The immediate cause of the recent outbreak in Kansas, which is now raging fearfully in that distracted country, may be traced directly to the pro-slavery party. For two months previous to the outbreak some two or three hundred men, mostly from Georgia and South Carolina, has been quartering themselves in various places in the Territory, openly declaring their intension of regulating the Free State people in their vicinity, and erected for themselves sort of forts, some of which I learn were built of logs with double walls and filled between with rock. And from these places of refuge these marauders were in the habit of sallying forth at intervals and committing all manner of depredations upon unoffending Free State settlers, frequently stealing their horses, cattle and hogs, and occasionally committing a robbery and even murder.

One of these commissaries were quartered within two squares of my house for most of the time I remained in the country—and four of their number one night a few weeks ago attempted to steal the horses of a near neighbor of mine, but being discovered after breaking the lock on the stable, they fled, and were watched until they entered their quarters.—And truly thus things went on until on the 13th day of August, a party of these men, near Washington creek murdered in cold blood a man by the name of Hoyt, who resided at Lawrence, and the murderers took refuge in their fort. I am informed that the authorities at Lecompton, and an officer in command of the United States troops were notified of this outrage and were requested to arrest and cause the offender to be brought to justice—but this outrage like scores before committed upon Free State men, was permitted to pass unnoticed.

At this stage of affairs the free State people of Lawrence, and its vicinity resolved that they would themselves rout these parties from their strongholds, and commenced by making the attack upon the party at Franklin, which resulted in capturing the party, at a loss of one of their own men killed and five wounded—none of the other party receiving any injury. An attack was soon after made upon two other places, at which something of a fight ensued, which finally resulted in capturing the party forted up, at a loss of two free State men killed and one of the other party, and others wounded. No attack whatever was made upon Lecompton or demonstrations to rescue the prisoners in custody of the United States troops.

On the 16th of Aug. W. C. Hopps, from Illinois, was brutally murdered, shot through the head and then actually scalped. The fiend who committed this outrage was well known in Leavenworth, and I was informed that he exhibited the scalp to his comrades at Leavenworth, that night and received a pair of boots which he claimed to have won in a bet that he would take the scalp of an abolitionist before night.

Mr. Hopps and his wife landed at Leavenworth on the 13th of August—had taken his wife out to Lawrence to see a sister, and was returning alone and within three miles of Leavenworth, when he was thus barbarously murdered. A few days after this murder, Mrs. Hopps, in company with her brother-in-law, Mr. Nute, started from Lawrence for Leavenworth, intending to get the body of her husband and take it to Lawrence for interment. On their way, and within five or six miles of Leavenworth, they were captured, taken prisoners and brought into Leavenworth. On the following day this poor woman was thrust aboard a descending boat and thus forced to separate from her friend, (who was detained a prisoner,) and without money or clothing, save that on her person, she was compelled to leave the country. Mr. Nute was sent out a prisoner to their camp, to meet whatever fate these irresponsible ruffians may see fit to inflict upon him. On the same day a German by the name of Bemmerle was shot dead in the streets of Leavenworth at the command of a Captain of one of these companies of Kansas militia, because some one chose to suspect him of being a spy.

All the roads leading into the country from Leavenworth have been blockaded for some time by armed parties called the militia of Kansas, which are composed mostly of citizens of Missouri, and many worthy peaceable and unoffending persons have been seized, robbed of their wagons, teams, and every thing they had, and they themselves taken as prisoners to their camp. I saw and conversed with four gentlemen sturdy intelligent farmers, who reside in Wapello Co., Iowa.—They came to look at the country, crossing the river at the fort; they then came to Leavenworth City. Stopping one day with an acquaintance, they started in the country, travelling in company with two wagons and four good horses and before they had gone ten miles were taken, robbed of their wagons and horses, and they themselves taken prisoners to the camp of the militia, and being thus detained for several days, finally being furnished with a pass, they were permitted to foot it to Leavenworth. For weeks these companies have been patrolling the streets of Leavenworth by day and by night, breathing the most bitter curses and threats against all free State men—the pretext of abolitionism no longer exists—but the war of extermination has been openly declared and the actual execution of these threats is going on against the free State people indiscriminately.

The first day of this month was election day at Leavenworth for municipal officers, and the Free State people fearing violence had generally resolved not to go to the polls—one of them however presumed to attempt to vote, and some one cried out shoot him. shoot him—and the last I heard of him two men were chasing him with muskets.

