



CLEARFIELD, PA

Monday Morning Oct 13th. 1862.

WHO ARE YOU FOR?

Are you for Scofield, Hall, Shannon & Co., the representatives of Radicalism—the men who support all extreme and violent measures—the men who maintain that party that has plunged the nation into war—that has buried the nation in a mountain of debt—that has loaded us and our posterity with an enormity of taxation—that has plotted against McClellan—that has mismanaged the war—that has needlessly sacrificed the lives of 100,000 of our brave soldiers? Or are you for Courtwright, Wallace, Boyer, Early, and the other moderate, Constitution siding candidates—who are for the Union as our fathers made it—who are for the Constitution as it is, with all its provisions faithfully observed—who will hold our public officials to a strict accountability—who who sustain McClellan as a patriot and a soldier—who who are for bringing peace, an honorable peace, out of the chaos that now reigns—who who will sternly demand that the hands of the Radicals account for the blood needlessly spilt, the treasure needlessly wasted? If you are for your country—united and happy—vote against radical Abolition. If you are for the Constitution, vote for the men who wish to preserve it unimpaired. True loyalty is exemplified by standing by the law. Preserve the nation by voting for the men WHO STAND BY THE LAW. If you are for the abolition of slavery, in preference to the Union, vote for Scofield and Hall. If you are for the CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION, in preference to the Nigger, vote for COURTRIGHT and WALLACE.

Levi W. Hall and Tongue Tax.

When the charter of the Penna. Railroad was granted, a tax for the benefit of the State was imposed of one of three mills per ton per mile. They repeatedly tried to get Democratic Legislatures to repeal it and failed. In 1860 a Republican Legislature was elected, and at the session that followed, this tax was repealed, and the company released from payment of upwards of \$200,000 to the State yearly. Levi W. Hall was active in urging the passage of the law, and voted for its passage. (See Senate Journal, page 349.) He has thus aided in taking out of the pockets of the tax-payers of the State \$200,000 yearly, and has given it to the Railroad Company. Last session Col. Hopkins introduced a bill in the Lower House to repeal this bill passed in 1861, in order to re-impose the tax, it passed the House by a vote of 70 to 26—it was sent to the Republican Senate with L. W. Hall as its Speaker, and never was passed. So that the tax is left to the people, the main line of public works is also gone, and direct taxation must make up the loss.

Tax-payers, will you vote to sustain these tools of a monstrous corporation?

The Proclamation.

Read the address of J. B. McEnally, Esq., Chairman of County Committee of the Republicans of Clearfield county. He says "the proclamation did not come a day too soon." The Republican party of Clearfield county have, by their authorized head, come out for the Abolition proclamation! Read it for yourselves.

What say you, moderate men of all parties? Are you for this Abolition proclamation? If you are vote for the Republican candidates, pledged to this Abolition policy.

If you are against this Abolition policy, let it be felt at the ballot box.

REMEMBER!!

The future of our once happy country is trembling in the scale! The mad policy of fanatical Abolitionists has stricken a fearful blow at the preservation of the Union. The insane course of fanaticism would trample upon the Constitutional rights of a free people. Your once glorious Union; your priceless boon—freedom of speech—freedom of the Press—trial by jury—are poised upon the result. Reverse this mad policy at the ballot-box to-morrow, or all is lost!

COURTRIGHT AND THE CONSTITUTION

versus SCOFIELD AND ABOLITION.

Who is there in this Congressional district that desires to send to Congress that wily Abolition demagogue, Gleni W. Scofield, the bosom friend of Morrow B. Lowry—through whose influence, and that of all the radical Abolitionists of the District, Scofield's nomination was effected. Vote for MILTON COURTRIGHT, an Old Line Whig—a conservative man—an upright man—and one who will truly represent us in moderate men of all parties.

AWAKE FROM YOUR SLUMBERS!! WHERE ARE YOU DRIFTING?

Abolition and Secession have arrayed the nation in bloody strife. Arouse, moderate men! and crush these monsters at the ballot box! Vote for Courtwright and Wallace, the exponents of moderate counsel. Sustain the Constitution, and crush Rebellion.

