd of May, 1862, General Blair commanded a Division in Sherman's attack on Vicksburg. The brigades of Ewing, Smith, and Kilby Smith composed his division. Frank Blair had the honor of leading the attack in person, five batteries concentrating their guns on the rebel position. The attack was terrific and was repulsed. As the head of the column passed over the parapet a dense fire of musketry swept all its leading files. The rear of the column attempted to rush on, but were driven back. Here by the bad management of Grant, Blair was not supported, as the supporting division were too far away to give him assistance. At the capture of Vicksburg Blair's division participated, and did the heaviest fighting in Sherman's command. It was at this time that Grant pronounced Frank Blair to be the best volunteer general in the United States Army, an opinion that was fully sustained by his conduct in action and his judgment as a campaigner. In the great march of Sherman to the sea, General Frank P. Blair commanded the Seventeenth Army Corps, the finest corps of the whole army. He crossed the Ogeechee near Barton, and captured the first prisoners. His divisions laid pontoons across the river, and the two wings were thus united before Savannah. His division was the first to march into Savannah. From Savannah the Fourteenth Corps was taken by water to Pocolingo, whence it threatened Charleston, while Slocum, with the Twentieth Corps and Kilpatrick's cavalry, marched on the Augusta to sister Ferry threatening an advance on Savannah at Tallahassee. Blair waded through a swamp three miles wide with water four feet deep, the weather being bitter cold. Here the Seventeenth had another fight and lost a number of killed and wounded, but drove the rebels behind the Edisto, at Branchville. The army then directed its march on Orangeburg. Here the Seventeenth carried the bridge over the South Edisto, by a gallant dash, Blair leading his men as usual up to the battery's mouth, which was covered by a parapet of cotton and earth extending as far as could be seen. Blair threw Smith's division in front, while his other division crossed below and carried the bridge after a hard fight. A half a dozen of men of Blair's corps were the first to enter Columbia. The Seventeenth Corps, however, were not guilty of the burning of this city, as has been charged. At the battle of Bentonville, N. C., on the march up to Richmond, the Seventeenth were engaged heavily. It is not necessary to go further into detail of the glorious services and gallantry of our candidate for the Vice-presidency. His name appears in the history of the great civil war as one of the first soldiers of the North. His life has been a romantic one, and full of strange and eventful occurrences. He bade farewell to his troops, July 24th, 1865, in an affecting address. He was nominated Internal Revenue Collector of Missouri in March, 1866. His nomination was rejected by the Senate. His popularity in the West is very great. His past record insures him success.

Grant, Jackson and Clay, It is certainly not very respectful to the memory of Jackson and Clay to associate their names and memories with the name of Grant, but, by way of contrast, the apparent disrespect will, no doubt, be excused in his letter accepting the Radical nomination for President. Grant says:

"I shall have no policy of my own to interfere against the people."
U. S. GRANT.

Now, if you want to see the great difference between this man and the immortal Jackson, who was a statesman as well as a soldier, read:

"I say again, fellow-citizens, remember the fate of Rome, and vote for no candidate who will not tell you with the frankness of an independent freeman the principle upon which, if elected, he will administer your Government."
"That man deserves to be a slave who does not vote for a man candidate when his liberties are at stake."
ANDREW JACKSON.

Henry Clay was not, like Jackson, a warrior, but he was, like Jackson, a great statesman. Do you suppose Henry Clay would vote for Grant, if he were alive to-day? If so, undecide yourself by reading the following:

"If my suffrage is asked for the highest civil officer of my country, the candidate, however illustrious and successful he may be, must present some other title than laurels however gloriously gathered on the BLOOD-STAINED BATTLE FIELD."
HENRY CLAY

Bennett on Lee. If the Democratic Convention must nominate a soldier—if it must have a name identified with the glories of the war—we will recommend a candidate for its favor. Let it nominate General R. E. Lee. Let it boldly take at once the best of all its soldiers, making no palaver or apology. He is a better soldier than any of those they have thought upon and a greater man. He is one in whom the military genius of this nation finds its fullest developments. Here the inequality will be in favor of the democrat; for this soldier, with a handful of men, whom he moulded into an army baffled our great Northern armies for four years; and when opposed by Grant was only worn down by that stolid strategy of stupidity that accomplishes its objects by mere weight. With one of the men Grant had this soldier fought him magnificently across the territory of his native State, and fought his army down to a stump. There never was such an army or such a campaign, or such a general for illustrating the military genius and possibilities of our people; and this General is the best of all for a democratic candidate. It is certain that with half as many men as Grant had he would have beaten him from the Acid Virginia, and he affords the best promise of any soldier for beating him again."
—N. Y. Herald.