On the same day at Leavenworth, three men surrendered up their lives—one had been shot the night before and died on that day.—About ten o'clock on that day the dwelling of one of my nearest neighbors was attacked by a company of about sixty men of the Kansas militia. I saw the company approaching—saw them halt immediately in front of the house—saw four at their head ride off a few steps and stop, huddled together for a moment, as though they were consulting, and then rode back to their places—heard the command given to surround the house. Two men alighted from their horses and walked to the house, and about the time they reached the portico I heard the report I should judge of twenty or thirty guns fired almost simultaneously into the second story of the building. The scene that ensued would require a master hand to describe. I can therefore only give you a faint idea of it. There were three lady boarders and some children, besides the females belonging to the family, in the house at that time. Mrs. Baily, the wife of a banker at Leavenworth, lay sick in the house and was unable to move from her bed. The rest of the females and those of the neighborhood were running in every direction, screaming and wringing their hands. A gentleman by the name of Philips kept the house, and a brother and a nephew boarded with him. They were all at home and no other men in the house at the time of the attack. After the excitement had partially passed off it was ascertained that Wm. Philips was killed, and his brother badly wounded—supposed to be mortally. The other had taken refuge in the cellar, and upon the other party promising not to hurt him, he surrendered himself into their hands. It was also ascertained that one of the attacking company had been killed and two wounded. The one that was killed resided in Platte county, Missouri, and leaves a family. During the period of my acquaintance with this family of Philips, which was for about two months, their deportment had been that of quiet, peaceable citizens. I have never heard of the first charge against the character of either, save and except that they were decided free State men.

Wm. Philips is the same person who had been on a former occasion, perhaps a year ago, taken by a mob and carried over to Weston, Mo., and there tarred and feathered, rode on a rail, and then sold at auction to a negro for a dollar. His wife is now in the Insane Asylum at Jacksonville in this State, her insanity being attributed to the barbarous treatment to her husband.

And these law and order men as they style themselves, not being satisfied after taking the life of Wm. Philips, sought further revenge upon his already afflicted widow and child by burning and destroying on Monday night two houses which he left them, and also, at the same time, they burned a store, goods and all, belonging to Mr. Weatherel, another free State man.

I left Leavenworth City early last Tuesday morning. The greater portion of the free State people left before that time, some of whom were forced to abandon their homes. At St. Louis I met with several citizens of Leavenworth, who came down on the next boat, and they informed me that they and their families were marched to the boat between files of men and compelled to leave their homes.

Soon after settling in Kansas, I addressed a letter to Hon. Wm. A. Richardson at Washington City, in which I set forth the horrible condition of affairs in the territory, and thro' him petitioned the Government, to correct the evils and use efficient means to stay the ruthless hand of oppression and wrong, and at the proper time I anxiously awaited an answer to that letter but none ever came—other letters mailed at the same time went to their respective places of destination. I therefore concluded it was duly received—but why he should thus neglect an old friend and constituent, I must leave to your own conjecture.

My Democratic friends will remember that both Judge Douglas and Col. Richardson loudly proclaimed to the people of Illinois in justification of their course in repealing the Missouri compromise, that by the Kansas bill the people of the Territory were guaranteed the right to regulate their own institutions—adopt Slavery or reject the institution as a majority of the people might determine—have the citizens of Kansas enjoyed and been protected in this right— truth claims the answer they have not.

And these very men who were so clamorous for popular Sovereignty have permitted their own off-spring to be beheaded, and embowelled alive—crushed by the iron rule of an armed invasion, and then when the people, American citizens, who had gone over there with their families to make for themselves homes in a new country, shall presume to remonstrate against such oppression, and petition Congress for relief—their petitions are treated with insult, and the harsh epithet is hurled back in their face "we will subdue you" comes from these apostles of squatter Sovreignty. The free State people of Kansas, ask the sympathy of all good men, especially do they appeal to the voters of the free States, confidently relying upon them, to remove the yoke of oppression and tyranny thus wrongfully imposed upon an unoffending people.

I have now given you my views of affairs in Kansas, together with a fair and candid statement of facts coming under my own observation, and derived from other reliable sources of information. And in view of all these things, and the position and policy of the administration in regard to Kansas, in upholding the power of a ruthless mob in subverting the most vital principles of civil liberty, and that policy being endorsed by the leading democrats throughout the nation, I am therefore compelled from sympathy with my fellow citizens of Kansas who have been thus enslaved and for the preservation of my own reputation and that of my children after me, to proclaim that I am no longer a member of that party.

