



**The Independent Republican.**  
C. F. READ & H. H. FRAZIER, EDITORS.

MONROE, PA.  
Thursday, February 7th, 1856.

**Democrats Supporting a Know-Nothing.**

The Democratic members of the House of Representatives, from among whom Chase & Ward's mass meeting requested Mr. Grow to select his candidate for Speaker, after having successfully supported Nebraska Richardson, of Illinois, and Nullification Orr, of South Carolina, on Thursday, January 31st, united with the Fuller Know Nothing, and voted for William Smith, of Virginia, a pro-Slavery Know Nothing, for Speaker! This pro-slavery fusion gave Smith one hundred votes; but Mr. Grow, notwithstanding the recent Montrose meeting, voted with the Banks men and the 'scatterers,' and so 'extra Billy'—as this Virginia Smith is called—was defeated.

Doughfaces of Susquehanna! to arms! Let another mass meeting of seven be called at once, and let the whole Democracy of the House hear the thunders of your ceasure. The rescals have been voting for a Know Nothing, a Southern, pro-slavery, faithless Know Nothing! The Democracy of the House, 'the invincible seventy-six,' the hope of the country, have turned traitors!

But perhaps all that is necessary is to elect a pro-slavery man, and Mr. Grow's crime consists in voting for a Free-Souler. Then the 'Seventy-six' may all right in voting for a Virginia Know Nothing. Let the people understand this.

The Republican and American members of the Pennsylvania Legislature, as our readers are already aware, have unanimously adopted a platform which pledges them 'to oppose the admission of any more slave States into the Union.' An article from the Lancaster Herald—which appears to receive the endorsement of that new apostle for slavery-extension, the Montrose Democrat—asserts that this position of opposition to the admission of any more slave States is untenable, and asks, "when Texas comes to be divided, and the new slave State asks for admission into the Union, as provided for by treaty and the pledged faith of the nation, whether will be the supporters of this resolution?"

Strange that the men who repealed the Missouri Compromise, should talk of the pledged faith of the nation as an obstacle to legislative action. It certainly did not prove such to them. If a wrong was done in the admission of Texas, why not rectify it? Why not Republicans act as boldly for the cause of Freedom, as Democrats for that of Slavery?

But the objection of these smart dough-faces does not possess quite as much force as they seem to suppose. Texas, it must be remembered, is already admitted into the Union as a State, and we can apply the doctrine of exclusion to all States to be admitted hereafter, without applying it to the subdivision of a State already in the Union.

As for opposition to slavery extension beyond such an extreme anti-slavery doctrine, we may remark that it is a doctrine held by Thomas Jefferson, who was probably as good a Democrat and patriot as any modern dough-face in the country.

Thomas Christian, formerly of Friendsville, in this county, died recently at his residence in Detroit, Michigan. He was born in this State, January 20, 1787. He removed to Detroit in 1834, and became connected with the Detroit Daily Advertiser, and afterwards acted as Justice of the Peace in that city for several years. He was noted for industry in business, and the most exact and indefeasible honesty in dealing, and for every virtue which befits the exemplary citizen, the devoted husband and the affectionate parent. He raised a large family who now survive as useful men and women to mourn his loss.

Mr. Christian left behind him a certificate of his membership of the first anti-slavery Society ever formed in Philadelphia, dated about half a century since and signed by the venerable Caspar Wistar.