Hon. Thaddeus Stevens writes a letter to Dr. Carpenter, of Lancaster Pa., correcting a report that he had opposed paying due honors to Mr. Bucksnort at his funeral. He cites the fact that he introduced in the House resolutions laudatory of Mr. Buchanan's private character and personal history, and asked the body to adjourn to attend the funeral, but Mr. Van Wyck, of New York, objected, and permitted only a lame resolution appointing a committee to attend the funeral, to be passed. Mr. Stevens says he would be ashamed of such a parody against the dead, and does not wish Mr. Buchanan's friends to believe so mean a thing of him.

What THEY SAY.—Butler says Bligham was a murderer. Bligham says Butler is a coward and a thief. Donnelly says Washburne is a scoundrel and a fool. Washburne says Donnelly is a criminal and a liar. All these leaders of Radicalism are charged for truth and veracity, and in this instant case will question their reliability.

Give us Old Times.

Give us back the days when the husbandman, reared by his cheerful evening fire, or rested on the ground beneath the tree planted by those long since dead, and read not of the bickerings, dissensions, strifes and plunderings, but of a great and glorious Union of states, each one peaceful, industrious and happy.

Give us back the days when the dignified and contented matron sang olden and light-hearted ballads as she made the spinning wheel hum so lively, and had no care and anxiety as to how her husband could pay the taxes, or the children be educated.

Give us back the days when the craftsman merrily whistled at his labor, knowing that whatever he earned would come to him in clinking, yellow gold when the week closed.

Give us again the days when our rulers drew an honest balance sheet with the people who placed them in power, and spent not their time in studying how to plunder and cheat the hard-working tax-payers—when great and good statesmen raised their voices in the halls of the nation and spoke gratefully and truthfully of the bone and sinew of the country.

Give us the days when the rich were taxed as well as the poor—when wealth was made to contribute to the fullness of the people's treasury, and the few could not overreach the many.

Give us back the long, long year that glided by so smoothly and evenly under the rule of Democratic statesmen—when no internal struggle brought brother in contact with brother—when father was not pitted against son—when America was respected for free government, and feared from the bravery of her sons.

They will come back! The people are tired of blood, and turmoil, and high taxes—have tired of the robberies and murders engendered by a fratricidal war and they again wish peace and contentment. They are rising in every town and hamlet, shaking off the public leeches that have drained their blood and money, and are wondering why they slept so long. The present party has reached the length of its rope—it can go no further. For eight long and weary years it has never raised a voice for the people—never cared aught but to fill the pockets of its leaders—never sought to lessen in the least the enormous burdens of the struggling taxpayers. A new sun will dawn in November, and the old time party will again be trusted and honored by the people whom it ever protected and cherished.—Pontiac Jacksonian.

Grant, Jackson and Clay, It is certainly not very respectful to the memory of Jackson and Clay to associate their names and memories with the name of Grant, but, by way of contrast, the apparent disrespect will, no doubt, be excused in his letter accepting the Radical nomination for President. Grant says:

"I shall have no policy of my own to interfere against the people."
U. S. GRANT.

Now, if you want to see the great difference between this man and the immortal Jackson, who was a statesman as well as a soldier, read:

"I say again, fellow-citizens, remember the fate of Rome, and vote for no candidate who will not tell you with the frankness of an independent freeman the principle upon which, if elected, he will administer your Government."
"That man deserves to be a slave who does not vote for a man candidate when his liberties are at stake."
ANDREW JACKSON.

