

Per annum in advance \$1 00
Six months 50
Three months 25
A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

1 insertion 3 do.
2 do. 5 do.
3 do. 7 do.
Four lines or less 25
One square (12 lines) 50
Two squares 1 00
Three squares 1 50
Four squares 2 00
Half a column 25
One column 50
Professional and Business Cards not exceeding four lines one year 25
Administrators' and Executors' Notices 50
Advertisements not marked with the number of insertions desired will be continued till forbid and charged according to these terms.

The Globe

WILLIAM LEWIS,

—PERSEVERE—

Editor and Proprietor.

VOL. XII.

HUNTINGDON, PA., JULY 30, 1856.

NO. 6.

Buchanan and Breckinridge.

Why should not the good Men of the Country Vote for Buchanan?

This is a question which has been often asked since the Cincinnati Convention adjourned. It is a question of vast importance to the country, and we will devote a little space to its consideration.

In a Government organized as that under which we live, it is the imperative duty to every man authorized to use the elective franchise, to weigh well the issues involved in a political contest, and to cast his vote where it will be most likely to promote the greatest good of the whole country.

Judging, then, the candid as prominent before the American people for the office of President by this standard, what conclusions are naturally presented? These candidates are FILLMORE, FREMONT and BUCHANAN.

Of the first we have not much to say, because we do not think he has any prospect of an election. The second is the one who is more directly arrayed against the candidate of the Democracy in the Northern States.

It maintains the right of any faction in a State or Territory to set up, by voluntary movement at any time, a Constitution and machinery of Government, in opposition to and subversion of the Constitution and laws already in force, and the officers already in power—a claim utterly at war with every principle of law and order, and pregnant with anarchy and bloodshed.

It violates the Constitution of the United States and the legal and moral obligations of every citizen, by giving aid and comfort to the treason and outrage and their perpetrators in Kansas.

Such is its platform; full of Abolitionism and inevitably leading to a dissolution of the Union and civil war.

Who were the men who made, and who are they who now support, this ticket?

JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS was at the Convention, a leading spirit in all its acts, recking as he is with the stretch of twenty years of Abolitionism.

"I look forward to the day when there shall be a servile insurrection in the South; when the black man, armed with British bayonets, and led on by British officers, shall assault his freedom, and wage a war of extermination against his master, when the torch of the incendiary shall light up the towns and cities of the South, and blot out the last vestige of slavery."

And though I may not mock at their calamity, nor laugh when their fear cometh, yet I will hail it as the dawn of a political millennium."

JOHN P. HALE, was there, the Abolition candidate for President against Scott and Pierce in 1852. What is his record? On the 7th of February, 1850, he presented, insisted upon, and along with Chase and Seward alone, voted to receive, refer and consider a petition demanding of Congress "an immediate dissolution of the Union," because a Union with slaveholders is violative of divine law and human rights.

Cass, Corwin, Benton, Clay and Webster, with forty-six other Senators, voted against it. On the 23d of March, 1848, he presented a batch of eight petitions at once, demanding the same thing.

SALMON P. CHASE, was there by letter; and originally as a candidate, afterwards a zealous supporter of Fremont for nomination. For his record let the columns of the Dayton Journal last fall answer. He is an original old line Abolitionist, in favor of negro suffrage and negro equality; opposed to the constitutional provisions for the rendition of fugitive slaves; in favor of excluding all slaveholders from office; believes that slavery in the States would not continue after a year the accession of the anti-slavery party to power, and thinks that it ought to be abolished by the constitutional power of Congress and the State Legislatures."

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, was there, first as a candidate, and afterwards as one of Fremont's warmest supporters. Indeed it is well known that to Chase, Seward and Greeley, Fremont is mainly indebted for his nomination—they defeated McLean. "When Henry Wilson mentioned the name of Seward," says the correspondence of the Pittsburg Gazette, "the whole convention rose to its feet, gave the New York Senator three times three, and would not have been warmer in their applause if he had just been nominated for President by acclamation." And now hear him on sectional parties:

"Slavery is not and never can be perpetual. It will be overthrown either peacefully and lawfully under this constitution, or it will work the subversion of the constitution, together with its own overthrow. The House of Representatives is already yours, as it always must be when you choose to have it.—The Senate of the United States, is equally within your power if you only will persistently all the wrong that has been done, not another slave State can now come into the Union. Make only one year's constant, decisive effort and you can determine what States shall be admitted."