**Sham Democracy and Personal Liberty.**

The alarming and unprecedented infraction of State and personal rights, committed by Judge Kane in imprisoning Esamiers Williamson, has received the sanction of the sham Democrats who constitute a large majority of the present House of Representatives of Pennsylvania. That party, it seems, is no longer the advocate of State Rights, but is in favor of a tame submission to Federal encroachments, which tend to concentrate all power in the general government. Herein they are as antagonistic to the doctrines of the old Jeffersonian Republicanism, as in their advocacy of the spread of human slavery. If things were called by their right names, these men should be called Federalists instead of Democrats; for they support Federal encroachment in opposition to the rights of the individual States. As far as their voice in the House is an index, the party in Pennsylvania are unanimous in opposing any action by this Commonwealth for the protection of her citizens against arbitrary and unlawful imprisonment. They hold that not only the blacks of the South, but the 'free white men' for whose benefit President Pierce says this Republic was formed, must be deprived of their liberty, whenever the interests of the slave-holders may seem to require it. They are in favor of opening, not only the Territories, but the Free States to the encroachments of slavery. The dictum of Judge Kane, that slave-holders have a right to bring their human chattels into Pennsylvania, to retain the custody of them while here, and to carry them back against their will into the slave-holding States, has been re-affirmed, and the position of the Judge strengthened, by the Pennsylvania Legislature.

A resolution introduced into the House, looking to a movement for preserving the dignity of the Commonwealth and the rights of her citizens, was rejected by a party vote, as appears by the following extract from the proceedings:

Mr. Mosman offered the following resolution: That the committee on the Judiciary be instructed to inquire if further legislation be necessary to protect the personal liberty of citizens of the Commonwealth, against the arbitrary proceedings of the Courts of the United States extending jurisdiction within this Commonwealth. This was twice read and negatived—yeas 31; nays 46.

Yeas—Messrs. Augustine, Baldwin, Ball, Barry, Brown, Caldwell, Clevor, Crawford, Dock, Gaylord, Gibbons, Haines, Hamilton, Holcomb, House, Husker, Imbrie, Ingam, Kerr, Laporte, Lott, McCann, McNeel, Moorhead, Morris, Munson, Phelps, Purcell, Reed, Struble, and Winrod—31.

Nays—Messrs. Anderson, Beckus, Beck, Bernard, Boyd, Boyer, Bush, Campbell, Cary, Craig, Dowdall, Edinger, Foster, Fry, Fulton, Getz, Hamel, Hanes, Hays, Hays, Hibbs, Hill, Hilles, Hippen, Huncker, Inis, Irwin, Johns, Johnson, Lebo, Leisinger, Longaker, Lorent, McCarty, Magee, (Allegheny), Mank, Maugle, Menar, Miller, Montgomery, Nunnacker, Orr, Patterson, Banes, Reinhold, Ridge, Roberts, Robinson, Salsbury, Shenk, Smith, (Allegheny), Smith, (Cambria), Smith, (Philadelphia), Smith (Wyoming), Thomson, Vall, Walter, (Dough), Wright, (Lancaster), Yearles, Zimmerman, and Wright, Speaker—46.

The Philadelphia Daily News has heretofore labored to excuse the course of Henry M. Fuller, on the ground that Banks was a Free Trader, and therefore inimical to the interests of Pennsylvania. Now Mr. Fuller has voted for William Aiken, of South Carolina. Aiken is a strong Free Trade man, a fierce anti-Know Nothing, a pro-slavery Democrat, who has voted all along for Richardson and Orr for Speaker, and is a supporter of President Pierce's administration. Will even the News have the face to attempt to defend Fuller's course longer?

The Good Templar is the name of a new monthly magazine, devoted, as its name imports, to the Temperance cause, published at St. Louis, Mo., by B. H. Mills, formerly of Montrose.

It is a thirty-two page Magazine, handsomely executed, and its contents are valuable. It has been adopted as the official organ of the Order of Good Templars of the United States. We wish friend Mills success. The Good Templar is published at one dollar a year in advance.

**Fuller on Slavery, in 1849.**

Henry M. Fuller was the Whig Candidate for Canal Commissioner in 1849, and among his speeches from the stump during that campaign, was one at Allegheny, from which the following is an extract:

"Another great question of political economy was now agitating the public mind—the question of the further extension of slavery. For his part, he held to the compromises of the constitution, since that constitution was passed at the expense of the blood of our citizens, both North and South, but he would not be willing to see Slavery extended. Let the people of the South talk as they pleased, Slavery was a dark and damning stain upon their escutcheon. Let us yield them then all the constitution requires on this point, but nothing more. Let us say to the proud warriors of Slavery, as they beat against the barriers of freedom, 'thus far shall thou go, and no farther,' and as our glorious country grows larger and larger, let liberty extend its arms. Let us give our land, free in every sense of the word, to our citizens, and to the poor and oppressed of other nations. The inhabitants of this part of the country were located in the neighborhood of both free and slave States, and had an opportunity of comparing the respective merits of the two systems. A few years ago, the great State of Ohio was a wilderness. There were only two places where a clearing was made, and the principal forest retained, namely, at Cincinnati and Marietta. Yet it is now a great State that Virginia, which boasts of being a century old. Why, he had seen it stand recently, on very good authority, that there was a greater demand for shipping in the State of Ohio, than in all the Slave States of Maryland, and that the comparative benefits of freedom and slavery could clearly be seen.

"There was one singular fact relative to the great staple of the South, cotton, which he begged leave to mention. It actually commanded a less price in foreign markets now than it did under the tariff of 1842—As lovers of freedom we had a duty to perform towards the South. Let us do it with a proper regard to our friends there, but let us insist on the earliest practical abolition of slavery."

**CONGRESSIONAL.**  
**END OF THE GREAT STRUGGLE.**  
Triumph of the Republicans—Banks elected Speaker—103 Yeas; Aiken, 100; Fuller, 6; Campbell, 4.

Editorial Correspondence of the N. Y. Tribune, WASHINGTON, Saturday, Feb. 2, 1856. The first vote under the Plurality Rule is over, and NATHANIEL P. BANKS is elected Speaker of the Thirty-fourth Congress. He has 103 yeas to 100 for William Aiken, and eleven scattering. The excitement is intense.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. WASHINGTON, Saturday, Feb. 2, 1856. Mr. Smith of Tennessee, said he had heretofore voted against the Plurality Rule, but yesterday's vote indicated some change of opinion, as Speaker, of a man of sound national views, he now offered a resolution for the adoption of that rule.

The House, by 10 majority, refused to lay the resolution on the table. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 113 against 104. Mr. Orr then unconditionally withdrew his name as the Democratic caucus candidate—there being now a probability that greater strength can be concentrated on his colleague, Mr. Aiken.

Mr. Boyce moved to rescind the resolution. The motion to rescind was laid on the table by a vote of 117 against 101. [Applause.] Mr. Jones (Tenn.) referring to the terms of the resolution—that if no election by a majority take place during the next three trials, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes on the fourth vote be elected Speaker—remarked that the Republicans are drilled and ready for the contest; and in order to give an opportunity for other gentlemen to come here understandingly, moved an adjournment till Monday.

The motion was disagreed to by 84 against 133. [Applause.] Impatient cries of 'Call the roll!' 'Call the roll!' Mr. Walker moved to rescind the plurality resolution. The House decided the motion to be out of order, by 45 majority.

Mr. Paine moved that the House adjourn. The motion was agreed to with yeas in the galleries, and on the vote being taken, the announcement that the House refused to adjourn, was received with applause from the same quarter.

Mr. Orr said if the House was to be annoyed by applause in the galleries, he would move to clear them excepting that portion occupied by ladies.

Mr. Paine made an impassioned appeal for the Plurality Rule, and the House proceeded to take the first ballot of the four, as follows:

Aiken.....103 Fuller.....14 Banks.....93 Wells.....2 L. D. Campbell, 4.

Necessary for choice, 108. Messrs. Barclay and Hickman voted for Wells, and Messrs. Dunn, Harrison, Moore, and Scott, for Mr. Campbell.

The second vote, excepting Mr. Fuller lost one, was the same as the first. The third was the same as the second, excepting Aiken lost one.

Mr. Fuller repeated what he had said on two former occasions, namely that he was not and did not desire to be a candidate. One hundred and thirty votes had satisfied him that he was not the choice of majority of the House, and on no other terms or conditions would he consent to take that position.

Mr. Barclay remarked that he had been averse to anything like coalition with Know Nothingism, whether it came from the North or the South. He asked Mr. Aiken whether the latter stood on the Democratic Caucus Platform, and whether he had not written a letter to Humphrey Marshall, making pledges to the Southern wing of the Know Nothing.