Henry Clay was not, like Jackson, a warrior, but he was, like Jackson, a great statesman. Do you suppose Henry Clay would vote for Grant, if he were alive to-day? If so, undecide yourself by reading the following:

"If my suffrage is asked for the highest civil officer of my country, the candidate, however illustrious and successful he may be, must present some other title than laurels however gloriously gathered on the BLOOD-STAINED BATTLE FIELD."
HENRY CLAY

Bennett on Lee. If the Democratic Convention must nominate a soldier—if it must have a name identified with the glories of the war—we will recommend a candidate for its favor. Let it nominate General R. E. Lee. Let it boldly take at once the best of all its soldiers, making no palaver or apology. He is a better soldier than any of those they have thought upon and a greater man. He is one in whom the military genius of this nation finds its fullest developments. Here the inequality will be in favor of the democrat; for this soldier, with a handful of men, whom he moulded into an army baffled our great Northern armies for four years; and when opposed by Grant was only worn down by that stolid strategy of stupidity that accomplishes its objects by mere weight. With one of the men Grant had this soldier fought him magnificently across the territory of his native State, and fought his army down to a stump. There never was such an army or such a campaign, or such a general for illustrating the military genius and possibilities of our people; and this General is the best of all for a democratic candidate. It is certain that with half as many men as Grant had he would have beaten him from the Acid Virginia, and he affords the best promise of any soldier for beating him again."
—N. Y. Herald.

Hon. Thaddeus Stevens writes a letter to Dr. Carpenter, of Lancaster Pa., correcting a report that he had opposed paying due honors to Mr. Bucksnort at his funeral. He cites the fact that he introduced in the House resolutions laudatory of Mr. Buchanan's private character and personal history, and asked the body to adjourn to attend the funeral, but Mr. Van Wyck, of New York, objected, and permitted only a lame resolution appointing a committee to attend the funeral, to be passed. Mr. Stevens says he would be ashamed of such a parody against the dead, and does not wish Mr. Buchanan's friends to believe so mean a thing of him.

What THEY SAY.—Butler says Bligham was a murderer. Bligham says Butler is a coward and a thief. Donnelly says Washburne is a scoundrel and a fool. Washburne says Donnelly is a criminal and a liar. All these leaders of Radicalism are charged for truth and veracity, and in this instant case will question their reliability.

Reconstruction.

For a long time past it has been a favorite charge of the Democratic press and orators that the Republicans oppose the reconstruction of the Union.

Nothing of the kind. The Democrats charge the mongrels with being hostile to the restoration of the Union. No Democrat has ever desired the "reconstruction" of the Union. The Union was good enough as it has existed for three quarters of a century. When the war ceased the Union was consummated once more. The repeal of the secession ordinances left the Southern States just where they were before the war, in the Union, and the whole legislation of the rump congress for three years has been directed to keep these states out of the Union, until "reconstructed" to suit the despotic tendencies of Mongrelism. It was simply restoration that was needed, and not "reconstruction." But, say these second Danieles, the constitutions of the Southern States were not republican, and it was the duty of congress to see that they were made so! What follows these fellows are, to be more than three-quarters of a century in discovering that certain states had not republican constitutions! The whole action of the rump towards the south shows conclusively that this rump congress is a liar, cheat, and sneak thief. Will we let the democracy oppose their infamous "reconstruction" policy, which contains innumerable violations of the constitution, and is a model of despotic duplicity. The States admitted under "reconstruction" are bogus. Their constitutions are unknown to the Union. They are essentially inherent carpet-bag states, while draped in their "reconstruction" state prison garments. The southern States lie prostrate under military despotism. There is nothing republican about them. They are out of the Union, kept out by mongrel bayonets, and cannot form a legitimate portion of the Union until restored to their normal place in a white republic. The negro had no Revolution, threw off no monarchy, established no republic. All this was done by white men—by the men now proscribed and disfranchised by our modern monarchists. To "reconstruct" negro states into the Union is to destroy the republic of our fathers and trample upon the liberty of their descendants. A precious set of hounds are these "reconstructionists." Under their auspices, congress has become a kennel, in which graceless pups bark and howl at chained white men. Fathers gave up their sons, and women their husbands, not for negro "reconstruction" but for the Union. They have been cheated most rascally, and the same miserable gang of liars and cheats now have the impudence to ask for four years more of time to enchain northern white men also. Every white man casting a vote for mongrels ought to be "reconstructed" into a negro. Nature made a mistake in his color.—Pontiac (Mich) Jacksonian.

What are We Contending for. We solemnly affirm that there is nothing on earth more intimately connected with the private and public interests of every individual in this country, than a full and just appreciation of the character and vital results of the approaching contest. This is essential, not simply as of old, to the formation of an intelligent opinion and the proper discharge of the public functions of the citizen, but it is necessary to the preservation of our liberty—our persons and our property, and to the safety of the Government which was established to secure these blessings. Believe us, this is not overdrawn. It is a truth which cannot be too strongly told, nor too vigorously acted upon.

