The Herald.

CARLISLE, PA.

Friday, Oct. 7, 1864.

FOR PRESIDENT,
ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
OF ILLINOIS.

VICE PRESIDENT,
ANDREW JOHNSON,
OF TENNESSEE.

Union Electoral Ticket.

SENATORIAL.
Morton M'Michael, Philadelphia.
Thomas H. Cunningham, Beaver county.

REPRESENTATIVE.

1 Robert P. King,	13 Elias W. Hall,
2 George M. Coates,	14 Charles H. Shriner,
3 Henry Baum,	15 John Wister,
4 William H. Kern,	16 David M'Conaughty,
5 Bartin H. Jenks,	17 David W. Woods,
6 Charles M. Runk,	18 Isaac Benson,
7 Robert Parke,	19 John Patton,
8 William Taylor,	20 Samuel P. Dick,
9 John A. Hiestand.	21 Everhard Bierer,
0 Richard H. Coryell,	22 John P. Penney,
1 Edward Halliday,	23 Ebenezer M'Junkin,
2 Charles F. Reed,	24 John W. Blanchard.

UNION COUNTY TICKET.

For Assembly,
JAMES KELSO, of Shippensburg.
For Sheriff,
E. P. ZINN, of Mechanicsburg.
For Commissioner,
GEO. W. CRISWELL, of East Pennsboro'.
Director of the Poor,
JOHN W. CRAIGHEAD, South Middleton
For Auditor,
DAVID FOGLESONGER, of Hopewell.

S. M. PETTENGILL & CO.,

NO. 37 Park Row, New York, and 6 State St. Boston, are our Agents for the HERALD in those cities, and are authorized to take Advertisements and Subscriptions for us at our lowest rates.

☞ Last year the people of the County lead by politicians and actuated by party feelings, defeated three maimed and crippled defenders of their Country who were before them for their suffrages. Will they allow their party prejudice again to overcome their feelings of the commonest gratitude? There are now two nominees of the Union party, who have gallantry served their Country while their competitors were enjoying the safety and comfort of their homes. Will the voters of Cumberland bestow again their honors on politicians and reward the brave defenders of their Country's flag by defeat? Can they forget that to the soldier who faithfully serves his Government is due all the gratitude, respect and honor of those who remain at home? Remember this on next Tuesday and cast your votes for those whose patriotism has deserved them. VOTE FOR KELSO AND ZINN.

This Congressional District should be represented by a man who has given the people unmistakable evidence of his loyalty. Since the war commenced the voice of this constituency has been in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the war and of sustaining and supporting the Government in every measure calculated to overthrow the rebellion. We must not change our position now, when the Government is just on the eve of a final trumph over treason. We must take no step backward nor do aught to cause rebels to think that we have ceased our hostility toward them. Our present Representative can be trusted. He has stood faithfully by the Government. His devotion to his country has secured him the hostility of every rebel sympathizer in the Country. The men who approve his past course should support him and return him to a position where he can aid the Government and counteract the efforts of those who would destroy it. Vote for JOSEPH BAILEY.

It has been repeatedly charged that John Jacobs, the Democratic Candidate for Sheriff declared that "if he were to fight at all in this war, he would fight on the side of the Southern Confederacy." These charges have been made from the stump, in his own Township and neighborhood and he and his friends have been challenged to deny it. He has never attempted to deny it, and those who have made the charge thus publicly, declare that they can establish their assertions by the most conclusive proof. Will the loyal voters of Cumberland County elevate to the most important office in their gift, a man who thus expresses his sympathy for the enemies of his country? Shall Captain Zinn, the brave soldier, who has been fighting the battles of his Country, ever since treason first attacked our Government, be defeated by a man, who hasn't even a *wish* to see the traitor Confederacy overthrown but would prefer to fight its battles? Let every man who honors consistent loyalty and patriotism and who hates treason and those who sympathize with it, vote for CAPTAIN ZINN.

