

Independent Republican.

CHARLES F. READ AND H. H. FRAZIER, EDITORS

MONROE, PA.

Saturday, October 6, 1855.

REPUBLICAN NOMINATIONS.

A clean victory or a clean defeat.

The allies of the Administration must be struck down in every State, County, and District.

For Canal Commissioner, THOMAS NICHOLSON, Of Beaver County.

For Representative, ORLANDO G. HEMPSTEAD, Of Susquehanna County.

THOMAS J. INGHAM, Of Sullivan County.

For Commissioner, WILLIAM T. CASE, Of Gibson.

For Treasurer, SELDEN A. WOODRUFF, Of Monroe.

For Auditor, DAVID B. BROWN, Of Friedville.

Election—October 9th, 1855.

TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The Whig party, the Republican party, and the American party have each nominated a candidate for the office of Canal Commissioner, at Harrisburg, on the 27th of September, 1855, and the names of the candidates are, THOMAS NICHOLSON, of Beaver County, and THOMAS J. INGHAM, of Sullivan County.

Chairman of Whig State Committee, LEWEL TOWN, Chairman American State Committee of 13, DAVID WILMOT, Chairman Republican State Committee.

A CARD.

The undersigned members of the State Republican Committee, deem it proper to say, that they went into the office of Canal Commissioner, at Harrisburg, on the 27th of September, 1855, and the names of the candidates are, THOMAS NICHOLSON, of Beaver County, and THOMAS J. INGHAM, of Sullivan County.

Calm and Dispassionate Reasoning upon the Question now at Issue.

The principle contained in Jefferson's ordinance of 1787, which prohibited Slavery North of the Ohio, and the principle contained in Wilmot's Proviso, which proposed to exclude Slavery from the Territory acquired of Mexico, is deeply rooted in the hearts of the freemen of Susquehanna county. It is the carrying out of a settled principle in Common Law, a principle old as history, that Slavery is a creature of law, and cannot exist without positive enactments.

The Declaration of Independence declares that all men are created free and equal. In a government formed in accordance with the principles of that Declaration, Slavery could not and ought not to exist. If, therefore, Slavery does anywhere exist under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, it is in violation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, contrary to the genius of a free government, and ought to be abolished.

By virtue of certain compromises, entered into between the States, at the time the Constitution was drafted, Slavery was permitted to exist in the several States, by virtue and by reason of their State Laws.

The adverse or opposing principle is termed Popular Sovereignty. By the practical operation of this principle, Slavery is now planted in Kansas and Nebraska, and may be planted in all the Territories of the Nation. It denies and abrogates the principle of common law, that Slavery is a creature of legal enactments, and affirms and establishes the principle that Slavery may exist anywhere, until prohibited by positive law.

some one of emancipation. How difficult it is to emancipate slaves, where once the institution has a foothold, is shown by the history of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and more recently of Kentucky. How easy and just it is to restrict Slavery is proven by the Ordinance of 1787. Contrast the North-western, with the Southwestern States, and who will say that the ordinance of '87 was not just and proper, and for the best interests of the country. The injustice and the iniquity of the principle of Popular Sovereignty is shown in the brief but inglorious history of Kansas. Slavery is there in violation of every just principle of human government. It is just in accordance with the principles of popular sovereignty, but contrary to the principles of common law, contrary to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, contrary to the genius of a free government, contrary to the compromises of the Constitution, and contrary to that Higher Law which regulates the duties of man to his neighbor. This principle of Popular Sovereignty, which overrides all the principles relating to the natural freedom and equality of man, is now endorsed by the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, and under its marshals her forces to a battle with Freedom.

So stand the two parties, the Republican and the Democratic. The one maintaining that freedom is the natural condition of all men, and that slavery is a creature of law, and that, therefore, when a man is carried, by his master, beyond the jurisdiction of the law which makes him a slave, that moment he is free. The other maintaining that slavery is the natural condition of the black man; that he is a slave, as well beyond as within the jurisdiction of slave law—and therefore must remain a slave, although carried beyond the jurisdiction of the laws which make him a slave, as in Kansas and Nebraska, until made free by legal enactments. This is the true question at issue between the parties, and a question of greater moment was never before the country. The patriot should ponder well before he casts his vote, for that single vote may decide the destiny of his country for many long years to come.