THE WORDS OF A VETERAN.—A public meeting of Democrats favorable to the election of Fremont and Dayton was held in Philadelphia last week. Prominent among those in attendance were John M. Read, Esq., William V. Pettit, William J. Duane, formerly Secretary of the Treasury under Gen. Jackson, and others of like years and experience. The venerable Mr. Duane, in the course of his remarks, used the following language:

I am a Democrat. I have long been in the ranks—and am yet a Democrat. Sixty years ago, I stood under this roof, and saw Washington surrendering the seals of office to his successor. At that time I was a boy, in the office of the Philadelphia Gazette, learning the art and mystery of a printer. The first article I ever set up with type was Washington's Farewell Address. I cherished the principle of liberty very young. I attended whenever I could obtain a few hour's liberty, to listen to that great man, Thomas Jefferson, who sat there, where Mr. Read sits now, in this very room. Could there have been a better school for me to learn Democracy?—Is it not natural, from my experience, that I should know something about the politics of the day? Almost twenty-three years I have been out of political life. I feel at a loss now how to condense my thoughts—I have so much to say. I have always been a Democrat and nothing else. I am every day denounced as a traitor, because I wish to vote for principles, not men. I was in the State Legislature when the slavery agitation took place—some forty years ago. I drew up resolutions at that time denouncing the increase of the slave power. I think that I am still in the Democratic ranks. I wish I could call up from their graves the men who worked with me some forty years ago. If I could we would not have any slavery agitation at present. I am no office seeker—never sought an office in my life. The newspapers cannot say this of me. Mr. Buchanan is well known to me, and if he was in adversity I would not wait to be called upon to assist him, but I would go at once; but as he is now taking a load upon his shoulders, I cannot carry him and his load too. I hope this organization will be carried out. It is an idea that should have been broached long ago. Gentlemen, you do not know my feelings in relation to this matter.

☞ The Missouri Army, which recently went into Kansas to attack Lawrence, committed numerous robberies and outrages on their retreat to Missouri. They burned three or four houses in and about the town of Franklin, and drove off between 300 and 400 cattle belonging to the free State settlers.—Governor Geary was informed of this, but made no effort to arrest the criminals. He contented himself with saying that he should write to their commander, General Reid, who was "a very fine man," and would see the plunder returned. Very likely.

☞ One of Douglas's friends writes to him from Kansas that—"he does'nt believe they will ever have peace in Kansas till Abolitionists and ministers are put down."

Put down the Abolitionists and ministers—that's modern Democracy!

VIRTUE, LIBERTY AND INDEPENDENCE

The Independent Republican.

C. F. READ & H. H. FRAZIER, EDITORS.

MONTROSE PA.

Thursday, October 16, 1856.

REPUBLICAN TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT,
JOHN CHARLES FREMONT.
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

The Election in Susquehanna County.

We have not yet full returns from this county, but those we have received give the following majorities, which will have to satisfy our readers till we publish the official vote next week:

The Republicans have these majorities—Auburn, 126; Ararat, 40; Bridgewater, 23; Brooklyn, 114; Dimock, 87; Forest Lake, 8; Friendsville, 4; Great Bend, 84; Gibson, 162; Harmony, 45; Harford, 55; Jackson, 75; Jessup, 67; Lenox, 20; Montrose, 100; New Milford, 50; Oakland, 6; Rush, 103; Springville, 86; Susquehanna Depot, 14; Thomson, 8—aggregate, 1274.

The Buchaneers have these majorities—Apolacon, 32; Choconut, 85; Franklin, 11; Liberty, 9; Lathrop, 35; Middletown, 60—aggregate, 232.

The above show a Republican majority in those towns of 1042. The districts to be heard from are Clifford, Dundaff, Herrick, and Silver Lake. All these but Silver Lake will give Republican majorities, making our majority in the county probably between 1100 and 1200. Well done, old Susquehanna.

THE STATE.

This morning (Thursday) the Buchaneers claim to have carried Pennsylvania—which if they have done, it was by colonizing voters, and naturalizing vast numbers of Irish Catholics—and last night they celebrated their victory by firing cannon in Montrose. A telegraphic despatch, received from Philadelphia last evening says that the State has gone 'Democratic' by from 5,000 to 10,000. We are disposed to wait for fuller returns before crediting that statement, and in the mean time consider the result in the State as still doubtful.

The telegraph reports the following which show in the aggregate considerable Shamocratic gains since 1854: Crawford county, 1500 Rep.; Northampton, 2200 Buck; Carbon, 700 Buck; Lycoming, 200 Buck; Sullivan, 200 Rep.; Wyoming, 100 Rep.; Lancaster, 3000 Rep.; Centre, 350 Buck; Pike 530 Buck; Perry 150 Buck; Lehigh 900 Buck; Westmoreland, 1200 Buck; Erie 2000 Rep.; Schuylkill, 1500 Buck; Northumberland, 600 Buck; Cumberland, 300 Buck; Chester, 800 Rep.; Delaware, 500 Rep.; Dauphin, 800 Rep.; York, 1500 Buck; Monroe 1500 Buck; Franklin, 200 Buck; Philadelphia is claimed by the Buchaneers at 5000 majority.