Mr. Aiken—I am not a candidate for the Speakership; if my friends think proper to place me in the Chair, I will serve them to the best of my ability.

Humphrey Marshall—I have only to say that Mr. Aiken has addressed me no letter whatever. [Applause, and cries of 'Call the roll, &c.'] The excitement was intense during the final ballot.

Mr. A. K. Marshall, during the call of the roll, congratulated his American friends, saying that they had fought a good fight and conquered. There was now no Democratic candidate in the field with an offensive caucus platform. Performing duty as a patriot and not as a partisan, he voted for Aiken.

Mr. Walker voted the same way as concerning Mr. Aiken a man with no claim of mere partisanship on his skirts—a man who had not sought office, but to whom office is tendered, and is true to the Constitution.

Messrs. Paine and Lindsey, (K. N.'s) voted for Mr. Aiken, knowing him to be a national man.

Mr. Smith of Ala., voted for Mr. Aiken under protest.

Other gentlemen vainly sought to make explanations, the greatest confusion existing. Several gentlemen now changed their votes, and were greeted with applause for doing so, and impatient cries "Announce the vote!" "Announce the vote!" The lobby was crowded to suffocation, and the excitement was increased by the startling cry that a boy was being crushed to death by the pressure in the galleries. Some of the members shouted out: "Fall back, fall back," and others: "Hand him over the rail!" The boy was at length released from his imminent danger.

"Announce the vote," was now shouted from all parts of the House.

The Clerk then read the vote as follows: Banks.....103 L. D. Campbell.....4 Aiken.....100 Wells.....2 Fuller.....6

Mr. Benson, one of the tellers, then declared that Mr. Banks was elected Speaker. Defeating shouts of applause followed from the Republican side and other quarters of the House. The ladies waived their handkerchiefs in the galleries. For several minutes the disorder was beyond description.

Mr. A. K. Marshall raised the question that Mr. Banks was not elected, saying the Clerk had no power to authorize such a result to be announced. It must be so declared by the vote of the House.

The Clerk explained, giving reasons which appeared to be satisfactory for his conduct.

Mr. Campbell of Ohio, appealed to the honor of gentlemen to carry the plurality resolution into effect, and end this disgraceful contest.

Mr. Cobb regarded Mr. Banks as virtually elected by a majority of the House under the plurality rule.

Mr. Aiken asked to be allowed to conduct Mr. Banks as Speaker to the Chair. (Applause.)

Mr. Smith of Ala., highly appreciated Mr. Aiken's request. If granted he thought it would heal divisions, and pour oil on troubled waters. When grown up men make a child's bargain they ought to stick to it. (Laughter.)

After further debate, Mr. Clingman offered a resolution declaring that by reason of the adoption of the plurality rule and the vote taken under it, Mr. Banks had been duly chosen Speaker, and is hereby so declared. This passed by Yeas 154; Nays, 39.

Several gentlemen explained, though they had consistently voted against Mr. Banks, they felt bound as judges, not as electors, to carry out the order of the House by voting for the above resolution.

Mr. Banks was, by request of the Clerk, conducted to the Chair by Messrs. Aiken, Fuller, (Penn.) and Campbell, (Ohio).

He was greeted with loud and enthusiastic cheers, and amid the profound silence which followed, said:

Before I proceed to complete the acceptance of the office, you have conferred upon me a great honor, and I am obliged to you for the obligation for the honor. It would afford me greater pleasure were it accompanied even by the self-assurance that I would bring to the discharge of arduous and delicate duties, always difficult, but now ennobled with unusual difficulties, any capacity commensurate with their responsibility and dignity.

I can only say I shall bear myself with fidelity to the interests and institutions of our free Government, and with impartiality so far as regards the rights of the members of this house. I have no personal objects to accomplish. I am animated by a single desire of contributing in some little degree to the maintenance of the well-established principles of our Government, in the original American significance—in developing the position of equality, and in extending as far as we may do within the power conferred upon us, enlarging and swelling its capacities for beneficent influences at home and abroad, and maintaining intact and in perpetuity the inalienable privileges transmitted to us. I am aware neither myself nor any other man is equal to the perfect accomplishment of these duties. I am, therefore, as a man, proud to be in such a presence, and as a citizen, to be in such a contest. I again return to you my thanks for the honor you have conferred upon me.