Silver Spring Township voted by an immense majority to deprive soldiers of the right of suffrage. John Jacobs resides there and is one of the most active politicians in the Township. He and those with whom he acted did what they could to disfranchise their fellow citizens who were absent in the army, defending the loyal States and particularly our own Valley, from rebel incendiaries and plunderers. He has never given an hour's care or labor to his country's defense while his opponent has devoted every day and hour to his Country since the war began. Now Mr. Jacobs asks the people of the County to elect him to a position of honor and trust. Will those who have felt the terrors of a rebel invasion and who appreciate the services of those who guard our border, vote for a man who has thus been the soldiers' enemy? Let every man who has a relative or friend in the army, or who respects those who have gone forth to defend our homes from the incursions of rebel hordes, vote against JOHN JACOBS.

It is of the utmost importance to the tax payers of the County that the office of Commissioner should be filled by a man of intelligence, honesty and experience, and one who is fully acquainted with the resources and the necessary expenditures of the County. The Union party has presented a candidate who combines all these qualifications. Our candidate has been a member of our State Legislature and has all his life enjoyed a reputation as a first class business man and one whose integrity has been above suspicion. Vote for GEORGE W. CRISWELL.

MILITARY OFFICERS and SOLDIERS should have BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES, as they can be carried in the pocket and taken upon the first appearance of a Cold or Cough, which, if neglected, may terminate in something worse. As there are imitations, be sure to OBTAIN the genuine *Brown's Bronchial Troches*, which are sold everywhere at 25 cents a Box. For sale at Elliott's Drug Store.

☞ An errand boy in Cincinnati realized over ten thousand dollars by means of a false key to the post office box of a large business house

THE GREAT ISSUE.

Hundreds of citizens of Pennsylvania will cast their votes on next Tuesday without any clear conception of the importance of the issue before them.—It is true that they are but called upon to elect local officers and Members of Congress, and these of themselves cannot be considered as of the most vital consequence. But the result of our local election will affect very seriously the great struggle in November next. If the result of our state election should be favorable to the Union cause our triumph at November will be certain and over-whelming. If the friends of the Government should be defeated, the apologists for treason will be encouraged to redouble their efforts to carry enough of States besides ours, to ensure the election of McClellan and commit our Government to the treasonable principles of the Chicago platform. They cannot succeed even if they carry Pennsylvania, but they may accomplish enough to inspire the traitors with the hope that the contest will be doubtful and thus induce them to prolonge their resistence to the Government.

On the election of Abraham Lincoln depends the existence of Government and the stability of our free institutions. Four years ago he was constitutionally elected President, but a great rebellion has prevented the exercise of his authority throughout nearly one-half of the country. Unless that authority is restored to him our Government is a failure. A nation that is too weak or too much under the control of traitors to enforce respect to her laws and her rulers is destitute of a Government. If eleven States may defy the authority of President Lincoln, any other number might if they chose and had the power defy the authority of any of his successors. There is but one course of policy that will prove to the world that we are determined to uphold and maintain our Republican institutions, and that is by forcing traitors and disloyal men. North and South, to acknowledge the right to him, who was fairly chosen by freemen's votes, to rule this nation. If we re-elect Mr. Lincoln and subdue the Southern confederacy we establish our Government on a foundation so firm that traitors will never attempt its overthrow — If we yield to the wishes of traitors and take him from a position from which rebel armies have failed to drive him before his rightful authority is established, then we acknowledge that our Government is too weak to enforce obedience to its laws and invite the rebellion of every disappointed or defeated party. Elect Mr. Lincoln and the people will secure an honorable and speedy peace, and a firm, enduring and permanent Government. Defeat him and we have a dissolved Union, the certainty of continued civil wars, and the final destruction of our country.