"It is written in the constitution of the United States that five slaves shall count equal to three freemen, as a basis of representation; and it is written, also, in violation of the divine law, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave. You blush not at these things, because they are as familiar as household words. * * * There is a higher law than the constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain. * * * It (slavery) can be and must be abolished, and you and I must do it. * * * Correct your own error, that slavery has any constitutional guarantees which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished. * * * You

will soon bring the parties of the country into an effective aggression upon slavery."

BENJAMIN F. WADE, is a supporter of Fremont and a leader of the party. Hear him:

"He thought there was but one issue before the people, and that was the question of American slavery. He said the Whig party is not only dead, but stinks. It shows signs occasionally of convulsive spasms, as is sometimes exhibited in the dead snake's tail after the head and body have been buried."

"There is really no union now between the North and the South, and he believed no two nations upon the earth entertained feelings of more bitter rancor towards each other than these two sections of the republic. The only salvation of the Union, therefore, was to be found in divesting it entirely from all taint of slavery."

NATHANIEL P. BANKS, the "Union Slider," Speaker of the Abolition House of Representatives, is a leader of the Fremont party, and was withdrawn from the candidacy of the Know Nothing seceder's convention to make way for Fremont. Hear him:

"Although I am not one of that class of men who cry for the perpetuation of the Union, though I am willing in a certain state of circumstances, to let it slide, I have no fear of its perpetuation. But let me say to the chief object of the people of this country be to maintain and propagate chattel property in man, in other words, human slavery, this Union cannot and ought not to stand."

HORACE MANN, is a supporter of Fremont. Hear him:

"In conclusion I have only to add that such is my solemn and abiding conviction of the character of slavery, that, under a full sense of my responsibility to my country and my God, I deliberately say, better disunion—better a civil or a servile war—better anything that God in his providence shall send—than an extension of the bonds of slavery."

HENRY WILSON, is a leader of the Fremont party, and was present and spoke at the Philadelphia convention, where he was received with unbounded applause. Hear him:

"Let us remember that more than three millions of bondmen, groaning under nameless woes, demand that we shall remove each other, and that we labor for their deliverance. * * *

"I tell you here to night that the agitation of this question of human slavery will continue while the foot of a slave presses the soil of the American republic."

CHARLES SUMNER, the "illustrious sorehead" of Massachusetts, is a leader and a martyr of the Fremont party. His blood is to be the seed of the party. Hear him:

"The good citizen as he reads the requirements of this act—the fugitive slave—is filled with horror. * * * Here the path of duty is clear. I AM BOUND TO DISOBEY THIS ACT. * * * * *"

"Sir, I will not dishonor this home of the Pilgrims and of the Revolution by admitting—nay, I cannot believe—that this bill will be executed here."

RUFUS P. SPAULDING, was a member and leader of the convention. Hear him:

"In the case of the alternative being presented of the continuance of slavery or a dissolution of the Union, I am for dissolution, and I care not how quick it comes."

"HON. ERASTUS HOPKINS," of Massachusetts was a member of the convention. Hear him:

"If peaceful means fail us, and we are driven to the last extremity where ballots are useless, then we'll make bullets effective.—[Tremendous applause.]"

GEN. JAMES WATSON WEBB, was a leader in the convention. Hear him in a speech on the floor:

"On the action of this convention depends the fate of the country; if the 'Republicans,' fall at the ballot-box, we will be forced to drive back the slaveocracy with fire and sword." [Cheers.]

Just in the same spirit and no more boldly speaks William Lloyd Garrison. Hear him:

"This Union is a lie. The American Union is an imposture, a covenant with death and an agreement with hell. * * * I am for its overthrow! Up with the flag of disunion, that we may have a free and glorious republic of our own, and when the hour shall come the hour will have arrived that shall witness the overthrow of slavery."

Hear also H. M. Addison of the American Advertiser, in the same strain:

"I detest slavery, and say unhesitatingly that I am in favor of its abolition by some means, if it send all the party organizations in the Union, and the 'Union Party' to the Devil. If it can only exist by holding millions of human beings in the most abject and cruel system of slavery that ever cursed the earth, it is a great pity it was ever formed, and the sooner it is dissolved the better."

ANSON BURLINGAME, of Massachusetts, member of Congress, is also a leader of the Fremont party. Hear him:

"The times demand and we must have an anti-slavery constitution and an anti-slavery Bible, and an anti-slavery God."