Applause, defending and long continued, followed.

Mr. Giddings being the oldest Member of the House, administered the oath to Mr. Banks, by request of the Clerk.

Mr. Stanton then offered the following resolution: That the thanks of the House be emphatically and are hereby tendered, to John W. Forney for the distinguished ability, fidelity and impartiality with which he has presided over the deliberations of this House during the arduous and protracted contest for Speaker.

**Union of the Democratic Party.**

An earnest desire is expressed by many to keep the Democratic party united, and especially to have all Democrats act in concert in the Presidential election. But few, however, of even those who are most ardent and astute seem to think it of much moment to take into account political principles in effecting or continuing this union. It would be difficult, perhaps, for them to tell what constitutes Democracy in 1856. The Democratic party rendered in its day great and important services, and accomplished the purposes for which it was instituted. But the Bank, the Currency, the Deposits, the Independent Treasury, and other incidental questions connected with the finances, are no longer in controversy. Until they were disposed of, there were antagonistic parties engaged in a great intellectual and political struggle for their adjustment.

One of the parties engaged in that mighty contest, extending through a period of twenty years, found the verdict of the country emphatically against it, and practical experience and observation have satisfied the minority that the views of their opponents were less objectionable than they had imagined, and the result is the detached party has abandoned its organization, and no longer has an existence. There are no differences of opinion among the people in relation to party questions. Instead of being issues, they have become matters of history. Of the giant needs that entered on that great struggle, few, comparatively remain. Jackson, Wright, Forsyth, Woodbury and Grundy, with Webster, Clay and Berrien, are no longer among us. Benton, who stood second to none in zeal, ability, service and resolution, survives; but those who are talking of the union of the Democratic party would scarcely admit that this veteran soldier of thirty years belongs to what they now call the Democratic party. He, meanwhile, would probably be as little disposed to recognize those who have adopted the name, as the same men, who under the lead of himself and others, fought the real battles of Democracy in years that are gone.

There is an Administration party in the country, and great efforts are made to strengthen it by appropriating to it the name of Democracy, and thus giving it the benefits of those services which other and better minds have achieved. But is there any analogy between them? The administration party of 1856 bears no more comparison with the Democratic party of 1836 than do the qualities of Franklin Pierce with those of Andrew Jackson. One elevated the name of Democracy, and the Government; the other has degraded both. While even opponents were compelled to respect and admire the stern patriotism and elevated tone of the administration twenty years ago, the supple friends of this Administration feel their inability to defend it on its own merits, and strive in vain to connect it with the past.

The men most anxious to maintain this Administration, and as solicitous as any to baptize it with a name that Jackson, Benton and their associates earned, are the Cushings and Wisnes and Toombses that gather round them who were the violent opponents of the Democratic party, so long as the old issues were maintained. These and their associates not only shape and direct the policy of this Administration, but they are the managers of the proposed Cincinnati Convention, in connection with the nullifiers, those implacable opponents of Jackson. He must be a superficial observer who is not aware that the present Administration party is the reverse of that which twenty years since gave character to the country. Those who rule in its councils were the antagonists of the Democratic party in the days of its renown.

Mr. Pierce was elected to the Presidency, and associated with the Democratic party, a man of pleasure, of too idling habits, for investigating himself, but relying on the labors of Wright and Benton and others, to whose views he conformed. But Cushing and Wise were also then in Congress, opposing with all the zeal, industry, and ability they possessed, every measure of the Democracy; Jefferson Davis came into Congress at a later period, and the pupil and disciple of nullification, and active for years in getting up conventions under the promptings of Mr. Calhoun, to enforce his peculiar and provincial policy. These are the leading men of the Administration party, the Mentors that have taken the place of Wright and Benton with the President; they are arranging for a President at Cincinnati, and it is earnestly to be desired that Democrats will unite to sustain their nomination.