We are opposed by a party which is merely the remnant of an organization which commenced the rebellion. Wherever its majority gave it the power the Democratic Party cast the States that it controlled into the confederacy of treason. The portion that now opposes us was in a minority too hopelessly great to drag any other State into rebellion. We do not assert that its action would have been as treasonable had it possessed the same power in any State in the North as it was in those Southern States which it controlled, but we cannot forget that there is not a man who is now accepted as a leader in the Democratic Party here, whose record is free from expressions of sympathy with rebellion and secession.—Can this party be trusted with the great work of putting down this rebellion?

Will they treat it as an unjustifiable and wicked revolt against our government or will they regard it as merely an irregular opposition to a party which has always opposed them? They claim that there should be no punishment for treason. They hold that no confiscation of property should follow the crime of rebellion. They insist that the institution which has produced all this war and bloodshed shall remain undisturbed and subject to the control and wishes of the men who have been all these years disregarding our constitution and setting our laws at defiance. They would recall the leading traitors to the Cabinet and Senate and place those who have heretofore led the hosts of treason, in command of the forces of the Union.—They would assume the whole of the debt incurred by the Rebel Government in the attempt to destroy the country, and fasten its additional burdens on the now overtaxed resources of our Nation. In short, there is concession too humiliating; and no sacrifice of honor too great, to be incurred in the effort of Democracy to concoct a peace that would endure no longer than the interests of a Slaveholding Aristocracy would be promoted by its continuance.

The issue between the parties fairly stated is this. Shall the Union of the States be restored and the authority of its Government respected by the entire people or shall we have, either two separate nations, or the surrender of the honor and authority of the nation for the conciliation of traitors? Shall traitors be subdued and receive the punishment due their crimes, or shall they be invited back to rule over the country they have attempted to ruin? Shall Slavery which has been the bane of the Republic and which has destroyed itself in its attempt to destroy us be brought to life and restored to its former power, in order that it may again disturb our peace and again make our country the theatre of strife, carnage and bloodshed? These are the questions we are called upon to decide and on our decision rests the future prosperity of our country and our own security from the horrors of future rebellions and civil war. The result of the contest on next Tuesday will exert a most powerful influence on the final settlement of these questions.

The success of the party that stands by the Government will do more to destroy the rebellion and hasten the return of Peace than the most decided successes our armies could achieve. The success of those who oppose the prosecution of the war will more than compensate the rebels for all they have lost during the last two months. A Democratic victory would cause a cheer to rise from every rebel regiment in the service; A Union triumph would inspire our own brave men with joy and courage. Let every loyal man remember this and cast his vote for the party which is pledged to the support of the Government and to the overthrow of the rebellion.

THE SOLDIER'S CANDIDATE.

HON. JOSEPH BAILY.

The re-election of Hon. Joseph Baily to Congress is a matter in which we see no reason why all loyal men, Republicans, War Democrats and Soldiers should not cordially unite. His nomination was made by the gallant soldiers just on the eve of their march to the "front." It comes appropriately from them for the men in camp from Pennsylvania are now *voters* as well as soldiers. The nomination is their hearty free-will offering to Mr. Baily, without regard to their former party attachments, for they know he will be, as he always has been, the soldier's true friend.

The soldiers nominated Mr. Baily and the earnest War Democrats heartily accept the nomination. They know that he is now, what he was when the war broke out, the fearless, unflinching friend of the Union. They know that he is now, as then, in favor of "fighting it out in this line" until the devilish Rebellion is crushed. They regard with indignation and abhorrence the nomination of Adam J. Glossbrenner. They will remember that two years ago when Joseph Baily was the regular candidate, a disorganizing faction brought out Glossbrenner as an independent, disorganizing candidate for the sole purpose of defeating Baily, because of his hatred of Secessionism and devotions to the Union. The War Democrats have "our account to settle" with the Glossbrenner disorganizers this fall.