☞ Hon. Galusha A. Grow is re-elected by more than 8000 majority. He runs a little ahead of the Republican ticket in this county. From Bradford and Tioga we have not yet the particulars.

THE WILMOT DISTRICT.—The reported Republican majorities in this congressional district are as follows: Bradford county, 4,000; Tioga, 3,300; Susquehanna, 1,200—in all, 8,500. The majorities in Bradford and Tioga sound large, but they come reported to us very direct, and we are disposed to consider them correct.

☞ E. Reed Myer is elected State Senator, and S. B. Chase and Alfred Hine are elected Representatives by handsome majorities. Wyoming county is reported to have given a small Republican majority, but we have nothing official from many townships. Sullivan is not certain, but a small shamocratic majority there cannot change the result on Representatives. We have done our duty by sending three votes for freedom to the Legislature.

☞ We learn that just before the State election, a report was industriously circulated by the Buchaneers in Dimock and neighboring townships, that Mr. M. C. Brewster had returned from Kansas to Susquehanna county, and was stumping it for Buchanan. There is not a word of truth in the story.—Mr. Browster, like the settlers from the Free States generally, of whatever former political party, is opposed to Buchanan and to the whole policy of the pro-Slavery Shamocracy. At the latest advices from him, received by his mother on Friday last, he was still in Kansas at the town of Topeka. Lexington had been for some days threatened by a band of Border Ruffians lurking in the neighborhood, but about the time an attack was expected a reinforcement of Free State men came on from Plymouth, and the Ruffians, perceiving that their presence was discovered, and that the "Yankees" were prepared to give them a warm reception, beat a hasty retreat. Lexington was afterwards deserted by the Free State men.

If Mr. Brewster should return from Kansas, and tell the truth concerning affairs there, the Buchaneers would denounce him as severely as they do Gov. Reeder for the same offense.

☞ The Cooperstown (N. Y.) Republican and Democrat contains a circular, signed by *five hundred and eighty-nine* citizens, who have heretofore co operated with the American party. They say that having become satisfied that an intrigue is on foot to divert the obligations resting on Americans from their legitimate ends, and being now convinced that to cast a vote for Fillmore is an indirect support of Buchanan, they take this method of publicly avowing their determination to give to the Republican party and to their nominees their earnest, active, and most hearty support.

For the Republican.

"The Issue" Falsely "Stated."

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Under the caption of "The Issue Fairly Stated," appeared the following rare compound of mendacity and faschood in the Border Ruffian organ of this county, week before last:

"Have the people of a Territory, like those of a State, the right to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States! This is the question which American freemen are required to answer through the ballot box in November next. The Democratic party maintains, and the Republican party denies, that they have such right. The issue is plain, and unmistakable. No man who has read the platforms of the two parties, and within whose breast throbs an honest heart, will pretend for one moment that we have not correctly stated the point of difference between them, relating to the subject of Slavery."

Now so far from this being a *true* statement of the issues involved in the present canvass, I submit that it is as false and deceptive as any one could well make it. The author, unless possessed of more stupidity than is common among his kind, knows that there is not a passage in the Platform of either party, that recognizes, even in the remotest manner, such an issue. The nearest and only approach to it is the following from the Cincinnati Platform:

"Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the fairly expressed will of the majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic Slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

Now in the name of consistency, let me ask what there is in the foregoing that even *implies* the right of the citizens of *any* territory to prohibit slavery previous to the formation of a State Government? Not a word. True, it speaks of their "right to *form a State Constitution*, with or without slavery," as they may think proper, but it no where gives countenance to the doctrine that, while in a Territorial condition, the citizens of said Territory have the right to interfere with the institution in question. To assert it, is to assert a lie, patent to even the dullest intellect, and to place one's self outside the pale of credibility. No intelligent, honest man will set up such a pretense.

Nor is such a doctrine supported by any considerable portion of the party—*I mean by* its leaders; by those who make its Platforms and Laws; who will control its policy, and its *President*, too, if it gets one. Ex-Governor Smith, of Virginia, member of the present Congress thus speaks upon the subject:

"*If I had supposed there was any one opinion more universal than any other in the South, it was the opinion that a Territorial Government while it remained in a state of infancy, has no power either to admit or to prohibit Slavery within its limits.* I say that this Congress, this Government, having no right or power whatever to admit Slavery or prohibit it in the Territories, has no right or power to delegate that power to the Territories themselves."