In the long-delayed organization of the House of Representatives—the candidates of the Administration party, the Speaker, as well as the whole proceedings of the Administration itself, there is little to commend itself to the old Democrats, of indeed to any party. In presenting Mr. Richardson as a man of admitted ability, and of the high character which had been the chairman of the committee that reported the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise, an insult was offered to the whole of the Free States; and when, finally, after obstructing the operations of the Government until the people were becoming restive, they changed their candidate, Mr. Orr, a South Carolina nullifier, was substituted for Richardson, and the people were thus introduced to a man whose policy, and features that disclose the policy of the Administration party, but nothing that identifies it with the measures or the men of the Democratic party.

Extreme anxiety is manifested among a certain class to surrender themselves to the decrees and management of the Convention at Cincinnati, regardless of all principles—past, present and future—a Convention in which the substantial Democracy of the Free States, on the old financial, political, and moral issues, will be represented. Most of the better friends will refuse to ally themselves to that intrigue, for they have the sagacity to perceive that it is a mere contrivance to promote the designs of the nullifiers and renegade politicians who are associated with them, whose aim is to prolong the policy of this Administration.

Whether the candidate proposed shall be Pierce, Buchanan, or Bright, is of little moment; the policy which the nullifiers have introduced under this administration, they propose to continue in the future, through the instrumentality of the Cincinnati Convention. Intensely partisan itself, the administration compels its retainers to be not less so. The letter which Mr. Attorney-General Cushing wrote at an early day to Massachusetts, and which Mr. Secretary Davis telegraphed to Mississippi, announcing that it was the President's intention to extend the Federal Government to "crush out opinions" in the States that did not conform to the standard which the nullifiers and Whigs had established at Washington, was a misative to every Custom-house officer, Postmaster, Attorney, Marshal and Law officer in the country. Hence, the Government officials, scattered over the country, are all engaged in the same view—to promote its party schemes and views—to see that delegates are duly elected to the Administration Convention, and to unite all whom they can seduce into that great intrigue, under the delusive pretext that it is a scheme to unite the Democracy. Unite it in what?—for what object?—for what principle? Not for Pierce, Jefferson or Jackson, or, indeed, for any object that preceded the present incumbent.

Three young ladies out west were recently suffocated by sleeping in a close room which had become filled with charcoal gas from the stove.

The professional engagement of Jenn Lind in England is to continue five months, for one thousand pounds a week. She sings for three concerts a week.

- FOR WILLIAM AIKEN.
- T. J. D. Fuller, NEW YORK.
  - John Kelley, NEW YORK.
  - John Wheeler, A. N.
  - John Williams, NEW JERSEY.
  - George Vail, PENNSYLVANIA.
  - Thos. B. Florence, JOHN CADWALLADER, J. GLANCY JOYCE, MARYLAND.
  - James A. Stewart, James B. Ricard, James M. Harris, Henry W. Hoffner, Thomas F. Bowie, VIRGINIA.
  - John S. Millison, JOHN CASKE, William O. Goode, Thos. S. Boock, Paulus Powell, Wm. Smith, Chas. J. Faulkner, John V. Wright, Zedekiah Kidwell, John S. Carlisle, J. A. Edmundson, Fayette McMillen, NORTH CAROLINA.
  - Smith Miller, Wm H. English, ILLINOIS.
  - Thomas L. Harris, James C. Allen, Samuel S. Marshall, MISSOURI.
  - Luther M. Kennett, Gilbert Porter, Jas J. Lindsey, Mordcai Oliver, John S. Phelps, Samuel Caruthers, ARKANSAS.
  - A. B. Greenwood, Albert Rust, MICHIGAN.
  - George W. Peck, FLORIDA.
  - Augustus E. Maxwell, IOWA.
  - Lennel H. Bell, AUGUSTUS HALL, WISCONSIN.
  - Daniel Wells, CALIFORNIA.
  - James W. Denver, Phillip T. Herbert, Total.....100.
- Democrats in Roman; Know Nothings in Italian. Three elected as Anti-Nebraska Democrats, marked "A. N."
- RECAPITULATION.
- For Banks.....103 Present but not voted.....3
  - For Fuller.....6 Absent.....16
  - For Campbell.....4 Vacancy.....1
  - For Wells.....2
  - The whole House.....234.