The Democratic party of this country, knowing that the hearts of our citizens are deeply imbued with free principles, is trying, by every possible means, to avoid the true issue. It attempts to avoid the question in two ways—first by putting itself and its candidates in a false position, second, by getting up a false issue.

The position of the party and its candidates is false and deceptive. They profess to be "opposed to the extension of slavery." They may be opposed to the extension of slavery, and still be opposed to the enactment by Congress of a law prohibiting the extension of slavery. They would oppose the extension of slavery, by popular sovereignty, by letting the inhabitants vote it out of the territories, after it is introduced—if they can. We believe the party and its candidates are opposed to the restriction of slavery by an act of Congress, similar to the ordinance of '87, or the Wilmot Proviso, for these two reasons:

First, neither the party nor any of its candidates has denounced the principle of Popular Sovereignty. Why is this? The whole North, from Maine to Kansas, is boiling with indignation, because of the outrages committed under the plea of popular sovereignty, and yet here are long strings of resolutions passed by three county conventions, and here we are flooded with letters from committees and from candidates, but not one word against popular sovereignty. What does it mean? Does not the party, and every one of its candidates, remember their connection with the State party, which endorses that principle, and sustains the administration in the outrages committed under it?

Second: Neither the party nor any of its candidates, has breathed a wish that Congress might prohibit the introduction of Slavery into the Territories. The entire North, from Maine to Kansas, is aroused and clamorous for a law prohibiting the extension of Slavery, and yet in all these resolutions and in all these letters, there is not a wish nor a desire expressed that Congress might pass such a law. Why is there such a constant and tedious repetition in the resolutions and in the letters of the words, "opposed to the extension of Slavery." Why did not some one of the candidates say the expression and say, I am opposed to popular sovereignty, or, I am in favor of a law prohibiting the extension of Slavery, or, I am in favor of no more Slave States and no Slave Territory? Ah! there is deception in these words, "opposed to the extension of slavery." The same words were used, last Fall, when an attempt was made to endorse the Nebraska Bill by the re-election of Gov. Bigler. The same words were used by the Democrat in a strong article against the restoration of the Missouri Compromise. Be assured, Free-Soil Democrats, be assured, "there is something rotten in Denmark."

Arnold Plumer's name was not placed at the head of the party organ, but is placed at the head of the Democratic ticket. Why at the head of the ticket and not at the head of the Democrat? Who will tell us?

The Democratic Party attempts to dodge the issue upon the Slavery question, and save itself from another ignominious defeat, by getting up a cry against the Know-Nothing. It is true there is such an organization in the county which aided, materially, in gaining an Anti-Nebraska victory. Had it not been for that organization the Democratic party would have endorsed the Nebraska Bill. The defeat of the Nebraska Democrats is the cause of the hue and cry against the Order.

The Council decided, by a unanimous vote, that the principles of the Republican party were of more immediate and pressing importance than their own distinctive principles, and therefore resolved to join the Republican party in a determined resistance to the aggressions of Slavery. The Republican party did not adopt, nor in any way sanction, the American principles. Its candidates have declared, in the most emphatic manner, that they will carry out the Republican principles, untrammelled by any other organization, or extension, or principles. The cry of

Know-Nothingism does not hold against the Republican party. It is a distinct organization for a distinct object.

The sincerity of the order, in the county, in joining the Republican party, is proved by the adoption of Passmore Williamson, the Republican candidate for Canal Commissioner, while the Order had a Free-Soil candidate of its own in the field, and is further shown by the fusion of the Order throughout the State, upon a candidate who is not a Know-Nothing. That the Order is in favor of prohibiting the extension of Slavery is no longer a question. It holds it to be a question of the first magnitude, and paramount to all other questions.

The cry is "redeem the county from the domination of the Lodges." If the Lodges use their whole power to resist the extension of Slavery, then, God bless the Lodges! The Democratic party makes the question a "home question," a mere local contest, a death struggle for the offices. The paltry offices of the county are worthless compared to the great principles at stake. Last fall we heard the same cry, "Save the State from the hands of the Whigs—the Governor has nothing to do with the Nebraska bill." The whole game is base and mercenary. A pro-Slavery party sustained for the sake of the offices!! The people are to remember that this is an attempt to build up a great national party to resist the aggressions of Slavery. Its defeat will be a Nebraska triumph.