Corroborative also is the following, from a speech in the late session of Congress by Ex-Governor A. G. Brown, of Mississippi—a Patriarch in the party, and one of the organs of the Cincinnati Convention to notify Mr. Buchanan of his nomination:

"It will be seen at once that the line of argument which I have marked out for myself will lead me to consider, to some extent the doctrine of 'squatter sovereignty.' This doctrine, however well designed by its authors, has, in my judgment, been the fruitful source of half our troubles. Before the people of the two sections of the Union, having—as they supposed, though I think erroneously—hostile interests, and already inflamed by angry passions, were invited into the country, we who gave them laws, should have defined clearly and distinctly what were to be their rights after they got there. Nothing should have been left to construction. I believed, when the Kansas bill was passed, that it conferred on the inhabitants of the Territories, during their Territorial existence, *no right* to exclude, or in anywise to interfere with Slavery."

And even that great "champion of Democracy," (as he is dubbed,) J. Glancey Jones, member of Congress from the Berks district, holds the same opinion. In answer to Cox, of Kentucky, he said:

"In my opinion, the Constitution *omits* the power of Congress to the extent of prohibiting them, either from *establishing* or *abolishing* Slavery in the Territories. Admitting that view to be correct, I suppose it follows, as a matter of course, that the Constitution of the United States confers upon the people of the Territory no right to dispossess any man of his right to property, whether it be SLAVE or any other property. And, therefore, the Legislative Council of a Territory, though they may pass laws regulating the disposal and protection of property, have no right to so administer those laws as to establish or abolish the right to hold that property."

Thus you have the leading expounders of "the Democratic Creed," North and South, agreeing to repudiate this miserable dough-face delusion. And even James Buchanan himself, in his famous letter to Sanford, declares the doctrine of "sovereignty" in "*the population of a Territory in an unorganized capacity*," "AN ABSURDITY!" Nor has it ever found support to any great extent among the Border Ruffian Democracy in Congress. Who does not know that the following proposition, offered as an amendment to the Kansas Bill, by Mr. Mace, (a Free Soiler from Indiana,) was voted down in the House by the combination that finally passed the Bill, and which claims to be the "Great Democratic Party?

"And the Legislature of said Territory is hereby clothed with full power, at any session thereof, to establish or prohibit Slavery."

Thus too was the following amendment to the Bill, offered by Mr. Fuller, of Maine, and voted down by the same "Democratic" combination:

"And the Territorial Legislature shall have power to establish or exclude Slavery, as to them seem proper."

In the light of these facts, will it be pretended longer, by *candid, honest* men, that the so-called "Democratic Party" is only struggling for the "right of the people to govern themselves?" Assuredly not. The pretense is a cheat, and those who now use it are either candidates for the Prison or the Mad-House. Which they will reach first, depends much upon "circumstances."

No, no! The "True Issue" is *not* "Squatter Sovereignty," but the extension or non-extension of Slavery. It is the "nationalization" or "sectionalism" of that "institution;" and deluded is he indeed who fails to see it thus. The "Democracy," on the one side, are the especial guardians of slavery, by being confederates of its champions in their labors for its extension; while the Republicans, emulating the example of Jefferson, and the early Fathers of the Government generally, seek to confine it within its present limits, and thus save the Territories of the nation from its pollution and curse. The "Democracy" *throw down barriers* our Fathers opposed to its "diffusion," while the Republicans seek to *restore them*. The Republicans affirm that Kansas is mis-governed—that her government is a rank usurpation—her laws, atrocious and tyrannical. The "Democracy" denies these allegations; strikes hands with the usurpers; gives them "aid and comfort;" and vaunts its determination to "crush out" Freedom there by enforcing the whole Border Ruffian code at the cannon's mouth.—Hence the issue.

No wonder that young men, not wholly lost to shame—not utterly deaf to the voice of conscience—should start back with horror when brought to face such an issue! No wonder that *they* seek to evade it by raising *false* issues in the place of the *true!*

REPUBLICAN.

For the Republican.

Letter to a Buchanan Politician.

R. B. LITTLE ESQ:

DEAR SIR:—Without waiting for answers to the questions propounded to you last week, I proceed to ask others equally important.