**To the Republicans throughout the United States.**

REPUBLICAN ROOMS, WASHINGTON, D. C. January 17, 1856.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned have been appointed a Committee on the part of the Association whose Declaration, Platform, and Constitution, accompany this, to address a circular letter to our Republican friends, urging upon their attention the importance of immediate and thorough organization of Clubs or Associations, somewhat similar to our own, in every town and village in the Union.

The power and influence of these organizations cannot be over-estimated by the friends of Freedom. They are all-important to carry on a political campaign, and will be a matter of impossibility to compete with those arrayed against us in the approaching contest, without them. They are the most powerful and only efficient means for bringing out, concentrating and utilizing our own, our free strength. They will serve to rally the people, inspire them with confidence and enthusiasm, and furnish the information necessary to expose and fairly meet the sophistry of pro-slavery demagogues. We have seen the power of these Associations fully manifested in recent elections. Let the friends of Freedom learn wisdom, even from their enemies.

We go into the contest as a new and untried party, opposed to a well organized party, party, opposed and backed by Government patronage or bound together by old party ties. We must compel these parties to show where they stand on the only great issue now before the country—Slavery or Freedom.

We must force them to bury themselves on one side or the other of this question, and consider every man who is not openly and avowedly on the side of Freedom, as against it. How, then, is this to be done, unless the friends of Freedom are themselves united? And how can they be better and more efficiently united than by these organizations?

Again we recommend prompt organization. If there be but six persons in your town who sympathize with you in this movement, or organize with these six. Do not despair. If a few more are to be organized, you will find immediate operation in Washington City, under the immediate frown of the National Government, and dedicated to Slavery, where is there the city, town, or village, in the North, East, or West, that cannot do likewise?

We appeal, sir, to you, to make this a personal duty—to set about at once bringing the friends of the Republican Movement together, for the purpose of organization on a platform similar to the one which accompanies this, and which you will find so liberal on the Slavery question, that every man, who is not entirely wedded to Slavery and its interests, may stand upon it, without its interfering with any of his former party predilections.

**THE FINAL VOTE FOR SPEAKER.**

- FOR NATHANIEL P. BANKS.
- John J. Perry, PENNSYLVANIA.
  - Elbenzer Knowlton, S. C. Bradshaw, Samuel P. Benson, Israel Wasserman, JOHN C. KUNKEL, JAMES PIKE, MAISON W. TAPPAN, Aaron H. Cragin, MASSACHUSETTS.
  - Robert B. Hall, James Buffington, Wm. S. Darnell, Linus B. Conins, Anson Burdgame, JOHN B. BISHOP, CHAUNCEY L. KNAPP, Alexander Dewitt, Calvin C. Chaffee, Mark Trafion, VERMONT.
  - James Meacham, Justin S. Morrill, Alvah Sablin, CONN. STATE.
  - Nathaniel B. Delee, Benj. B. Thurston, CONNEXICUT.
  - Ezra Clark, jr., John Woodruff, Sidney Dean, Wm. W. Welch, NEW YORK.
  - Jas. S. T. Stranahan, Guy H. Rector, James H. Murray, Rufus H. King, Killian Miller, Russell Sage, Samuel Dixon, Edward Dodd, George A. Simmons, Francis E. Spinner, Thomas B. Horton, Orans B. Matteson, Henry Bennett, Andrew Z. McCarthy, William A. Gilbert, Amos P. Grainger, Edwin B. Morgan, Andrew Oliver, John M. Parker, William H. Kelsey, Benjamin Pringle, THOMAS T. FLAGLER, NEW JERSEY.
  - Isiah I. Clawson, George B. Robbins, Total.....108.

For Aiken.....100 Wells.....2 Fuller.....6