We want you, Free Soil Democrats, to cast your votes in favor of an act to prohibit the extension of Slavery. That question will be before Congress again this winter, and a large territory now lies open to the introduction of Slavery. We want you, Free Soil men, to cast your vote against the admission of any more Slave States, and especially of a Slave State made out of territory from which Slavery was excluded by the Missouri Compromise. Kansas will, this winter, send two delegates to Congress, one asking for admission as a Slave State and the other as a Free State. Do not be deceived with the cry that this is a "home question," a local contest. It is a question that will tell on the future history of our country, and if it tells for good, we must have an expression from the entire North against the admission of Kansas as a slave State.

We want you, Free-Soilers, to cast your vote in favor of the principle, that Slavery cannot extend beyond the jurisdiction of Slave Laws. Passmore Williamson lies now in prison for telling a woman that she was free by the laws of Pennsylvania, and is now awaiting a suit brought against him, for the recovery of the full value of Slaves made free by a voluntary act of his master. We want a strong expression in favor of the principle Pennsylvania has adopted—that Slavery cannot exist beyond the jurisdiction of Slave Laws—lest a contrary decision be rendered by our Democratic pro-Slavery Judges of the Supreme Court.

Go, Friends of Freedom, go, every one of you, to the polls and vote the Republican ticket, not as a "home question," not as a "local contest," not to secure the offices, but to make an expression on the greatest and most important question that has been before the country since the adoption of the Constitution. Go to your hesitating neighbor and take him with you to the polls—telling him that his country requires a vote from him, and he must come out. Let us poll a heavier majority on this question than was ever given for any question yet submitted to the people.

Independent Free-Soil Nomination.

We the undersigned citizens of Susquehanna county, desire to present to the Electors of this Representative District the name of Elhanan Smith, of Tunkhannock, Wyoming county, as a suitable and highly proper candidate for Representative at the ensuing General Election. Col. Smith is known for his long cherished Free-Soil principles, and his former connection with a party whose masses have always favored that doctrine. His ability, integrity and capacity for business, we can fully endorse, as well as his freedom from all the liberal prejudices and aims of the day. We therefore ask, on his behalf, a liberal support.

Henry Drinker, E. Patrick, Jr., Henry W. Allen, Hiram C. Conklin, Thomas Nicholson, George Walker, Eph. Hollenback, Roger S. Starle, N. P. Cornell, E. G. Babcock, Billings Stroud, A. G. Hollister, Wm. Vaughn, Almon P. Stephens, Trayway Kellogg, E. S. Kent, Edwin Taylor.

The above we clip from the last Montrose Democrat. It would be curious to learn just how high signature was obtained. Henry Drinker is absent from the county, and has been absent since the 1st of September, when he left here to attend the State Fair at Harrisburg. We are sure that he never saw the card to which his name is attached, for he left some time before Mr. Smith had concluded to run; and besides, we know that when word was sent into this county from Wyoming that Smith desired the Republican nomination this Fall, Mr. Drinker was opposed to him, and said he had information that satisfied him that Smith was in Cameron's interest when Clerk in the Legislature last winter, and he believed he used his influence to get Sturdevant to vote for him. We therefore cannot believe that Mr. Drinker ever consented to have his name put to such a paper as the above.

Henry W. Allen is not a Whig, and never was. He says since his name was put to the card, that he did not know whether he shall support Smith or not.

George Walker's name was got on in this way: Col. Smith went to him and told him that all his (Walker's) Whig friends in Montrose were going for him, and that if elected he was going to support Judge Jessup for United States Senator! This was getting on George's weak side, as he is a particular friend of the Judge's, and on that statement he consented to have his name used. As soon as he learned the facts of the case, he was sorry he had consented; and he will undoubtedly feel bound to oppose the man who tried to obtain his support by deceit and falsehood.

