

THE VOLUNTEER.

John B. Bratton, Editor and Proprietor. CARLEISLE, THURSDAY, NOV. 30, 1849.

AGENCY. V. B. PALMER, Esq., is our authorized Agent for procuring advertisements, receiving subscriptions and making collections for the Volunteer, at his office, No. 1, W. corner of Third and Chestnut streets, Philadelphia.

THE APPROACH OF WINTER.—Winter is coming! and if we are to believe the predictions of our oldest inhabitants, it will be a severe one. There are, beyond doubt, many families in the borough of Carlisle who need assistance from their fellow citizens—families who are nearly on the brink of starvation, and suffering for want of fuel. We hope, therefore, that the good people of our town may take early steps for the relief of such persons as are destitute of means. We would suggest the propriety of organizing one or two benevolent societies in our borough—society committees to examine to what extent assistance is wanting, and who are in need, &c.

Thanksgiving Day was very generally observed by our citizens. The stores were all closed, and business of all kinds suspended.

Distressing Accident.—On Friday last a railroad accident occurred in this borough, the particulars of which are distressing in the extreme. As the train of passenger cars, on their way to Harrisburg, were passing through town, a boy about 13 years of age, son of Mr. James Callio, of this place, was observed standing on the track in front of Mr. Foster's store. Before the cars were very near him the whistle was sounded, but the boy being deaf, did not move. The engineer then spoke at the top of his voice to "get out of the way," but still the boy did not hear the warning. The cars could not be stopped—the boy was knocked down, and in falling one of his legs crossed the track, and several of the cars passed over it, which, as may be supposed, crushed the limb to a jelly. Medical assistance was soon called, and the amputation of the limb above the knee was deemed necessary. The operation was performed in a most skillful manner by Dr. G. W. Foulk, assisted by several other physicians of our borough. We are happy to add that the patient is doing well, and strong hopes are entertained for his recovery.

We notice that most of our contemporaries in the city of Philadelphia and elsewhere put down the Federal majority in this county, at the recent Presidential election, at 164. The real majority is 84, as appears by the official returns, and the mistake appears to have been made through the Telegraph office at this place, after the meeting of our Return Judges. Will our friends be kind enough to correct the error. We have signed enough in Old Mother Cumberland without being charged with greater delinquencies than we are really chargeable with.

Sartain's Union Magazine of Literature and Art.—This new, beautiful and highly valuable magazine, being a continuation with improvement of the Union Magazine of New York, has made its appearance. It is under the editorial management of Mrs. Kirkland and Prof. Hart, and the illustrations are Mr. Sartain's best style. The announcement to the shepherd is a truly magnificent mezzotint, "The Mother and Child" is extremely well executed, and the engraved title page representing "Liberty introducing the arts to America," is a perfect gem. The contributions are well written, and they are presented to the public in the most attractive form. The work can be obtained by writing to J. Sartain & Co., Philadelphia.

Down's North American Farmer.—We have received the first number of this valuable agricultural paper, published in Philadelphia, by E. Down and M. Strauss. The paper is of mammoth size, beautiful in appearance, and filled with valuable agricultural information. The following named gentlemen, among others, are mentioned as contributors to the "Farmer," viz:—Hon. Morris Longstrech, Hon. Thomas H. Burrows, James Gowen, Esq., Professors Liebig and Baur, of Germany, Francis J. Grund, Edgar A. Poe, John S. Bowen, Esq., &c., &c. This paper should receive the patronage of all enterprising farmers.—Specimen copies may be seen at our office.

Terms of Down's North American Farmer.—One copy, 62; two copies, 83; six copies, 25; thirteen copies, 41; thirty copies, \$20. The person procuring the largest number of subscribers over any, at any single Post Office in the United States, (except cities), will receive a prize of \$75 in cash, (or any other article of value) to be selected by the proprietor, to commence from January 1st, 1849. For the largest list in Pennsylvania, \$30 will be awarded.