First, How happens it that you and your *antipode*, of twenty years standing, C. L. Ward Esq., are now upon the same platform, contending for the same doctrines and measures? you cannot, surely, have forgotten how manfully you, for twenty long years, stood up in argument for the slave and the slave's friends, against the taunts and ridicule of Mr Ward and others in his lead. You can not have forgotten on the one hand, how conclusively and often you demonstrated the right and duty of all patriots and Christians, and especially ministers of the Gospel, to rally under the abolition banner, and yet how persistently, and many times bitterly, he, on the other, opposed, trying to prove from the Bible that slavery is not wrong, that ministers and churches had nothing to do with it—saying, as he did on one occasion, "I am out of patience with the doctrines daily and hourly preached and prayed for. The time is come when we see the cloven-foot." Don't you remember that occasion? "The supremacy of the Law" meeting, in May, 1839, when a leader of the Democracy charged you and others with having "a spirit as fierce and venomous as that of the old serpent, almost."—And when you proposed to reply, how Mr. Ward put you down by claiming the floor. John Comfort, the Harmony democrat, said, "Little shall not speak; he has unsettled the meeting, and has done so before," and Geo. Fuller said, "Little had been the miserable tool of others."

Don't you remember how, in 1835, Mr. Ward advocated the doctrine that the Legislatures of the States ought to adopt Legislative enactments prohibiting the free discussion of the question of immediate abolition of slavery, in the United States, and the measures at present pursued by the anti-slavery Society to promote that object?" Don't you remember the famous presentment of the Grand Jury, of our county, ranking you among *nuisances*, and the great meeting which endorsed that presentment? Pardon me for asking as to your remembrance of those matters, as your memory has been so recently refreshed by a re-endorsement of that presentment, in the re-passage of the resolutions of that meeting, by a so called Democratic county mass meeting of which you were a prominent member, no longer ago than Monday of last Court. All is fresh in your memory. The Presentment, as sustained by Mr. Ward, then a Whig, and opposed by you, an abolitionist, as aggressive upon the Constitutional rights of Freemen, as a document of which the authors *ought* to be, and would be, (as they have been) *ashamed*, is now, after twenty years, re-endorsed, and you among the endorsers!

How is this? how happens it, that C. L. Ward and R. B. Little Esqs., of 1856, are agreed in *deprecating* "the interference of Ministers of the Gospel in matters (so the resolutions read) of such deep and vital importance, and of so exciting a character, as the question of slavery in the Southern States;" and more directly to the point, are agreed in denouncing R. B. Little Esq., of 1837 as a *disturber of "the peace and common tranquillity of the good people of this Commonwealth,"* as being guilty of "*treason without overt* crime?"

It is a common remark that extremes sometimes meet. It appears to be so in this case; but for the life of me I cannot see how, with any degree of moral consistency, it has been done. If Mr. Ward has abandoned his whig principles, and you your anti-slavery principles, for the slavery-propogating Democracy, all may be explained.

But again, and in the second place, how happens it, that you and Geo. Fuller, the man who once, as I have quoted, called you "*the miserable tool of others*," are upon the same platform?

Do you remember an editorial article of his in the *Montrose Volunteer* of Oct., 1837, when he speaks of you as "the *Little* abolition orator?" There he says as follows:—

☞ "The *Little* abolition orator of our village, last week *beautified* a column in the *Spectator* with a senseless article to which he appended as a signature L. The only really intelligible sentence pertaining to it is embraced in the first four lines. We only notice this Lilliputian effort for the purpose of stating that the writer in his abolition fever has overlooked a very material fact, to wit, that the statement had no foundation in fact."

Possibly you may have forgotten your reply. It was so truthful then, so characteristic of a young man, than of noble promise, so true in this latitude now, that I can not refrain from copying it from the *Spectator*, as I find it. It reads as follows:—

"Mr. Fuller has been unusually eloquent in relation to the Communication of L. of week before last. Disregarding his low personalities, not condescending to refute his baleful charge of misrepresentation which all who have read "*Showing the Hand*," and all who have read his past assertions, know to be so, I am only surprised that he should dare to make it.

"*That a Democratic newspaper Editor should think of charging others with misrepresentation is indeed strange. From the* HIGHEST *to the* LOWEST—*from the cedars of Lebanon even to the hyssop that groweth upon the wall*, THEIR PLEBEIAN PENS ARE NEVER USED but to *frame some electioneering story, or to* ASPERSE *some political character, which to their* OWN, is as the SUNBEAM OF HEAVEN to the GLOOM OF EREBUS. *Such* a charge is worthy of *such* a source."

I have given the reply, italicizing and capitalizing some of the words and expressions that the pertinacy of my questions may be the more readily noticed.