DIALOGUE

REPUBLICAN.—See here, Jim, I heard that you said that the two great objects of Mr. Lincoln was to free the blacks and enslave the whites. DEMOCRAT.—I did say so, John, and I can't believe anything else. REP.—That is his object to free the blacks I don't deny, but the assertion that it is his purpose to enslave the whites is foolish, and one that no sensible man would make. DEM.—Stop, John, not quite so fast—Don't fly up in a passion. You and I have always been friends, and I trust will continue to be. Now let us reason together about this matter. REP.—Well, sir, go ahead. DEM.—Now, John, do you consider the people living under an absolute monarchy, free? REP.—Of course I don't. But this is no absolute monarchy. DEM.—Well, John, wherein does an absolute monarchy differ from a limited monarchy? REP.—In an absolute monarchy the king rules according to his own will and discretion; in a limited monarchy the power of the king is restricted by a Constitution. DEM.—Well, sir, if the king should disregard the restrictions in the constitution, wherein would his government differ from an absolute monarchy? REP.—There would be no difference at all; his government would in fact be an absolute monarchy. DEM.—Right, sir. This government of ours, you know, John, is established upon a Constitution, that it consists of three independent and coordinate branches, namely, the Legislative, the Judicial and the Executive. That it is the duty of the Legislature to make the laws, of the Judiciary to expound and construe them, and of the Executive to enforce them.—You know that each of these branches are expressly defined and limited by the Constitution. You know, too, that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and that all other laws must be in accordance therewith. The limitations of this Constitution upon the powers of those in authority over us are what make a free government. The powers of the Chief Magistrate are still more strictly defined than in a limited monarchy, because here there is no vague and undefined prerogative under which to shield any undue exercise of power, besides, you know that all powers not delegated to the General Government are expressly reserved to the States. Am I not right? REP.—Yes, sir, I believe you are correct, so far. DEM.—Then you must admit that if these restrictions upon the power of the President are disregarded by him, his government, is in fact an absolute monarchy, and the people are no longer free. REP.—Of course, I'll admit that, but then you are only supposing the case.—You have not yet attempted to show that Abraham Lincoln has set aside any of the Constitutional limitations of his authority. DEM.—I shall show that now. One article in the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." Mr. Lincoln has suppressed certain newspapers. That was a direct violation of the spirit and letter of that article. There is another article which says "The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such trial shall be held in the States where the said crimes shall have been committed." There is another which says "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law; and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted by the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence." There is yet another article, which provides that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Now sir, you know, as well as I, that Mr. Lincoln has violated and disregarded all these provisions, which were, above all others, intended as a check upon his power, and to secure to the people of this land their "inalienable rights" for which our forefathers fought and bled. Are we, sir, a free people, when at any moment, the President can drag us from our homes, and from our State, without any charge or accusation, or any "due process of law," without giving us a "trial by Jury," without confronting us with the witnesses against us, incarcerating us in a military prison, there to remain during his pleasure? REP.—I must confess, Jim, that I can't justify Mr. Lincoln's course in the arrest of persons in the loyal States, and their imprisonment in military prisons. In those acts he has certainly overstepped his legitimate authority; and they are acts which if allowed to be precedents, may be the means of ultimately subverting our liberties, when one less patriotic than Mr. Lincoln may fill the Presidential chair. But then, Jim, I have been disposed to yield somewhat of our rights, considering the roughness of the seas on which the ship of State is at present tossed, and I have hitherto defended those acts of Mr. Lincoln as I have defended the suspension of the writ of Habeas corpus, upon the ground that the turbulence of the times, demanded this exercise of power,