Our nervous neighbor of the Herald again refers to the "Slave Slander," and again pronounces "the story false." Poor fellow—you are to be pitied. That little squib of ours has cost you much trouble, and the loss of much sleep, we fear. When, during the war with Mexico, the New York Tribune, North American, National Intelligencer, and other leading Federal journals pronounced Gen. Taylor an "adroit skull-breaker," "murderer," "baby-killer," &c., why did not the Herald then defend him? It could then remain quiet, and see Gen. T. stigmatized as a "murderer," without being "shocked." Then, however, Gen. Taylor had no fat objects to bestow—now he is the President elect, and will soon distribute the "spoils" with a perfect looseness. This then is the secret of the servile and spiteful course of the Federal press at this time. So long as Gen. Taylor was fighting the battles of his country and had no patronage for hungry office-seeking demagogues, no epithets were too hard to be applied to him—Tom Corwin even wished him a "hospitable grave" in Mexico. But now that he is clothed with power and patronage, his former revilers are great admirers of the "benevolence of Gen. Taylor." Away with squab rank hypocrisy and dishonesty!

This story the Volunteer declares its ability to prove. We deny it, and again venture to denounce the story as false, and infamously slanderous.

Herald of yesterday.

Tut, tut, Mr. Herald—such "big talk" we will not suffer. You will venture to denounce "It, his, you venture" to denounce a good many things, but whenever we "call you out," and dare you to the proof, you sneak off like a whipped scoundrel, and beg for quarters. Like the Irishman's flea, when we attempt to put our finger on you, you are not there.—But, Mr. Herald, you must not be saasy with us—we will not put up with it—and if you persist in such a course we will feel it our duty—however painful it may be to our feelings—to "spank" you soundly—we will!

James B. Ruple, Esq., late one of the efficient editors of the Washington Examiner, in this State, having sold his interest to Andrew Hopkins, Esq.—Mr. Ruple is a steady and intelligent Democrat, and assisted to make the Examiner one of the best Democratic papers in Pennsylvania. May he prosper in all his undertakings.

Ohio Official.—The full official vote of Ohio for President, is: Cass, 154,821; Taylor, 138,396; Van Buren, 85,456. Cass' plurality over Taylor, 18,425.

The Odd Fellows of Philadelphia have 109 lodges, containing between 10,000 and 15,000 members. This number of subordinate lodges in the State of Pennsylvania at the last annual report was 29,903; and the revenue for the last year, \$173,311 58. There was paid during that period, for the relief of members and their families, burying the dead and educating the orphans, \$67,649 06—a strong proof of the beneficence of Odd Fellows.

NEUTRAL PAPERS.

One of the most powerful engines which the Federalists have made use of in this country, to give a misdirection to public opinion, exists in our "neutral papers." Pretending to stand entirely aloof from our political excitements, and sit in impartial judgment upon the acts of both parties, they seldom find anything to approve in the Democratic party, or anything to condemn in the movements of its political enemies. As they are presumed to belong to no party, it is supposed that their dictums will pass current with the people, as the fair and just decisions of unbiassed candor. How little their remarks upon public events have deserved that character for the last few years, we will leave it to those who have read the New York Herald, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the Baltimore Clipper, and other similar journals, to determine. Professing neutrality, those prints are conducted by some of the most violent Federal demagogues in this country. Pretending to pass upon political events with the utmost fairness and impartiality, they suffer no opportunity to escape, of covertly attacking Democratic men and Democratic principles. We care not how many presses the Federalists bring into the field, to support their principles openly and honorably. But we detest that vile hypocrisy which would impose upon the community, as the candid speculations of an impartial mind, the bitterness and spleen of a violent and unprincipled partisan. In the recent political struggle these "neutral" presses were constantly finding fault with General Cass and Butler—no slander was too foul for them not to give credit to—they not only published slanders against our candidates, but in more than one instance they were the originators of those slanders. They were constant in their abuse of Cass and Butler, and as constant in their praise of "Old Zack" and Fillmore! Let the Democracy look to it, that they warn no more of these vipers in their bosoms—vipers which will do their best to sting them to death in return.

