



The Independent Republican

C. F. READ & H. H. FRAZIER, EDITORS. F. E. LOOMIS, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

MONROE, PA. Thursday, March 18, 1858.

The Act to extend the terms of the Courts in Susquehanna County has been signed by the Governor, and is now a law.

Letters to members of our State Legislature need not be prepaid, as an Act of Assembly provides for the payment of the postage on such letters by the State.

The town elections of New York, according to the Evening Post, show the following aggregate of Supermajorities: Republican, 452; Democrats, 244; American, 84.

The explanation of "Reduction of Currents" asked for by our correspondent, "H. N.," can probably be found in our next issue; though we can not imagine how any one who understands the subject as far as he appears to, can fail to understand it in full.

We extract the following from the proceedings of the Senate of Pennsylvania, March 9th: Mr. Sessions presented a remonstrance signed by seven citizens of Susquehanna County, against the abolition of Judge Wilmot's Judicial District.

Also, seven from citizens of Susquehanna County generally, and nine of similar tenor, from citizens of Bradford County, without distinction of party.

What the Stateholding aristocracy of the South think of the Northern men who vote here, those Stateholders in power, among whom we have the names of Messrs. Hammond, of South Carolina, published on our fourth page this week.

Did our fathers, when they established American independence, only establish a system that makes the great mass of our white population slaves? "White slaves of the North," read and ponder!

The publication of Parton's "Life of Aaron Burr" has occasioned a good deal of controversy among literary men.

There are now in Kansas 2,516 United States troops, kept there at an annual cost of nearly \$1,000,000.

We learn that the Shamocratic leaders in this County are working indefatigably to get signatures to their petition for the re-organization of this Judicial District.

It is desirable that our friends throughout the County should forward their remonstrances promptly to our Senators and Representatives.

Mr. Kait, of South Carolina, and Phillips, of Pennsylvania, both Democrats, spoke in the House of Representatives, March 9th, on the Kansas question.

Some of the more honorable of the Democratic members in the State, are beginning to speak against the proposed destruction of this Judicial District.

It is the motion proposed in this instance, the proposition is, shall the State hold the territory under the right of appportionment, this purpose, in this instance?

Mr. Harris, of Maryland, and Underwood, of Kentucky, American, proposed to postpone the matter till Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Groves, of Indiana, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Groves, of Indiana, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Groves, of Indiana, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Groves, of Indiana, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed.

Don't do anything so very ridiculous, so impolitic, so outrageous, so unconstitutional, as to attempt to make a martyr of David Wilmot; we do not desire to embrace the party in the State, and we believe such a course would have that effect.

These papers present an honorable contrast to the *Montrose Democrat* and the *Honolulu Herald*, which are attempting to urge the disgraceful project through by sheer naked lying.

For instance, both of these last-named papers have asserted that a majority of the people of this County are in favor of the movement, when a more glaring, outrageous, and untruthful statement could not be made.

We extract from the *Honolulu Herald* a statement in the last issue of the bar of Susquehanna County, are in favor of the proposed law. It was seen by an extract from the *Legislative Record* which we give in another place that the remonstrance against it was signed by seventeen members of the bar of this County.

Again, on page and article as above, he says, \$1 in New York, Ohio, and North Carolina, is equal to 80 cents in New England States, &c.

I supported the resolution on the following grounds: On page 105, art. 152, of the *Practical Arithmetic*, he says, "The legal value of £1 English or Sterling money, is a value of £1 as fixed by an act of Congress in 1829."

Again, on page and article as above, he says, \$1 in New York, Ohio, and North Carolina, is equal to 80 cents in New England States, &c.

Now I maintain that there is an inconsistency in this making \$1 in N. Y. equal to two-fifths of a pound, and in Comm. equal to three-fourths of a pound.

The solution of this apparent inconsistency, as given by you, and by Prof. Stoddard to me in a private letter, is as follows: "At the time Federal money was adopted, in 1789, the colonial currency, or bills of credit issued by the Colonies had more or less depreciated in value, that is, a colonial pound was worth less than a pound sterling, &c."

This explanation is not only untrue, but it is a gross misstatement of the facts. The value of the colonial currency in New York, and in other States, was equal to the value of the Federal money in use at the present time.

We do, it is true, call 8 shillings a dollar in New York, but that is not two-fifths of \$1.84, which is the value of a pound of the same metal.