The Republicans and all friends of the Union can cordially and consistently support Mr. Baily. In a district where they cannot possibly elect a thorough Republican they owe it to the great Union cause of the country to give their votes, without hesitation to a man who has with unshaken loyalty and unswerving firmness stood by, the government first, last and all the time. His "record" as a member of Congress shows this conclusively. The Republicans voted for him two years ago when the Glossbrenner faction of disorganizers fought to defeat him. He was then a Democrat he is still a Democrat. Whether he is for Lincoln or for McClellan for the Presidency, we may have entire confidence as to his course in Congress with his past "record" before us. That record shows him to be a firm, reliable, patriotic supporter of the Government. Such a man we want in Congress at this critical period and we therefore commend Mr. Baily to the undivided support of our friends.

MYER STROUSE ON HON. JOS. BAILEY.

Hon(?) Myer Strouse, the Jew-Copperhead member of Congress from Lebanon and Schuylkill counties, said recently in a speech at a "Democratic" meeting in his district, "that all the Democratic members of Congress, who were elected as such, stood like a band of Spartan brothers in opposition to the Administration, *except one miserable son of Pennsylvania*"—meaning Hon. Jos. Bailey of this district. We consider this a good recommendation for Mr. Bailey—to be traduced by men like Strouse, whose sympathies are with Jeff. Davis & Co., and who have always opposed the war and those who are upholding it, is evidence that Mr. Bailey has not failed to do his duty. We trust the people of this district will sustain him by a triumphant re-election.

Elect Little Mac and then—

Aye, elect Little Mac and then look out for the opening of the Sixth seal. For then you may expect the assumption of the rebel war debt, $2,000,000,000, making with our own, a total of nearly $4,000,000,000.

Elect Little Mac, for then you may expect to pay the rebels for spoliations, losses, confiscations, as much more, making your national debt $6,000,000,000.

Elect Little Mac, for then you will never receive a dollar from England for the spoliation on your commerce committed by rebel privateers, fitted out in British ports and manned with British crews—a nice little sum of $50,000,000.

Elect Little Mac, and compromise your troubles by paying pensions to wounded rebel soldiers for fighting your own brethren, thousands of whom have been even denied burial by these rebel braves.

Elect Little Mac and have Lee, Beauregard, Bragg, &c., come back into the service which they have left in dishonor, and pay them from your treasury the same salaries you pay to the patriot Generals of the Union armies.

Elect Little Mac and abandon to the tender mercies of the slave oligarchies the Union families of the south who have aided our cause, and the Union men who have fought under our flag.

Elect Little Mac and have your national currency superseded by legalized bank trash and add $600,000,000 to your debt to achieve this feat.

Elect Little Mac and welcome Davis, Stephens, Toombs, Foote, Mason, Slidell, etc., back to the Cabinet and the Senate, to crack their slave whips again around the ears of freemen.

Elect Little Mac and abandon the cause of freedom forever.

"He made a few desultory remarks," said the schoolmaster. Mrs. Partington stopped suddenly in the bustle she was making around the table for tea, and gazed over her specs thoughtfully at him. Leaning on a plate edgewise, as if to enforce her views by the support it gave her, "I suppose it was because he was weak," said she, "but AYER'S PILLS will cure him. I never knew 'em to fail." They are very solitary in such cases." "Really, madam," replied he, "I cannot guess your meaning." "You said dysentery," said she, laying down the plate and putting a spoon in the preserves. "I said desultory," said he, smiling, "quite a different thing." "No matter," said she, looking up in time to box Ike's ears, who was putting paper down the chimney of the kerosene lamp. "The Pills are good for both, I dare say, for they cure almost all the diseases in the cornucopia."

Vallandigham for McClellan.

On the appearance of Gen. McClellan's letter of acceptance, Vallandigham and all the other copperheads of his stripe gave indications that they would not support the Gunboat General. We were never inclined to take much stock in this movement. We regarded it as a cunning trick to secure the support of the War Democracy. McClellan owed his nomination to Val. and the faction controlled by him in the Chicago Convention and he would not have received it had they not been perfectly satisfied with his record and position. He was completely in their hands and when they gave him their support, it was in consideration that their party had been fully committed to the treasonable dogmas of their platform. That every one of the peace faction would support McClellan, we never for a moment doubted. He is every thing that the most ardent advocate of "peace on any terms" could desire. Their show of dissatisfaction was merely intended as a dodge to deceive the honest portion of the Democracy and to produce the impression that McClellan was a war Democrat and a patriot and therefore objectionable to these men who have been doing their utmost to aid the rebellion. It was well known that many honest Democrats would never support a candidate whom Vallandigham and his followers supported and therefore it was deemed prudent to withdraw him from an active support of the Chicago nominees.