THE SPOILS PARTY. Composed of all the conglomerated classes of Federalism, from the time of the elder Adams down to the present, are already at loggerheads about the leaves and fishes. In New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other large cities, hundreds of applicants are announced for custom house appointments, and a fierce war is now being waged by the different factions.—In this place there are no less than some half dozen hungry applicants after the Post-office, a large majority of whom, of course, will be disappointed, the consequence of which will be that they will split up into as many factions as the whole Taylor party was originally composed of. The same anxiety for office, we learn from our exchange papers, exists among them all over the Union, and if we are not much mistaken in our surmise, their rallying cry of "Old Zack" will become as odious before one year hence, as it was popular with them before the election.—Thousands of misguided men will find out, much to their mortification and chagrin, that it was easier to make promises than it is to fulfil them.

A SLAVE CASE. Catherine Oliver and others, of the State of Maryland, vs. Daniel Kaufman, of Cumberland County, Pa. The above case, which was tried last week in Carlisle, before Judge Hopburn, and his Associates, in the Court of Common Pleas, excited a great deal of interest. A Carlisle correspondent of the Public Ledger gives the following report of the case, which is substantially correct.—The plaintiff, Catherine Oliver and others, of the State of Maryland, instituted a suit against Daniel Kaufman of this county, for aiding the escape, and harboring 13 slaves, claimed as the property of the plaintiff. Messrs. Watts and Biddle were engaged for plaintiffs, and Gallagher, Graham, and Adair for defendant. A great number of witnesses were produced by plaintiff's counsel, who proved that the slaves were brought on the evening of the 24th of October, 1847, to the barn of Kaufman, and after remaining there part of the night, were taken in his wagon across the Susquehanna river.—Several witnesses were called, who were immoderate neighbors of Kaufman, and obstinately refused to answer any questions or inquiries propounded by the court or counsel. Being apparently determined to keep silent, one of them, (Mode Griffith), was given into the custody of the Sheriff and conveyed to jail. But after remaining there a short time he and they concluded it was better to come forward and give evidence, and accordingly did so in a very humble and submissive manner. The defendant's counsel took the ground that a case of this kind did not come under the jurisdiction of this court. Able and lengthy speeches were made by the counsel on both sides, and the Judge's charge, though brief, was to the point.

The jury retired, and after being out some eight hours, returned a verdict of \$2,000 damages for the plaintiffs. In the surrounding neighborhood of Kaufman's residence, there appears to be a number of most inveterate abolitionists, who are strongly suspected of part of a grand chain extending from Mason and Dixon's line to the northern section of this State, who aid in the escape and secreting of runaway negroes. This spirit of false philanthropy cannot be otherwise than deleterious in its tendency, and should receive the frown of every good citizen. Slaves have been recognized by the constitution as property, and every sensible man, until they are proven otherwise, should be treated as such in the recognition. The law should not be trampled upon, and individual rights should not be oppressed by a wild and dangerous fanaticism.

The Massachusetts Legislature on Friday last chose Whig electors for President and Vice President, by a majority of 102.—Carlisle Herald.

The Massachusetts Legislature also passed resolutions declaring the war against Mexico "infamous and unconstitutional," and all who participated in it as "unworthy of commendation." A resolution of thanks to Gen. Taylor for his "patriotic services," was voted down by nearly a unanimous vote!

Gen. Cass' vote in this State is larger than that of Johnston, the successful Whig candidate for Governor, by 4,124 votes. Taylor's vote is larger than Johnston's by 17,886 votes.

CALLING THE ROLL.—The editor of the Nashville Union, who appears to be a sufferer in more senses than one under the recent defeat of the democracy of Tennessee and the Union—thus pleasantly "confesses the corn."