In Comm. 68 is called a dollar, but that is not two-fifths of \$1.84, which is the value of a pound of the same metal.

The error then that it seems to me Prof. Stoddard has inadvertently fallen into, is, giving what formerly existed, but is now obsolete, as what exists at the present time.

He gives no such explanation in his *Arithmetic*; but, merely giving the table and the rules for working the problems, he leaves the learner to understand that this rule is in full practical force at the present time, when this is not the case.

Hence it seems to me that if we take the words as they mean, which is the only way we have any right to do, these things are so in error in saying that these things were so when they are not, but merely were so prior to the adoption of Federal money, in the United States, &c.

It is evident that Prof. Stoddard did not intend that we should understand the article under consideration to mean as it reads, and yet we have no right to do otherwise.

If we do put that construction upon it which the words demand, certainly I have proved the first part of the resolution, and the remainder follows of course.

I hope no one will think that, in the course of this examination, I have been unfair to either party, or that I have been disrespectful to either party.

It is desirable that our friends throughout the County should forward their remonstrances promptly to our Senators and Representatives.

We are happy to see that the Democratic party will count so suicidal an act as to pass the bill, but prudence requires that we should do all in our power to guard against it.

Senator Hamlin, of Maine, made a good speech in answer to Hammond of South Carolina.

Mr. Hamlin asserted that the Southern had entirely misapprehended the condition of the laboring men of the North.

They include the great mass of the people, are intelligent, and generally live well. At the North labor is considered honorable.

At the South it is thought a disgrace—hence the North advances, while the South retrogrades.

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

the exact meaning intended to be conveyed, and we should expect a work of his preparation, and with so much care and attention as his *Arithmetic*, ought in this respect at least to be as near as possible perfect.

At the Teachers' Institute held in Gibson, Pa., at the Teachers' Association, as treated of in his *Arithmetic*, was brought up, and for the sake of discussion, I offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That that section of Stoddard's *Practical Arithmetic* entitled "Reduction of Currents," is unfounded in reason, and untrue in fact, and therefore useless.

I supported the resolution on the following grounds: On page 105, art. 152, of the *Practical Arithmetic*, he says, "The legal value of £1 English or Sterling money, is a value of £1 as fixed by an act of Congress in 1829."

Again, on page and article as above, he says, \$1 in New York, Ohio, and North Carolina, is equal to 80 cents in New England States, &c.

Now I maintain that there is an inconsistency in this making \$1 in N. Y. equal to two-fifths of a pound, and in Comm. equal to three-fourths of a pound.

The solution of this apparent inconsistency, as given by you, and by Prof. Stoddard to me in a private letter, is as follows: "At the time Federal money was adopted, in 1789, the colonial currency, or bills of credit issued by the Colonies had more or less depreciated in value, that is, a colonial pound was worth less than a pound sterling, &c."

This explanation is not only untrue, but it is a gross misstatement of the facts. The value of the colonial currency in New York, and in other States, was equal to the value of the Federal money in use at the present time.

We do, it is true, call 8 shillings a dollar in New York, but that is not two-fifths of \$1.84, which is the value of a pound of the same metal.

In Comm. 68 is called a dollar, but that is not two-fifths of \$1.84, which is the value of a pound of the same metal.

The error then that it seems to me Prof. Stoddard has inadvertently fallen into, is, giving what formerly existed, but is now obsolete, as what exists at the present time.

He gives no such explanation in his *Arithmetic*; but, merely giving the table and the rules for working the problems, he leaves the learner to understand that this rule is in full practical force at the present time, when this is not the case.

Hence it seems to me that if we take the words as they mean, which is the only way we have any right to do, these things are so in error in saying that these things were so when they are not, but merely were so prior to the adoption of Federal money, in the United States, &c.

It is evident that Prof. Stoddard did not intend that we should understand the article under consideration to mean as it reads, and yet we have no right to do otherwise.

If we do put that construction upon it which the words demand, certainly I have proved the first part of the resolution, and the remainder follows of course.

I hope no one will think that, in the course of this examination, I have been unfair to either party, or that I have been disrespectful to either party.

It is desirable that our friends throughout the County should forward their remonstrances promptly to our Senators and Representatives.

We are happy to see that the Democratic party will count so suicidal an act as to pass the bill, but prudence requires that we should do all in our power to guard against it.