as a political necessity. I think, too, that many of those who were arrested, deserved it, for talking about the administration and censuring its acts as they did. DEM.—It is not times of peace and general tranquility that our liberties are in danger of subversion; but in turbulence and civil commotion, just such times as these, when the attention of the people is engrossed by the war, and their enthusiasm against their enemies in arms is such that they are likely to overlook those more silent, yet more fatal attempts on the part of avowed friends to sap the vitals of freedom. The history of all ages and all countries teaches us this. It was in turbulent times too, that the Magna Charta, the great charter of the liberties of Englishmen was extorted from tyranny. The Barons of England with their swords in their hands, demanded this acknowledgment and security of their rights. Shall we allow those rights which were extorted from the tyranny of King John, wrested from the grasping despotism of George the Third, secured to us by a Constitution and government the noblest ever devised for man, now, in these times of trouble and peril, when we most need their protection to be invaded and violated. You have spoken of the suspension of the writ of Habeas corpus as being justifiable as a political necessity. Why, dear sir, the London Times of the 10th of September, says that the Queen of England would never think of obtaining the power to suspend that writ, and boasting the cause the comparison between our President and their monarch. The writ of Habeas corpus has not been suspended in England for two hundred years, yet within that period the French Revolution occurred, a convulsion which threatened every crowned head in Europe, when Jacobine flooded England, avowed approvers of everything monarchical.—Within that period Napoleon the First swept the continent of Europe with his victorious legions, and threatened the very existence of the British Government.—Yet, sir, the British Monarch did not find it necessary to attempt so extraordinary and high-handed a measure as the suspension of the usual course of the laws. But here, in the loyal States of the North, where there has been no act or thought of opposition to the Constitution or laws; here, when all the Courts of the United States and of the respective States are in the full exercise of all their powers, here in this "land of the free," men are arrested for what Mr. Lincoln terms "disloyal practices," a crime nowhere defined and totally unknown to the Constitution and the laws, and being so imprisoned they are without a remedy for that writ which Mr. Hallam styles "the principal bulwark of British liberty," is suspended by a President's proclamation. Now, sir, is it any wonder that we view these encroachments of executive power with alarm?—Is it not our right, ay, our duty, to talk against these invasions of our rights? I believe, sir, with Mr. Hallam, the English historian, that "a suspicious people are most likely to retain their liberties." I believe with Andrew Jackson that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." And I am surprised that you, an old line whig, should so far depart from the teachings of your great leaders. Who more bitterly denounced any attempt on the part of the Military or Executive authority to trample upon the laws, than Henry Clay, whom you styled "the embodiment of whig principles." And listen to the language of Daniel Webster, "the great expounder of the Constitution, and one of your greatest leaders." "Constitutional liberty must never permit power, and least of all executive power, to overstep its prescribed limits, either in peace or war, though benevolent motives and patriotic intent come along with it. The spirit of liberty is jealous of encroachments, jealous of power, jealous of men. At all times it demands checks; it insists on securities; it entrenches itself behind defenses, and fortifies itself against the assaults of ambition and passion." Now Sir,— REP.—Stop, Jim, you need argue that point no longer, I see clearly that you were right and I was wrong. I see that the exercise of such arbitrary powers by the President is a grand stride towards despotism, whether so intended or not.—I see, too that we should speak and act in such a manner as to show that "we know our rights, and knowing will maintain them." DEM.—Well, John, I have changed my opinion about the war. REP.—So have I, Jim. We both thought at first that we could easily conquer the South, and that therefore we ought to do it, but I suppose we are both satisfied by this time that the conquest of the South is an impossibility, and being an impossibility the further prosecution of the war is useless, and being useless is wrong, for it is sacrificing men and money to no purpose. But, Jim, you know that at the time of the Revolution, Great Britain could not make peace with us until there was a change in the ministry. So now, our present rulers are obstinately wedded to a war policy, and we must have a change of men before we can have a change of measure. I am with you heart and hand to effect that change, and if we are successful, our land may again be prosperous and happy under the benign influence of liberty and peace. REP.—For the purpose of exposing the monstrous attempts at corruption of our opponents, we this week publish our paper—a "full sheet"—two days in advance

BASE ATTEMPT AT BRIBERY! BEHOLD THE PROOF!!

The annexed affidavit of Mr. SAMUEL H. HINDMAN, a worthy citizen of Beccaria township, in this county, exposes the most vile and desperate attempt to corrupt the purity of the election ever brought to light, we venture to say, in this or any other State; and which too clearly shows the base, reckless and unlawful means to which the leaders of the opposition are resorting, to defeat Mr. WALLACE, the Democratic candidate for Senator. We say the leaders, for we know that there are hundreds of the rank and file of the Republican party who will abhor such means, and who, we doubt not, will rebuke the authors of this vile scheme in the most effectual manner.