Billings Stroud is Mr. Smith's cousin. He says he tried all he could to have him run, but says he would run he could not refuse his name because he is his cousin. Billings was

formerly a Whig, and now would probably be a Republican if he had no cousins.

Edwin Taylor says he does not intend to vote for Col. Smith, never promised to and never intended to do.

Treyway Kellogg says he never saw the card to which his name was attached till after it appeared in the Democrat, and never gave any one permission to use his name.

We have not learned particularly about the other names, but Mr. Walker's case gives a key to the plan for getting them by downright falsehood. Is the man that can descend to such meanness, worthy any honest man's support?

We hear that the names are used in Wyoming as those of leading Whigs in Susquehanna county, but the truth is that about a third of them are, or till a very recent period were Democrats, viz: H. W. Allen, E. G. Babcock, H. C. Conklin, A. G. Hollister, N. P. Cornell and Edwin Taylor.

Dr. Patrick, who appears to be one of the prime movers, left the Whig party long ago and has since fought against it with all his might till his decease. Thinking, with some other politicians, that "the use of the Whig party was to be beaten" he is now striving to galvanize it into life again, but he will find the case beyond his skill. The Dr. has helped Chase out of several tight spots in his political career, and if this Smith game succeeds in defeating the Republican candidates, he will deserve his everlasting gratitude.

The card endorses Col. Smith's "freedom from all the liberal principles and aims of the day," but whether this means Know-Nothingism or Free-Soilism we are not quite sure. We have the authority of the North Branch Democrat, Luzerne Union, Montrose Democrat, and himself (however of little worth) that he is a Know-Nothing; and the signers of the card endorse his "Free-Soil principles" which, however, we never heard of before, and which we suppose were first discovered last winter, in his efforts to secure the election of Cameron, who although a pro-Slavery man, secretly gave Free-Soil pledges—pledges given to be broken the first opportunity. We should think Chase ought to make haste to correct the statement that he is Free-Soil, for Chase has bawled till he was hoarse to convince the people that the Know-Nothing is pro-Slavery. But as a final proof of the strength and consistency of his principles, he now brings before the people of Susquehanna county a man whose sole nomination was received from the Know-Nothing of Wyoming county, as a Free-Soil candidate. O Cameron, great wonders canst thou work, by the magic of thy purse!

To the Free-Soil Voters of Susquehanna County. Your County Committee have learned that arrangements have been made by which Elhanan Smith, of Wyoming county, is announced as an independent candidate for Representative from this District, he not having been able, after strenuous endeavors, to obtain the assent of any respectable man to stand as a candidate with him on a Whig party ticket. To the objects of this movement we respectfully request your attention. He is urged by some (men who have for the last five years been engaged in schemes to break up the Whig party) as a Whig candidate. These men now say the Whig party must not be destroyed. We sincerely condole with them in their affliction, but suggest to them that the way to resuscitate the Whig party is not to adopt as their candidate a man who openly avows himself as the candidate of the American party of Wyoming county, and seeks support as such.

It was with some surprise, we confess, that we found such men as Dr. Patrick sustaining and aiding him, when he was at the same time pledged to vote for Hon. Wm. Jessup, who, however, we have learned, has neither solicited nor desires his friendly offices, and even were he a candidate, would not seek the nomination outside of the Republican party.

The true reason, we apprehend, for which this course has been taken, is if possible to secure the election of John V. Smith, of Wyoming, he being the only one of the candidates who fully represents the principles of the Harrisburg convention. It is extremely desirable to the friends of the Nebraska Administration to secure the election of some man from this District who will truly represent them.

Every vote cast here for Elhanan Smith will tend to increase the chances of John V. Smith's election. Are you prepared for such a result? A combination has been attempted, and we fear may succeed, to secure the vote of Wyoming county to the two Smiths. There are true men in Wyoming, who will not enter into such an arrangement, but it is much to be feared that it will be effected, and if Susquehanna does not stand firm, it will succeed in defeating one of your candidates, and thus gain a vote in the next Legislature for a Slavery extensionist for United States Senator.

By order of the Republican County Com.

Falsehoods by Wholesalers.

Of course nobody that knows Chase, and his present desperate circumstances, will for a moment think of believing anything that appears in his paper, unless substantiated from other quarters. Even the members of his own party no longer think of placing any confidence in his word—at least those who know him best.