Senator Hamlin, of Maine, made a good speech in answer to Hammond of South Carolina.

Mr. Hamlin asserted that the Southern had entirely misapprehended the condition of the laboring men of the North.

They include the great mass of the people, are intelligent, and generally live well. At the North labor is considered honorable.

At the South it is thought a disgrace—hence the North advances, while the South retrogrades.

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

For the Independent Republican. "Examination of the Body of Wm. Archer."

Messrs. Burton, in your paper of last week, I saw a statement signed by Dr. D. F. Brundage, and twenty-one others, "with a view of correcting an impression that may have arisen in the public mind in the trial of Walter Gogo Archer, &c."

You may think it hardly worth while to burden your columns with conflicting statements about so small a matter as a ball-hole; but when you consider that this ball-hole cost one fellow mortal his life, and another his liberty, and that both the life and the liberty, and the reputation of a distinguished physician, and also the reputation of a dozen common men who would gladly yield the character of candid, honest citizens, you will exercise forbearance.

Being one of those to whom was assigned the painful duty of examining the body of that ill-fated young man, and having more definite knowledge, and a more exact measurement than any other witness, I think I justify myself and others, in making a statement of facts not embodied in the article referred to.

If Dr. Brundage had given a full statement of the facts as they appeared at the re-examination, and not left the public to infer that the jury of Inquest were a set of doughheads not knowing their right hands from the left, or that he had not been so glad to have this unpleasant subject laid down and buried in his unimpaired grave.

It will be remembered that at the trial referred to, Dr. Brundage testified that he examined the patient, probed the wound, and that the ball passed one-half or three-fourths of an inch to the right of the backbone, and to the right of the right hip, &c.

This explanation is not only untrue, but it is a gross misstatement of the facts. The value of the colonial currency in New York, and in other States, was equal to the value of the Federal money in use at the present time.

We do, it is true, call 8 shillings a dollar in New York, but that is not two-fifths of \$1.84, which is the value of a pound of the same metal.

In Comm. 68 is called a dollar, but that is not two-fifths of \$1.84, which is the value of a pound of the same metal.

The error then that it seems to me Prof. Stoddard has inadvertently fallen into, is, giving what formerly existed, but is now obsolete, as what exists at the present time.

He gives no such explanation in his *Arithmetic*; but, merely giving the table and the rules for working the problems, he leaves the learner to understand that this rule is in full practical force at the present time, when this is not the case.

Hence it seems to me that if we take the words as they mean, which is the only way we have any right to do, these things are so in error in saying that these things were so when they are not, but merely were so prior to the adoption of Federal money, in the United States, &c.

It is evident that Prof. Stoddard did not intend that we should understand the article under consideration to mean as it reads, and yet we have no right to do otherwise.

If we do put that construction upon it which the words demand, certainly I have proved the first part of the resolution, and the remainder follows of course.

I hope no one will think that, in the course of this examination, I have been unfair to either party, or that I have been disrespectful to either party.

It is desirable that our friends throughout the County should forward their remonstrances promptly to our Senators and Representatives.

We are happy to see that the Democratic party will count so suicidal an act as to pass the bill, but prudence requires that we should do all in our power to guard against it.

Senator Hamlin, of Maine, made a good speech in answer to Hammond of South Carolina.

Mr. Hamlin asserted that the Southern had entirely misapprehended the condition of the laboring men of the North.

They include the great mass of the people, are intelligent, and generally live well. At the North labor is considered honorable.

At the South it is thought a disgrace—hence the North advances, while the South retrogrades.

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

Mr. Fowler & Wells, publishers, No. 308 Broadway, New York, announce a new set of "Hand-Books for Home Improvement."

From the Bradford Argus. A Call for the Evidences. Below is a copy of a letter which has been addressed by Judge Wilmot to several of the persons whose names as members of the Bradford County Bar, were signed to the memorial asking the Legislature to annul the Judicial District.

The memorialists do not make any specific charge, or give any special reason for the Legislature demanded by them, save an indefinite sort of declaration that "in their opinion the due administration of justice demands it."

It is well known, however, that a stealthy and unscrupulous member of the Legislature against Judge Wilmot. They are met at their private rooms, and there plotted with every species of fabrication that depraved and reckless men are capable of inventing to accomplish an unholy purpose.