"All persons who have won hats and boots of us on this election will please call at Robertson's to-morrow, between the hours of 9 and 12, and get them. They are requested to form on the square and march up in single file, to prevent blocking up the street.—Our friend from Robertson county, who won both hats and boots of us on this State, is requested to act as chief marshal."

Revolving boot heels are made in Baltimore. First-rate articles for the whigs, when they wish to turn on their heels, and cut old acquaintances who have labored for the good of the party and now expect their girders.

Hoo Stravertins.—The State of Ohio, according to official returns made by assessors during the present year, has within its limits the large number of 1,870,477 hogs, the value of which is set down at \$9,320,439. This is an increase since last year of 118,859 hogs.

Singular Fact.—Lancaster County, Pa., at the whole election, cast 6,224 more votes than were cast in the whole State of Rhode Island.

MESSRS. BUCHANAN AND DALLAS.

The North American, since the election, is occupied in slandering and vilifying these two eminent statesmen. "Cease vipers—your abuse of Messrs. Buchanan and Dallas can never injure them. Their characters cannot be tarnished by assaults from such a quarter. The North American is regarded as the organ of the Federal party in this State, but for low pot-house, fish-woman slang, it has no rival. The manner in which it speaks of political opponents is disgraceful to the press, and disgraceful to the city in which it is published. The editors of the American are reputed to be men of talent, but they certainly take a bad way of showing their powers, if they possess any. They must think their readers very ignorant if they suppose them capable of approving of the abusive epithets constantly contained in that paper. We can excuse a spicy article occasionally—even if it be illiberal and unwarranted—but the constant abuse of the North American is disgusting in the extreme. Bitterness in that paper is not confined to a few weeks before and after an election—it is constant day in and day out the year round.—Since the election that paper, with scarcely a day of intermission, has been backbitting the two distinguished gentlemen above named—and for what?—Merely because they are prominent Democrats, whose opinions do not accord with the opinions of the editors of the American! We repeat that the names of James Buchanan and George M. Dallas are not to be disgraced by the puny attacks of reckless politicians—they are both statesmen of whom Pennsylvania feels proud—men whose lives have been models of purity. In the language of a contemporary, Messrs. Buchanan and Dallas "will be remembered by their admiring countrymen when the grave-worm will refuse to feed upon the loathsome carcases of their traducers."

WELL ANSWERED. The Philadelphia Bulletin—a reckless Federal sheet published in Philadelphia—in a late article headed "A Prophecy Fulfilled," attempts to show that the result of the recent election in Pennsylvania is an expression of the people against Mr. Polk's administration, and a severe rebuke to George M. Dallas, because of his course in favor of the tariff bill of 1846. The Bulletin quotes a portion of General Cameron's speech, delivered in the U. S. Senate a short time previous to the passage of the tariff bill, in which the prediction was made that the passage of that bill would defeat the Democratic party in Pennsylvania. We were about to answer this Federal dummy, when the following article from that able Democratic paper, the Lycoming Gazette, met our eyes. The Gazette answers the Bulletin in an article of some length, which we would publish, if full if we had the room. After giving many reasons why this State cast its vote for Gen. Taylor, the Gazette proceeds:

Now while we will not attribute to Gen. Cameron the design of defeating General Cass at the late election, and thereby fulfilling his own prophecy, yet the fact is nevertheless plain, that he contributed essentially to it by his rash and untimely endorsement of General Taylor's Democratic policy. It was through him and him that the Taylor faction was introduced into the Democratic camp in Pennsylvania, and the several Democratic Taylor meetings throughout the State were generally of his getting up. In this way he did a check to the Union, and the whirlwind which followed was a certain and necessary consequence. We can hardly esteem our contemporaries of Pennsylvania honest, now that the election is over, when we hear them assert that Gen. Taylor is in favor of Free Soil and the Tariff of 1842! What evidence have they of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any but their own broad assertions before the election, contradicted as they were and are by their brethren and contemporaries of the South? If Free Soil and Protection, were particularly high measures, why were they not inscribed upon the Whig banner at Philadelphia, and made a part of that? Have they any