It is not a political, but a governmental contest. It is not a conflict, the issue of which is to decide who will administer the Government, but it is a conflict to decide what sort of a Government is to be administered. It is not a contest simply as to who shall be President; it is not a contest between men, nor even between opinions and measures; but it is a conflict of ideas irreconcilably opposed to each other: it is a dire collision of two systems of government that can never move in the same sphere.

It is not one of those light hearted campaigns which look only to the spoils; here the black flag is lifted, and if Radicalism goes down, it falls like Lucifer, never to rise again.

Should Democracy fall, then farewell to a free country. These are facts which, upon a moment's reflection, must be patent to the plainest mind. And can it be possible that, feeling and appreciating these startling facts, one man in ten will hesitate as to his action?

We beg our readers to take these serious facts to heart, and to scatter them broadcast around them. We repeat, the coming campaign is not a contest between Grant and our nominee, but it is a war to the knife between constitutional government and arbitrary will; between the intelligent rule of the people governing themselves, and the grinding heel of a relentless despot, or the anarchy of a mob; between the chaplet of a freeman and the shackles of a slave. Judge you between the two, and go forth to plead and convince while the day is early and victory before us.

Ask your neighbors whether the vile wretches who now dishonor the Government shall consummate our eternal ruin, or whether the honesty and patriotism, now driven to obscurity, shall come forth to save us!—Hanover Citizen.

THE NEGRO WORMY OF THE RADICALS.—The negro wormy begins in warry the Radicals, as much as he worries the Democrats, for while the previous news from Southern negro Georgia set them to thinking, the later news from Mississippi has given them fright. Is Sambo, "a man and a brother," to forget the carpet-bagger? Is Cuffee to ignore the Yankee? Can a negro be a Democrat? Certainly,—for the Democrats alone has been the negro's best friend for many years past, and upon the Democracy alone must be now rely to be saved from yankee cupidity and from carpet-bagger rapacity. Sambo begins to see there is no male and no 40 acres in electing to Congress a man from Maine or Wisconsin, and hence Sambo Cuffee and Sambo are beginning to turn to the Democracy, who have not cheated nor lied, but who will take good care of negroes if negroes will not be fooled or duped by obolous overseers from abroad.

THE RADICAL PLATFORM.—Gold for the bondholder—greenbacks for the farmer, the mechanic and the laborer. Suspension of the liberty of the press and freedom of speech. Suppression of *habes corpus* and enhancement of the military over the civil power. Reduction of ten States to military dependencies under the rule of heartless and brutal satraps like Siskies, Sheridan, Canby and Meade. Removal of white officials and the substitution of niggers therefor. The overthrow of constitutional freedom and the establishment of a military despotism. The political elevation of the brutal and half savage negro over the white man. The inauguration of a war of races and the destruction of the most fertile portion of the Republic. The oppression of the working classes and the final overthrow of white citizenship by the rule of the negroes.

It is now currently reported, says an exchange, that before surrendering the War Office Stanton destroyed many very many papers on file there relating to secret interior party matters, particularly of detective military and confidential reports, upon which his high-handed action was in many instances based. It will never be known how much the independence of his appointees has been oppressed. In all the branches of the office—the Freedmen's Bureau, the Detective and the Army—he has had hosts of associates in secret correspondence with him, the matter of which has no doubt been destroyed. In the Army the papers and best have had to be extremely cautious of eyes among even intimate associates. The army has been degraded by his minions. A better time dawned.—Covint's Bluffs Bugle.

Every Pennsylvanian knows that Gov. Seymour's troops were so "promptly sent" that they were here before Gov. Curtin had made up his mind what to do about calling out the militia. If it had not been for Seymour's promptness, the capital of Pennsylvania might have been laid in ashes. In connection with this subject, we also find the following in the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser of June 22, 1868, a Radical journal during the war and now, and at present engaged in calling Gov. Seymour a "copperhead," &c.

"We should be guilty of a great injustice were we not to give due credit to the Governors of this State and N. J. for their zeal and promptitude in this crisis. When danger was impending, neither of them had conditions to propose or terms to exact. The only question was, who could first and most effectually discharge his duty as the ruler of a free and loyal commonwealth. They made use of no 'if' and/or 'but.' In the case of New Jersey, indeed, Gov. Parker called upon the people to come to the rescue with unprecedented zeal! The conduct of these officials will be more cordially appreciated, inasmuch as they do not belong to the political party to which the national reins of authority have been committed. It is very possible that by referring to the past, we might find that such men as Governors Seymour and Parker have taken positions not to our liking; but as the deeds of to-day are of more importance than the sayings of yesterday, we prefer to make conduct rather than professions the test in judging the merits or demerits of our public servants."