Mr. Hindman is a man of character and responsibility, upon whose statements, without the sanction of an oath, the public can implicitly rely. But we have heard of other corroborating facts and circumstances. In the township of Bell, a like attempt was made to corrupt the vote of Mr. JAMES FULLMER, who repelled the offer. Three other electors—citizens of Beccaria township—were also approached by this man Crissman, with his offers of place and money. He usually proposed to hire men to work on the Railroad, at very high wages, but would state that unless Mr. Hall was elected to the Senate, the work could not go on, and of course men could not be employed, and the high wages could not be paid. In the township of Jordan a similar attempt was made; and it is plainly demonstrated that Crissman was vile enough to boast that he had accomplished his work of corruption with at least one citizen of Clearfield county. Even in this town he was seen handing over money. We have no terms sufficiently significant to characterize this infamous attempt to corrupt the very fountain of political authority, and the very palladium of our liberties; nor will it be easy for its authors, prior to the election, to imagine the depth of the indignation, contempt and scorn with which the people will repel the attempted outrage upon their rights, dignity and peace. We had supposed that the law of 1860, which imposes a fine of \$500 and imprisonment for two years upon any person corruptly influencing an election, would have been sufficient to restrain even a very bad man. But this man Crissman seems to have proceeded as if he had the fear of neither God nor man, nor the law of 1860 before his eyes.

Fellow citizens: this is no ordinary affair and we ask you to read and reflect upon the inevitable consequences of such wicked practices, and, then deal with the case as your sense of honor, duty and patriotism may dictate and we shall be content.

SAMUEL H. HINDMAN, millwright, of the township of Beccaria, Clearfield county, Pennsylvania, being duly sworn, saith, That he was, during the past week, engaged in repairing a saw-mill for Hon. John P. Hoyt, in Penn township, some four miles from Lumberville: that on Tuesday night, (7th inst.) he was awakened at his boarding-house by one John Dickinson, who desired him to go along with him to Lumberville; that he accompanied him supposing the purpose was for social enjoyment; that when he arrived at Lumberville he there found one Thomas Crissman, an agent of the Pennsylvania railroad Company at Sandy Ridge; that the said Crissman had been an acquaintance of his previously; that a conversation occurred between them, the substance of which was as follows:—Crissman said he could get me (Hindman) a situation in the Navy Yard at Philadelphia, worth from \$2 1/2 to \$3 per day, if I would do him a favor, and he knew I could do it; he said if I would exercise influence in Beccaria township I could change some fourteen votes; that I could promise each of these men, if they would vote for Louis W. Hall for Senator, a lucrative position on the Rail Road, and could explain this to them; he also said that HE WAS ARRANGING IT THROUGH THE COUNTY SO AS TO HAVE A DEMOCRAT AT EACH POLL, who could exercise his influence, and would also slip the ticket of L. W. Hall for Senator into the hands of all Democrats who were not watching it; he also told me that he had seen one Mr. —, and had a talk with him; that — was from the county of Clearfield, and had seen him either at Sandy Ridge or Tyrone; that — had told him that for the consideration of TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS he could change FIFTEEN VOTES in his district, that there were half a dozen votes in the family he could control; he said either that he had paid him TEN dollars, or was to pay him TEN dollars in hand and the remainder after this was effected; he said he was then going to look for —; he said he despised the man, but wanted the votes. I assented to Crissman's proposition, and we parted. He also told me that he had effected an arrangement with two other men, whom he named—one of them in Beccaria township, the other in Jordan township, and that they were all right.

SAMUEL H. HINDMAN.

Sworn and subscribed 11th Sept. 1862, before me, JAMES WRIGLEY, Rec. of Deeds.

To the Voters of Clearfield County

The undersigned are informed from some of the districts in the county that a report is being put in circulation to the effect that MILTON COURTRIGHT, the Democratic nominee for Congress, has declined! Here at the county seat, where we have better means of direct communication with all parts of the district, no attempt will be made to circulate so base a falsehood. We take this method of warning our friends to beware of any "ROORBACK," immediately before or on the day of the election. IT IS UTTERLY FALSE! He is not only a candidate, but feels confident of success, and unless affected by some such unfair means will be triumphantly elected. Every voter in the county, who is opposed to Abolition fanaticism, and in favor maintaining the Constitution, and preserving the Union, should not only vote but labor for his election.

- R. V. WILSON, Ch'n Dem. Co. Com. G. B. GOODLANDER, Sec'y do. do. WILLIAM BIGLER, JAMES T. LEONARD, WILLIAM PORTER, L. J. CRANS, ISRAEL TEST, WALTER BARRETT, D. W. MOORE.