The Abolition Disunion Ticket.

Such is the caption under which we publish the ticket nominated at Philadelphia—Fremont and Dayton. We did it deliberately; and in spite of the writhings of our adversaries, we mean that it shall stand till the close of the campaign. It is a true and just designation of the ticket, and we proceed now to prove it from the record.

First, the platform upon which it stands is Abolition and Disunion.

It denies the great principle of popular sovereignty, lying as it does at the foundation of our institutions—their first principle—the very breath they draw.

It demands the intervention of Congress in the domestic institutions and concerns of the people of the Territories.

It insists that Congress has and shall exercise "sovereign power" over these Territories in all cases whatsoever, just as the British crown and Parliament set up a like claim over the Colonies in 1765 and 1776.

It asserts the right and duty of Congress, by virtue of this sovereign power, to intermeddle with the marriage relations in the Territories. Great Britain never went half so far.

It declares that no more slave States shall be admitted into the Union.

It maintains the right of any faction in a State or Territory to set up, by voluntary movement at any time, a Constitution and machinery of Government, in opposition to and subversion of the Constitution and laws already in force, and the officers already in power—a claim utterly at war with every principle of law and order, and pregnant with anarchy and bloodshed.

It violates the Constitution of the United States and the legal and moral obligations of every citizen, by giving aid and comfort to the treason and outrage and their perpetrators in Kansas.

Such is its platform; full of Abolitionism and inevitably leading to a dissolution of the Union and civil war.

Who were the men who made, and who are they who now support, this ticket?

JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS was at the Convention, a leading spirit in all its acts, recking as he is with the stretch of twenty years of Abolitionism.

"I look forward to the day when there shall be a servile insurrection in the South; when the black man, armed with British bayonets, and led on by British officers, shall assault his freedom, and wage a war of extermination against his master, when the torch of the incendiary shall light up the towns and cities of the South, and blot out the last vestige of slavery."

And though I may not mock at their calamity, nor laugh when their fear cometh, yet I will hail it as the dawn of a political millennium."

JOHN P. HALE, was there, the Abolition candidate for President against Scott and Pierce in 1852. What is his record? On the 7th of February, 1850, he presented, insisted upon, and along with Chase and Seward alone, voted to receive, refer and consider a petition demanding of Congress "an immediate dissolution of the Union," because a Union with slaveholders is violative of divine law and human rights.

Cass, Corwin, Benton, Clay and Webster, with forty-six other Senators, voted against it. On the 23d of March, 1848, he presented a batch of eight petitions at once, demanding the same thing.

SALMON P. CHASE, was there by letter; and originally as a candidate, afterwards a zealous supporter of Fremont for nomination. For his record let the columns of the Dayton Journal last fall answer. He is an original old line Abolitionist, in favor of negro suffrage and negro equality; opposed to the constitutional provisions for the rendition of fugitive slaves; in favor of excluding all slaveholders from office; believes that slavery in the States would not continue after a year the accession of the anti-slavery party to power, and thinks that it ought to be abolished by the constitutional power of Congress and the State Legislatures."

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, was there, first as a candidate, and afterwards as one of Fremont's warmest supporters. Indeed it is well known that to Chase, Seward and Greeley, Fremont is mainly indebted for his nomination—they defeated McLean. "When Henry Wilson mentioned the name of Seward," says the correspondence of the Pittsburg Gazette, "the whole convention rose to its feet, gave the New York Senator three times three, and would not have been warmer in their applause if he had just been nominated for President by acclamation." And now hear him on sectional parties:

"Slavery is not and never can be perpetual. It will be overthrown either peacefully and lawfully under this constitution, or it will work the subversion of the constitution, together with its own overthrow. The House of Representatives is already yours, as it always must be when you choose to have it.—The Senate of the United States, is equally within your power if you only will persistently all the wrong that has been done, not another slave State can now come into the Union. Make only one year's constant, decisive effort and you can determine what States shall be admitted."

"It is written in the constitution of the United States that five slaves shall count equal to three freemen, as a basis of representation; and it is written, also, in violation of the divine law, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave. You blush not at these things, because they are as familiar as household words. * * * There is a higher law than the constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain. * * * It (slavery) can be and must be abolished, and you and I must do it. * * * Correct your own error, that slavery has any constitutional guarantees which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished. * * * You

Know-Nothing Manifesto against Col. Fremont.