His last issue was full of wholesale falsehoods, but we only wish to call attention to the attempt to injure our candidate for Treasurer. In addition to meanly circulating a false report as to his habits, his desperate opponents stated in the last Democrat that "the Posts" were going to establish a new Bank in Montrose, and Woodruff, if elected, would deposit the County funds in it! This is a complete fabrication from beginning to end, and we doubt not the people of Susquehanna County, will respond to this attempt to injure a worthy man and industrious mechanic, as it deserves.

We know not how many such stories about our candidates they may be circulating throughout the county, but when it is known that they make a business of fabricating them, solely

to injure the Republican ticket, of course no one will notice them.

Our ticket is composed of good men, and it is very important to those who do not wish the county to relapse into Hunkerism, to have it elected.

Wyoming County.

The County of Wyoming contains about one third the population of Susquehanna, and consequently in that proportion should be represented in the councils of the State. Yet since the last apportionment the representation of Wyoming, has been greater than that of Susquehanna, having either a Senator or Representative every year but one; and last year both; while Sullivan standing in about the same relative proportion to Wyoming as that County does to Susquehanna, has been represented but two years, since the organization of the County, and although Wyoming County had both the Senator, and a member of the other house last year, she claims both, this year, while Susquehanna with three times the population, has but one, and Sullivan none, if our friends in Wyoming are to have their own way. Last year the candidate from Sullivan, was withdrawn, in favor of Wyoming, with an understanding all round that, this year the Candidate should belong to Sullivan; and with that understanding in view, Mr. Hempstead from this County, and Mr. Ingham from Sullivan were placed in nomination by the conferees of this district. In violation of all honor and good faith, in those concerned, a candidate from Wyoming is brought forward, with the settled and avowed determination of defeating the ticket. We trust that the people of Wyoming County are not a party to this move, so dishonorable and unfair in all its aspects. Elhanan Smith who thus thrusts himself before the people of this district, as an independent Whig candidate, came here at the Republican Convention, and demanded a nomination at their hands, and in a swaggering and bragging manner declared, that he would run whether he was nominated or not. He did not present himself as a Whig candidate, but claimed to have received a nomination from the Know Nothings of Wyoming County. After his bombast and threats, there was but one feeling amongst Republicans, and that was a settled determination not to swerve from the straight forward path of duty, regardless of threats or intimidations from whatever quarter they might come. After the nomination, Smith came here, with the intention, as he avowed, "of giving the people of Susquehanna County, one more chance to throw off Ingham and place him on the Republican ticket." We think however the magnanimous offer was not made, as his company while here, was composed, almost wholly, of the Hunker Democracy and two or three of Chase's whippers-in, and his chief figure in this County, is a tool of Chase, as bitter opponent as the Whig party of this County ever had.

Last year the tickets for Wyoming were printed here with the name of C. J. Lathrop and John Sturdevant for Representative, but when the votes were counted Mr. Lathrop's name was not upon one of them, the voters of that County, supporting their own man, and dropping Mr. Lathrop altogether while in Susquehanna County, the whole ticket was voted, giving Mr. Sturdevant a large majority over his administration opponent, and the only thing that saved Mr. Lathrop from defeat was that he was on both tickets. A similar game is being attempted again this year, with what success time alone must determine. If Wyoming is not only to have two thirds of the whole representatives of the district, but vote for the candidate from this County when it suits her whim, and withhold her vote when she chooses, it is time the thing was known, and a corrective applied. That game may answer very well to carry out the ambitious views of one or two ambitious and unprincipled politicians, but we are satisfied that the people will not sustain it. If the candidate from this county, is dropped from their ticket, this year, in the same manner that he was last, the people of that County will find that the game has been played once too often. There is no pretence but Susquehanna County is entitled, to at least one half of the representation of Wyoming, or that she has not the right to nominate her own candidate. Susquehanna County has one man on the ticket, just one half that she is entitled to this year. If the people of Wyoming County choose to withhold their votes from the nominee from this County, suffer him to be defeated, by the might of the whole Hunker vote of that county, we can assure them most conclusively, that any man in that County, who is connected in the slightest degree in the infamous business, will in the future, stand about the same chance of receiving the vote of this County, should he come before the people, as he does of being struck with lightning, but not quite. But Elhanan says that he would not go to Harrisburg, except this winter. Of course, Cameron would not then be in the field. Smith was there last winter as a Clerk, and got a snuff of the flesh pots, and could he but go this winter, no doubt on his return, he would scatter the "Middleton Fifties" as thick as they have been in this place.