Several of these fabrications have come to my knowledge, and as specimens of wickedness and of the character of the men who have been honored with the confidence of his fellow citizens, has had responsible trusts reposed in them, and has played no unimportant part in public affairs.

This act originates in personal and partisan antipathies; and it seeks its consummation by an appeal to partisan feeling. And besides this, if the attempt of the opponents of Judge Wilmot was successful, it is manifest that the wisest of the people of the thirteenth district would be disgraced.

They would be ruled over by a rascal, by a party to the bills introduced will be acted on, or, at all events, passed. The precedent would be dangerous in the extreme; and the measure would be insulting to the people of Bradford and Susquehanna.

The members of the Legislature, who would lend themselves to its passage, would not be forgotten, and would ultimately have to pay the penalty of a public reprobation.

Our country is not a democracy, as it is called; but her people are not a democracy; and the Legislature will so far forget itself as to entertain the project seriously.

We have reliable information, that the Judiciary Committee of the House are unanimously against the bill now before them; and if it should be reported by that Committee, it will be accompanied by a bill providing for the annihilation of this Judicial District, and a memorial signed by yourself and others, asking for the passage of such law, in which I am informed that said Committee has made the following order touching said bill:

"That the said bill be held over for further consideration; that complainants be requested to put charges definitely in writing; and that the Chairman be requested to communicate to Judge Wilmot."

I respectfully request: Firstly, that you will give me information in writing, of those specific matters or things of which you complain in your memorial; and, secondly, that you will state in writing, in plain and concise, order, or ruling, in which I have been guilty of any partiality or political bias, the time when, and parties interested in said decision, decree, order, or ruling.

And further, that you will state specifically, any discrepancy on my part towards yourself, of which you complain—the time when such discrepancy was offered, and on what particular matter, and on what particular matter, and on what particular matter, and on what particular matter.

Also, please to specify any act of tyranny of which I have been guilty, either upon your counsel; or time when, the matter before the Court, and the particular act or acts of tyranny of which you complain. Also, please to specify the time when I exhibited an overbearing manner towards you—what matter was before the Court, and particularly, what matter was before the Court, and particularly, what matter was before the Court, and particularly, what matter was before the Court.

Mr. Stephens replied, denying that there was any precedent for such a step on the part of the minority; denying, also, that the re-organization of the Committee is a question of privilege, and denouncing the motion as revolutionary.

Mr. Groves argued that the Committee was instructed to inquire into the facts about Kansas, and had not done so; had, in point of fact, refused to attend to the matter referred to them.

The Speaker interrupted him, saying that the matter referred to the Committee was the President's Message.

Mr. Groves replied that there was a difference of opinion on that point. He considered that the matter referred to was an investigation into the facts in Kansas. The Committee was probed, and would not investigate. The majority of the Committee was appointed from those hostile to its objects.

Mr. Groves was called to order while speaking upon this point, and the Speaker declared that reflections upon the appointment of the Committee were not in order.

Mr. Groves replied that he thought the official acts of officers of the House proper subjects of discussion.

Mr. Groves was vehemently interrupted while speaking, and repeatedly called to order by Mr. Stephens and others on the Legislature, by whom much ill-feeling was manifested.

Mr. English, of Indiana, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed. He proposed, however, to postpone the question and allow the majority and minority reports to be made and printed.

For this he asked the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Washburn, of Maine, objected. Messrs. Harris, of Maryland, and Underwood, of Kentucky, American, proposed to postpone the matter till Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. Stephens said that there was no such journal.

Mr. Harris contradicted him. He had himself, as Chairman, kept a most regular and careful journal which he had signed, and which is the official Journal.

Mr. Stephens replied that the majority of the Committee knew nothing of it.

Various propositions were then made to allow the Committee to report, but they were all objected to, there being an apprehension on the opposition side that advantage would be taken of the opportunity to report a joint resolution for the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution.

The House was in great uproar, while voting by Yeas and Nays, on the motion to lay Mr. Harris's appeal on the table, the Speaker having decided such motion in order. The vote stood: Yeas 109; Nays 111.

The appeal on the table were: Messrs. Adams, Cox, John G. Davis, English, Foley, Groves, Hall, of Ohio, Harris, of Illinois, Haskin, Lawrence, Marshall, of Illinois, Montgomery, Morris, Shaw and Smith, &c., &c. The Monitor has told his Lordship the same in its largest type. He "regrets the omission," but promises that under this circumstance the song of Rule Britannia ought to be suspended, as the *habeas corpus* act is not in a portion of the United Kingdom.