From the New York Express, (N. Y. paper.) COL. FREMONT'S MARRIAGE—HE MUST HAVE BEEN A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

There is a point now made one of great importance in the Presidential election—by the denial on the part of Col. Fremont's friends, and by authority, as we understand it, from him—that he is, or ever has been, a Roman Catholic. The point is one of this importance, in a political view, first, because many Americans who support him in New England, and especially support him upon the ground that he is anti-Roman Catholic—and second, because, if he ever has been a Roman Catholic, he denies the fact, and has ostensibly changed his religion. The Rev. Mr. Beecher says, in his Independence, apparently by authority:

"Until he was fourteen, Col. Fremont was educated in the hope and expectation that he would become an Episcopal minister. At sixteen, he was confirmed in the Episcopal church, and has, ever since, when within reach of the church, been an attendant and communicant. And since his temporary sojourn in New York, he has been an attendant at Dr. Anthon's church until recently; and now he worships at Grace church. Mrs. Fremont was reared strictly in the Presbyterian Church, and united with the Episcopal Church upon her marriage with Col. Fremont. Their children have been baptized in the Episcopal church," &c., &c.

These are strong statements—there is prodigious wrong somewhere, and we propose to find out where.

There are two periods in a man's life when his religion, or the feeling for the religion he was educated in, first discloses itself—the first, when he marries for life; the second, when on his deathbed, it is admitted—and nowhere denied—that when Lieutenant Fremont married Miss Benton, Father Van Horsburgh, of Washington, a Roman Catholic priest, of character and high standing in his church there, married them. Nobody compelled Mr. Fremont thus to go to a Roman Catholic priest. He went there of his own free will and choice. True, it is said, that in consequence of the social influence of Senator Benton, in Washington, no other than a Roman Catholic priest could marry the runaway pair; but it is not proven, and it is not true, or if true, it does not vitiate the fact that a Roman Catholic priest cannot under the ordinances and councils of his church, unite parties in "the holy sacrament of matrimony," unless one of them, at least, professes to be of that church.

To understand the laws and the councils, and the customs of the Catholic church, we must take our readers a little way into the theology of that church.

Marriage is with the Roman Catholic a sacrament. The Protestants have but two Sacraments; the Roman Catholics have seven, and among them is matrimony. Hence, a Roman Catholic priest would no more administer the sacrament of matrimony to a party not of his church, than he would the Lord's Supper, or confirmation, or baptism, for matrimony is, in the Romish church, just as much a sacrament as the Lord's Supper. The highest written authority of the Romish church is the famous Council of Trent, and there it is decreed:

3d. Whosoever shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord or that they are more or less in number than seven; that is to say, baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, extreme unction, orders and matrimony; or that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be accursed.

Marriage among most Protestants—not all, however, is but a civil contract, but in the Romish Church, it is an obligation, to be taken only before priests—it is a sacrament.—The Romish Church is rigid, and stricter in its rule of marriage than any other religious denomination. Marriage in that church is an indissoluble tie, and never to be loosed even by the civil law of divorce. The marriage of heretics by a priest is a crime, except under some special Papal dispensation—just as much of a crime as it would be to administer the Lord's Supper to heretics.—When Colonel Fremont, therefore, voluntarily went before Father Van Horsburgh, and asked him, as a Priest of Rome, to marry him to a Protestant woman, he must have been, or pretended to be, a Roman Catholic, and he must have promised to bring up the offspring, if any, in the Romish Church. That promise Col. Fremont fulfilled in an adopted daughter, now a grown woman, for he educated her in the convent on the heights of Georgetown, D. C., and he cannot deny, or authorize any one to deny the fact. The sacramental obligations of the marriage have been fulfilled till a late period; and if they are not fulfilled now, it is because of late, a change has taken place in Col. Fremont's profession of religion—it may be for the purpose of obtaining the Protestant vote for President.

The Roman Catholic celebration of the matrimony sacrament (Ritus celebrandi matrimonii Sacramentum) is one of the august ceremonies of that church. The priest puts on his cassock and white stole, and he brings out his missal, and holy water to sprinkle the marrying parties, and he then unites the parties according to the rites of the Holy Mother Church, and the priest sprinkles the marriage ring with holy water, in the sign of the cross.

THE PREPARATION FOR MARRIAGE. From the Roman Catholic Catechism of the Christian Religion, chap. 9, sec. 5, page 378—Donahoe's edition:

Question. How should we prepare ourselves for marriage?