How, now, is it that you are upon the same platform with this same Mr. Fuller, writing for these same "Democratic newspapers," associating with these same or similar "*Democratic newspaper Editors*," whose PLEBEIAN PENS are NEVER *used but to* FRAME SOME ELECTIONEERING *story* OR ASPERSE some political character, which to *their own*, is as the *sunbeam* of Heaven to the gloom of *Erebus?*" How is it that you who once gloried in sympathy for the slave, freely submitted to the reproach of "*Bobolition*" "nigger worship," manfully defended the cause of God and humanity, have become of the kith and kin of these Editors, apologizing for slaveholders, denouncing those who stand where you once stood as "*Black* Republicans," and those "ministers of the Gospel" whom you once nobly defended, as *Priests*, and "*desecrators* of the Pulpit? But I have not yet quoted all of your reply to Mr. Fuller, you add:

"Mr. Fuller says the arguments of anti-slavery men touching the Texan question are fallacious, because the number of slaves would not be augmented by the annexation. But would it not *give strength* and *importance* to *slavery principles?* Would not the *evil be greater* and more *difficult of removal?* and would it not be, in us, *equivalent to an express approbation of the system?* Thus Mr. Fuller, while he *rejects* the name of *pro slavery man*," is *adding props to the fabric*. It would seem that he had invested the Moloch of slavery with the sickly hues of his imagination, that he had arrayed it in garments of beauty; and seeing in the image so much *loveliness* and *grace*, HE FALLS PROSTRATE BEFORE IT."

How happens it, that you and Mr. Fuller stand on the Kansas question the same as he stood on the Texas question? Have you both, *while rejecting "the name of pro-slavery man"* become united, in "ADDING PROPS *to the fabric?*" both together "FALLEN PROSTRATE BEFORE IT—the Moloch of slavery?"

Will you explain these matters in your eloquent newspaper communications, and in the speeches you are making in the different Townships and school districts of the county? And oblige

CONSISTENCY.

For the Republican.

The Mass Meeting at Susquehanna Depot.

The friends of Fremont and Freedom assembled at Susquehanna Depot Oct. 11. inst. afternoon and evening. It was by far the largest and most enthusiastic political gathering ever held in the eastern part of the county. The numbers were variously estimated at from 3000 to 5000.

L. P. Clark of Susquehanna Depot was elected President, and the Presidents of the different Fremont Clubs of the County present, were chosen Vice Presidents. L. P. Hinds of Susquehanna Depot, P. L. Norton of Lanesboro, H. H. Frazier of Montrose, and John Bradford of New Milford, Secretaries.

S. B. Chase Esq., of Great Bend, addressed the meeting in a few introductory remarks, followed by the Hon. Wm. Jessup in his usual eloquent manner. Hon. Henry Wilson of Massachusetts was next introduced to the audience. Senator Wilson appeared much worn, and his voice was quite hoarse; but his speech had the ring of the true and noble freeman. He was determined to stand by the Constitution, the Union, and the right, and never surrender. Gov. Hannibel Hamlin, of Maine, was next introduced. His speech was a manly vindication of the Republican principles, abounding in argument, wit, and eloquence. It was a real treat to look upon Hamlin's good natured honest face as it lighted up and glowed with the genuine Democracy of Jefferson.

The time for adjournment having arrived, on motion a committee of three were appointed to draft Resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting, and report at the meeting held at Nichols Hall in the evening. L. P. Hinds, W. H. Jessup, and Jonathan Taylor were appointed said committee. At 7 o'clock the meeting re-assembled, Hon. David Wilmot was the first speaker, followed by the Hon. G. A. Grow. Both were received with a shower of boquets from the ladies. Both speeches were characterized by great beauty and eloquence, and were frequently interrupted with applause.

The report of the committee on resolutions being called for, they submitted the following preamble and Resolutions through their chairman L. P. Hinds, which were unanimously adopted, after which the meeting adjourned:

Whereas in the coming Presidential election great principles are at stake, and mighty interests involved, affecting the destiny of our beloved country. We in the land of Washington are called upon to settle forever the question of Freedom or Slavery—civilization or barbarism for the vast territories of the nation; we are called upon to settle the doctrine of National standing, or National honesty—of wrong or right; we are called upon to maintain, or destroy, all that is glorious in the past, noble in the present, or precious in the future, therefore,

Resolved, That we hail with the liveliest satisfaction the great truths so eloquently set forth in the Republican Platform upon which John C. Fremont and Wm. L. Dayton stand as the standard bearers of the party. 1st, The inalienable and God-given heritage of Freedom to the territories. 2d, The utter repudiation of the doctrine of the Ostend robbers—Soule, Mason, and Buchanan, to wit, that "*might makes right*," and the substitution of that other principle, "*our country right.*" 3d, The protection and vindication of the Constitution and Union, with all their Heaven-descended guarantees of life, liberty, nobility, and happiness to the people—with all their glorious memories of the past, and precious hopes of the future.