Judge Wilmot's District. Complaints reach us from all parts of the State about the attempt now made to legislate Judge Wilmot out of office. They are not confined to the political friends of Judge Wilmot, but they come from his political enemies; and they consider it impossible that so low a step as to entertain any such petty proposition.

The North American, a well-known commercial paper in the city of Philadelphia, contains a long article on this subject in its yesterday's issue, from which we extract the following:

"With us it is a matter of indifference to what party the Judge thus assailed belongs. We should speak in his behalf, were he a Democrat, as quickly as we do, he being a Republican. It is not the man, or the party alone, that is involved in the present case. It is a principle. It is manifest that an act of injustice is attempted against one who has long been honored with the confidence of his fellow citizens, and has had responsible trusts reposed in them, and has played no unimportant part in public affairs.

This act originates in personal and partisan antipathies; and it seeks its consummation by an appeal to partisan feeling. And besides this, if the attempt of the opponents of Judge Wilmot was successful, it is manifest that the wisest of the people of the thirteenth district would be disgraced.

They would be ruled over by a rascal, by a party to the bills introduced will be acted on, or, at all events, passed. The precedent would be dangerous in the extreme; and the measure would be insulting to the people of Bradford and Susquehanna.

The members of the Legislature, who would lend themselves to its passage, would not be forgotten, and would ultimately have to pay the penalty of a public reprobation.

Our country is not a democracy, as it is called; but her people are not a democracy; and the Legislature will so far forget itself as to entertain the project seriously.

We have reliable information, that the Judiciary Committee of the House are unanimously against the bill now before them; and if it should be reported by that Committee, it will be accompanied by a bill providing for the annihilation of this Judicial District, and a memorial signed by yourself and others, asking for the passage of such law, in which I am informed that said Committee has made the following order touching said bill:

"That the said bill be held over for further consideration; that complainants be requested to put charges definitely in writing; and that the Chairman be requested to communicate to Judge Wilmot."

I respectfully request: Firstly, that you will give me information in writing, of those specific matters or things of which you complain in your memorial; and, secondly, that you will state in writing, in plain and concise, order, or ruling, in which I have been guilty of any partiality or political bias, the time when, and parties interested in said decision, decree, order, or ruling.

And further, that you will state specifically, any discrepancy on my part towards yourself, of which you complain—the time when such discrepancy was offered, and on what particular matter, and on what particular matter, and on what particular matter, and on what particular matter.

Also, please to specify any act of tyranny of which I have been guilty, either upon your counsel; or time when, the matter before the Court, and the particular act or acts of tyranny of which you complain. Also, please to specify the time when I exhibited an overbearing manner towards you—what matter was before the Court, and particularly, what matter was before the Court, and particularly, what matter was before the Court, and particularly, what matter was before the Court.

Mr. Stephens replied, denying that there was any precedent for such a step on the part of the minority; denying, also, that the re-organization of the Committee is a question of privilege, and denouncing the motion as revolutionary.

Mr. Groves argued that the Committee was instructed to inquire into the facts about Kansas, and had not done so; had, in point of fact, refused to attend to the matter referred to them.

The Speaker interrupted him, saying that the matter referred to the Committee was the President's Message.

Mr. Groves replied that there was a difference of opinion on that point. He considered that the matter referred to was an investigation into the facts in Kansas. The Committee was probed, and would not investigate. The majority of the Committee was appointed from those hostile to its objects.

Mr. Groves was called to order while speaking upon this point, and the Speaker declared that reflections upon the appointment of the Committee were not in order.

Mr. Groves replied that he thought the official acts of officers of the House proper subjects of discussion.

Mr. Groves was vehemently interrupted while speaking, and repeatedly called to order by Mr. Stephens and others on the Legislature, by whom much ill-feeling was manifested.

Mr. English, of Indiana, disapproved of the way in which the Committee had been appointed. He proposed, however, to postpone the question and allow the majority and minority reports to be made and printed.

For this he asked the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Washburn, of Maine, objected. Messrs. Harris, of Maryland, and Underwood, of Kentucky, American, proposed to postpone the matter till Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. Stephens said that there was no such journal.

Mr. Harris contradicted him. He had himself, as Chairman, kept a most regular and careful journal which he had signed, and which is the official Journal