Answer. By prayer, good works, and the reception of the sacrament.

Other authorities say by "confession," and through the confessional.

FROM WHOM CAN TAKE THE SACRAMENT. From the Catechism of the Christian Religion, Patric. Donahoe. Boston edition, 1852. Page 375.

Question. Who are the persons with whom the Church forbids us to contract marriage?

Answer. Besides unbaptized infidels whose marriage with Catholics is null, the church forbids marriage with heretics and excommunicated persons, so long as the excommunication is in force. The church gives her sacraments only to those within her bosom.

CHILDREN MUST BE PLEDGED TO ROMANISM. From the Golden Manual—Being a Guide to Catholic Devotion. D. & J. Sadler, N. Y., with the approbation of the Right Rev. Archbishop Hughes. Page 582:—

A Catholic, in marrying a person of another religion, cannot be allowed to enter into any agreement that any of the children shall be brought up to any but the Catholic faith. THE RITUAL FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.

From the Golden Manual, published in London, with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster;" and in New York (Sadler & Co.,) with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, N. Y.:

The priest, vested in a surplice and white stole, accompanied by at least one clerk, to carry the book and a vessel of holy water, and by two or three witnesses, asks the man and the woman, separately, as follows, in the vulgar tongue, concerning their consent.

And first he asks the bridegroom, who must stand at the right hand of the woman:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful wife, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the priest asks the bride:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful husband, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the priest asks the bride:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful husband, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the woman is given away by her father or friend; and if she has never been married before, she has her hand uncovered; but if she is a widow, she has it covered. The man receives her to keep in God's faith and his own; and holding her by the right hand in his own right hand, pledges his truth, saying after the priest as follows:—

I, N., take thee, N. to my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part, if holy church will it permit, and thereto I plight thee my truth.

Then they loose their hands; and joining them again, the woman says, after the priest:—

I, N., take thee, N., to my wedded husband, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, &c., if holy church will it permit, and thereto I plight thee my truth.

Their truth being thus pledged to each other on both sides, and their right hands joined, the priest says:—

Ego conjungo vos in matrimonium, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

Then he sprinkles them with holy water. This done, the bridegroom places upon the book gold and silver, (which are presently to be delivered into the hands of the bride,) and also a ring which the priest blesses.

[The nuptial benediction, which here follows, is omitted in mixed marriage. Vide "Rituale Romanum."]

Then the priest sprinkles the ring with holy water, in the form of a cross; and the bridegroom having received the ring from the hand of the priest, gives gold and silver to the bride, and says:—

"With this ring I thee wed," &c.

Then the bridegroom places the ring on the thumb of the left hand of the bride, saying:—"In the name of the Father;" then on the second finger, saying, "and of the Son;" then on the third finger, saying, "and of the Holy Ghost;" lastly, on the fourth finger, saying, "Amen," and there he leaves the ring.

The service is continued in regular marriages with benediction, prayers and sometimes the singing of mass.

From these documents and facts, thus authenticated, the following conclusions follow:—

1st. That the Council of Trent makes matrimony a sacrament in the Romish Church.

2d. That a Romish priest cannot administer a sacrament but to a Roman Catholic.

3d. That Col. Fremont, therefore, at the time of his marriage, must, at least, have professed to be a Roman Catholic; and was, therefore, sprinkled with holy water, and accepted other forms and rites of the Romish Catholic Church, as such a Catholic.

4th. That then he must have taken all the obligations of that sacrament, with the pledge to educate his offspring in Romanism.

5th. That in educating an adopted daughter in the convent at Georgetown he carried out the obligations of the sacrament.

But, says the "Independent?"

"It is said that a daughter has been sent to a Catholic institution for education. So far from it, she has never been sent away from home at all, but has been educated by her own mother."

This is a quibble. The statement was that his adopted daughter was educated at the convent at the heights of Georgetown, and we dare a denial from Col. Fremont.

If Col. Fremont, in view of the Presidency, has recently changed his religion, and only with a view to that office, so much the worse, but the fact is undeniable, overwhelming and crushing, that he was married by the Romish priest, Father Van Horsburgh, Mr. Fremont must have professed the Romish Catholic religion, and hence accepted all the rules and rituals of the Romish Catholic Church! He may have broken the sacrament of his marriage within a few weeks past; and he may have become a convert to Protestantism in good faith, in order to win the American vote, but there is record of Romanism, in the most solemn act of his life, and it cannot be got over or got under; it cannot be tied down or covered up, and we, as journalists, but do our duty in publishing truths, no matter how much abuse may follow.