Pierce on Pennsylvania.

In his speech at the State Fair in Harrisburg, President Pierce said:—"I can never touch the soil of Pennsylvania without involuntarily recurring to the stirring incidents of her history, which instead of being shaded or obscured by time, are inevitably, as years roll on, to be brought out in stronger, clearer, and more glorious light. Within her borders the Declaration of Independence was drafted, signed, and proclaimed to the world. To the memorable convention of the United Colonies, on the 25th of June, 1776, she declared, through her delegates met in provincial conference, in favor of absolute separation from the mother country. Within her borders the Constitution under which we live was framed, adopted, and signed by the 'Fathers of his country,' and those associates, whose patriotic labors, like his own, will never be forgotten, though signatures may fade and parchments decay.

He should have added, "From within her borders I selected a man to be sacrificed to the Moloch of Slavery on the plains of Kansas; and within her borders a man of pure life and noble character now lies in prison, without law and without a crime."

The Cameron Movement.

In the last Montrose Democrat, E. B. Chase tries by various expedients to evade the force of public opinion that is settling down upon him as the paid agent of Simon Cameron. It will not do. The evidences are too many and too convincing.

To begin with last winter. It will be remembered that Cameron was nominated in a Know Nothing Caucus at Harrisburg, for U. S. Senator, but on his nomination a large body of members "bolted." A great struggle followed, and Cameron was barely defeated in the Convention, by an adjournment till October inst. Old line Democrats, among them Platt from this district, kept gradually going over to Cameron, who was well known to employ the most corrupt means to gain an election. While the struggle was going on, Chase was in Harrisburg. We had information at the time directly, from various sources, that he was working hard for Cameron the Know Nothing Candidate, among the members. That fact was notorious at Harrisburg, as was stated by the Harrisburg Correspondence of the Bradford county papers, and by gentlemen who were there from this and neighboring counties. We are told that he sat by John Sturdevant's side when he voted for Cameron, and also tried to induce C. J. Lathrop to aid in his election. To injure the prospects of one of Cameron's opponents, he mutilated and falsified a letter, and published it, to the world in that condition. If Elhanan Smith, the man whom Chase endorsed in the last Democrat as "a very clever fellow," is any authority, he stated not many weeks ago, in the presence of D. D. Warner, Isaac P. Baker, and Samuel F. Carmalt, that "Chase was in all of Cameron's private caucuses,"—and we would ask, who ought to know the fact better than Col. Smith who undoubtedly was there too?

But Cameron failed last winter, and the battle has all to be fought over again. There is no doubt that Cameron, one of the most adroit, unscrupulous and corrupt politicians in the Union, has been laboring assiduously throughout the State to secure the nomination of men in his interest. It is feared that he has in a great degree succeeded, and that the people of Pennsylvania are again to be cursed with a doughface representative in the U. S. Senate.

The question arises—Has he secured any candidates in this district? Knowing Chase's position with regard to him, and judging from the fact that he controls the Little Democracy of Susquehanna, and appears to have had influence enough to get Deegan, who was pledged to the Democratic Caucus nominee for U. S. Senator, off the ticket, and John V. Smith of Tunkhannock, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock, a political friend of Mr. O. Lathrop declares that the latter says he will vote for Cameron for U. S. Senator, if he will give Strong Free Soil pledges, and not without. This is Mr. Lewis' statement, whether correct or not we cannot say. Mr. Lathrop says in the last Democrat, that he will not vote for Cameron. If he has concluded not to vote for Cameron, he has concluded not to vote for Elhanan Smith, in his place, we should naturally infer that he had got two Cameron men on his ticket, especially when, in addition to this inferential evidence, Mr. Lewis, of Dimock,