Resolved, That we turn in amazement and disgust, from the bogus Democratic Platform and its embodiment, James Buchanan, viewing with patriotic indignation the monstrous and wicked doctrines therein promulgated. 1st That *National* stealing is no sin, but to be encouraged at the price of blood.—2d, That Freedom is sectional and slavery national. 3d, That Slavery, Polygamy, Arson and Murder are the guarantees of the Constitution—he only bond that indissolably binds the Union together, as exemplified by Border Ruffianism in Kansas, southern chivalry in beating an unarmed Senator, and shooting an Irish waiter—he approval of the administration of Franklin Pierce, and the striking down of the freedom of the press, and the freedom of speech in the 15 Southern States of the Union.

Resolved, That the triumph of the bogus Democratic party, and their abominable doctrines, would, at the present time, be abhorrent to all the better impulses of our nature, contrary to reason and justice, in contravention of the Constitution, against the plainest teachings of the christian religion, calculated to destroying the Union of these States and bring upon the country all the horrors of a civil war.

Resolved, That we will use all honorable means to hurl from power the tyrant slavery, and bring back the government to the early policy of the fathers of the Republic, the policy of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, and their compatriots.

Therefore, Resolved, That we will vote the Republican ticket—all of it—*town, county, State* and *National*.

For the Republican.

Republican Meeting at Nicholson.

NICHOLSON, Pa. Oct. 8th 1856.

MESSRS. READ & FRAZIER:—A lovely autumnal day this has been—such as rejoices the husbandman who has crops to secure and buckwheat to thrash. In these vocations it has very generally been improved in this section.

This afternoon in pursuance of notice, Mr. Grow spoke in this township, at a small place nearly four years ago christened Pierceville—a name highly suggestive of its politics at that, and the present time.

Mr. Grow spoke between three and four hours in a very affective manner, to a respectable number of Republicans, and to at least a few Buchanan—men, for several of them during the whole speech were constantly asking questions and making remarks—sometimes those that were pertinent, but much oftener such as were entirely irrelevant and apparently for no other purpose than that of making interruption. This course added greatly to the interest of the occasion, as it enabled Mr. Grow to answer in a masterly manner such catch questions and petty quibbles as are daily current among us. Undisturbed by what would have seriously annoyed most speakers, he answered all these questions and charges so as completely to silence them. Discomfiture seemed to be depicted on the countenances of these self-constituted inquisitors, and they evinced the hopelessness of their cause by catching at every thing that looked like a straw of comfort, yet only to have it swept away by Mr. Grow's unanswerable logic and withering rebuke. His triumph was complete and when he sat down, the walls of the old School house rang with unwonted sounds—hearty cheers for Grow and for Fremont.

The Republicans as a general thing then left for home, many of the Buchanan men remaining to hear R. R. Little in the evening. While untying my horse I heard loud hurrahs for Buchanan—turning around I perceived that they came from men in front of the Hotel a dozen rods distant, and that over their heads was waving a large flag with the stars down—a signal of distress! and surely what could be more appropriate to their condition? if it don't prove just such a banner as they will need next Nov. it is no longer true that "coming events cast their shadows before."

On reaching home I found the boys boasting that they had had a grand time for thrashing buckwheat, and that reminded me that Mr. Grow had had a grand time too in thrashing Buck——men. He swings a lively flail at that business, and if anybody can thrash out a flooring of this sort quicker or cleaner than he, it would do one good to look upon him.

Bed time apologizes for the brevity of

Truly Yours, 3. 3. 8.

For the Republican.

Fremont Club in Harford.

HARFORD Oct., 1, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—A meeting was called in this place a short time since for the purpose of organizing a Fremont Club. A very large number of the most prominent and influential citizens assembled. The Declaration, Platform, and Constitution of the Club were presented and unanimously adopted. Upwards of *fifty voters* enrolled their names as members.

The following officers were nominated and elected:

Wm. C. Tiffany Esq., President; F. E. Loomis, Vice President; A. J. Stearnes, L. R. Peck, A. S. Rice, Directors; C. S. Johnston, Treasurer; R. H. Eaton Recording and Corresponding Secretary.

By order of the Committee.

R. H. EATON, Sec.

THE CAUSE OF THAT SQUEAL.—Prentice, in a notice of Choate's letter says: "Politically, he is a poor Shote, (he must pardon our adoption of the original family orthography.) One might think from the doleful tones he utters, that instead of getting to one side of the fence he had got hung in it."

☞ IT WILL BE SEEN FROM MR. FILLMORE'S LETTERS THAT HE OCCUPIES PRECISELY THE SAME POSITION IN REGARD TO THE SLAVERY QUESTION THAT THE SOUTH HAS ALWAYS CONTENDED FOR.—*Louisville Journal.*