Now, is it not too preposterous for human credence hereafter, that such a Union should be diverted from its great objects to a senseless wrangle about the African race? that such a Union should be perverted to a violation of a solemn compact between States of a kindred origin, to result in its destruction?

Will posterity believe the sadly true—but almost incredible—story?

Make it untrue—make it incredible!—let the true story be, that you crushed the vipers of abolition and faction—that you restored peace—put down agitation—and the two sections, once more in harmony, united with a common energy to realize that brilliant destiny which will fill history with our glory, and posterity with wonder and admiration!

"A wag entered a turner's shop and asked him—

"Can you turn out a joke?"

The turner did so by turning the joker out of the shop.

"Pride costs us more than hunger, thirst, and cold.

"If three feet make a yard, how many will it take to make a flower garden?"

From the Washington Sentinel Will Posterity Believe It?

When we look at the position of this great confederacy—at its capacity for the attainment of internal good, and of external glory—at its constitution, the result of conflicting interests, controlled by the sway of a noble wisdom—when we see it spreading its power from ocean to ocean, and rising to the majesty of guiding the policy of the American continent, and reaching forth by the resistless power of its wondrous destiny to a controlling influence in the commerce and policy of the world—when we know that American interests demand the energy and wisdom of an enlarged statesmanship—and then turning from this broad view of our true policy and our responsibilities to our action, what is it that presses upon our astonished vision?

With interests of such stupendous magnitude, what has the government accomplished in seven months? It has elected an agitator of internal strife to preside over its deliberations; (?) it is keeping the entire country in commotion by instigating lawlessness against the constitution, and has consummated a capture upon one of its members for an assault and battery! Oh! most lame and impotent conclusion!

When in the light of coming events, so full of moment, our history shall be written, will posterity believe that our government has turned aside from its highest duty to waste its energy upon the schemes of faction and the plots of traitors? Oh! shame, where is thy blench?

And, as if to turn the drama of American destiny into a low farce, a great party announces itself as leader in its development, by proposing as its highest aim a division of the country into ruling States and seced States, thus dividing instead of concentrating its power to achieve the noblest purposes of its existence; and to give a greater dignity and a more imposing grandeur to the whole scheme, the most important part in the farce is assigned to an unknown actor, whose past appearance treads close upon the heels of his first, and whose chief qualifications are his entire unfitness and his open treachery against the interest and honor of the State which gave him birth.

Queen Deas call posterity, &c!

Do we need experience in the office of President? We offer to the people a man of the latest experience in the country. Will they set him aside for one who has had the most limited?

While Mr. Buchanan has had forty years, Fremont has had forty days experience in political life!

Do we need intellectual ability? We present in the person of our candidate that native sense, to which cultivation and profound study have added stores of knowledge, and the most reliable wisdom and sagacity. As a statesman of ability, he has no superior, perhaps no equal, in the country.

In what way has Fremont manifested this great desideratum? Where are the evidences or the fruits of his ability? Would any man in the country have picked him out as one in ten thousand, who would be barely fit to fill the Presidential chair?

In experience, in ability, in integrity, in tried statesmanship, Mr. Buchanan cannot, without disparagement, be compared with Col. Fremont. Comparison, in such a case, becomes a painful contrast.

Why, then, should a patriotic party seek the election of Fremont over Buchanan? Is it not palpable that the clique of tricksters, who seek power by their country's distraction; who arouse human passions, that upon their swelling waves they may gain advancement; who sectionalize Saxons, in order to nationalize sectionalities; that these men only use this puppet of their contrivance, to attain their infamous ends, either of the degradation of fifteen Commonwealths of the Union, or of the destruction of the Union itself?

People of the North! you occupy the battle ground of this fierce conflict. Scourge with patriotic energy these enemies of public peace—these traitors to the constitution and to the Union. Turn your eyes to noble purposes; and give other direction to the policy of your country. The destiny of America cannot be frittered away its energy upon a squabble about negroes! Of the latter, there are but three million slaves, and they, happy and contented. Of the white race, there are twenty-five million—who are far from being happy and contented, and are kept in continual "hot water," by this system of minding other people's business