We think this will spike the guns of at least one Radical battery. The Commercial Advertiser had better furnish up its spectacles and look over some of its old files before it again pronounces Seymour a "copperhead."

The People are Moving. From one extreme of the land to the other the people long for the arrival of the day when they can record their verdict against the demagogues, who are profaning the temple of their liberties, and bringing reproach upon a great and magnanimous nation, by the daily commission of petty acts for the gratification of partisan prejudice. A people to become truly great and prosperous must cultivate a liberal sentiment, and labor to harmonize conflicting elements, instead of creating discord by constantly fostering a spirit of hate.

For four years our once happy and prosperous land was drenched in fraternal blood, and nearly every *breidde* band was made sad by the loss of some member who was sacrificed to gratify the mad ambition of designing demagogues. The war in the field ended three years ago by the surrender of the "rebels" in arms, who acknowledged defeat, and promised upon their honor to obey the laws hereafter. A magnanimous conqueror would at once have taken them by the hand and aided in binding up their wounds. But no! Unfortunately a party is in power whose controlling sentiment is *Ade*. It is represented by men of narrow minds, destitute of the broad and liberal views of genuine statesmen, and, consequently, intolerant and proscriptive.

These demagogues—for they are nothing else—live upon the excitement and clangor of battle afar off, and fatten up on the carcasses of the slain. They were thrown into a paroxysm of rage when the war ended, and have labored with untiring energy to keep up the conflict. It is against this party that the people are now moving, being satisfied that if peace and harmony are ever to be restored to the country, new men of enlarged minds and liberal, patriotic views must be placed at the head of the government.—Williamsport Standard.

THE RADICAL PLATFORM.—Gold for the bondholder—greenbacks for the farmer, the mechanic and the laborer. Suspension of the liberty of the press and freedom of speech. Suppression of *habes corpus* and enhancement of the military over the civil power. Reduction of ten States to military dependencies under the rule of heartless and brutal satraps like Siskies, Sheridan, Canby and Meade. Removal of white officials and the substitution of niggers therefor. The overthrow of constitutional freedom and the establishment of a military despotism. The political elevation of the brutal and half savage negro over the white man. The inauguration of a war of races and the destruction of the most fertile portion of the Republic. The oppression of the working classes and the final overthrow of white citizenship by the rule of the negroes.

It is now currently reported, says an exchange, that before surrendering the War Office Stanton destroyed many very many papers on file there relating to secret interior party matters, particularly of detective military and confidential reports, upon which his high-handed action was in many instances based. It will never be known how much the independence of his appointees has been oppressed. In all the branches of the office—the Freedmen's Bureau, the Detective and the Army—he has had hosts of associates in secret correspondence with him, the matter of which has no doubt been destroyed. In the Army the papers and best have had to be extremely cautious of eyes among even intimate associates. The army has been degraded by his minions. A better time dawned.—Covint's Bluffs Bugle.

Every Pennsylvanian knows that Gov. Seymour's troops were so "promptly sent" that they were here before Gov. Curtin had made up his mind what to do about calling out the militia. If it had not been for Seymour's promptness, the capital of Pennsylvania might have been laid in ashes. In connection with this subject, we also find the following in the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser of June 22, 1868, a Radical journal during the war and now, and at present engaged in calling Gov. Seymour a "copperhead," &c.

"We should be guilty of a great injustice were we not to give due credit to the Governors of this State and N. J. for their zeal and promptitude in this crisis. When danger was impending, neither of them had conditions to propose or terms to exact. The only question was, who could first and most effectually discharge his duty as the ruler of a free and loyal commonwealth. They made use of no 'if' and/or 'but.' In the case of New Jersey, indeed, Gov. Parker called upon the people to come to the rescue with unprecedented zeal! The conduct of these officials will be more cordially appreciated, inasmuch as they do not belong to the political party to which the national reins of authority have been committed. It is very possible that by referring to the past, we might find that such men as Governors Seymour and Parker have taken positions not to our liking; but as the deeds of to-day are of more importance than the sayings of yesterday, we prefer to make conduct rather than professions the test in judging the merits or demerits of our public servants."