Vallandigham has however of late given public assurance that he would support McClellan. He has made speeches at Dayton and Sydney, Ohio, in which he announces his determination to support the General in spite his leter of acceptance. He takes the true position that the Democracy is committed to an abandonment of the war and that McClellan's letter is not an expression of the principles of the party, He says:

"I do not concur in the sentiments expressed in the letter of acceptance of General McCLELLAN. What I shall say on this subject will meet the approbation of many of you: it may not of all, but I am here to speak freely and candidly, therefore I allude to the subject. I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman, my friend, to whom I have alluded (Mr PUGH), that the letter is identical with the platform presented by the Convention. My reading of the English language *does not lead me to that interpretation of it.* I differ, with all due respect, from him. And I claim, as the member from Ohio of the Committee on Resolutions in that Convention, to have official personal knowledge that he is mistaken. The two principal points in that letter of acceptance to which I object were brought before that committee. The one containing the threat of future war was *unanimously rejected.* The other, to the effect that, until the States and people of the South had returned to the Union, we would not exhaust these arts of statesmanship," as they are called, receiving but three votes in that committee, though presented *almost in the very words of the letter itself.* I say, therefore, it is impossible to subscribe to the opinions expressed in that letter. They are the private opinions, if you please, of Gen. McCLELLAN, which he has a perfect right to entertain and publish, I having an equal and perfect right to dissent from them. I do reject them. *I do not accept them as an expression of the sentiments of the Democratic party, but recognize his right to entertain and express them on all suitable occasions.* Which of the number of those who are for the opinion expressed in that letter or in the platform is right and which is wrong the people of this country must determine. For myself, I not only entertain the opinions expressed in the Chicago platform, but I recognize the platform as containing the law and the prophets of the Democratic party."

Here we have the great leader of the Democracy declaring that McClellan's letter is not identical with the Chicago platform but in opposition to it, and that the two principal points in his letter were before the Chicago Convention and were almost unanimously voted down. How will the politicians who contend that the letter of acceptance is explanatory of the platform and in accordance with its spirit, and that both are pledges that the war for the Union will be carried on until treason is crushed, get around this public declaration of the man who dictated the platform of their party.

We are rejoiced to see this support of Gen. McClellan by this great apostle of copperheadism. It will tend greatly to make a distinct issue between the two parties. The men who have always labored for the success of the rebels, should be found supporting the Democratic nominees and we always feel disappointed when they refuse to do it. Before November every peace patriot, every apologist for rebellion, every man who desires the success of the confederacy, and every Democrat who desires the withdrawal of our armies and the acknowledgment of Southern independence will be found working faithfully for the election of McClellan.

Now we ask the honest Democracy, those who believe that Vallandigham and his supporters are enemies to their country and important allies of those who are in rebellion against the Government, whether they can support *his* candidate for the Presidency? Can loyal patriots and disloyal men act in concert to accomplish a common purpose? The Peace Democracy denounce the war, and insist it should cease at once, even if a divided country and a ruined Government be the result of its abandonment. They support McClellan for the purpose of bringing about that result. Can men who insist on the vindication of broken laws and the punishment of traitors help them to a success which will be the destruction of our Government and the ruin of our country?

☞ Mayor Gunther of New York has vetoed the resolution of the council to illuminate the City in honor of our recent great victories. His objections are:

1. That those who might not join in the illumination would be considered disloyal.

2. That those in power claim the victories as the result of the "Emancipation Proclamation."

3. That the new policy will give us a succession of victories and that they might be called upon to illuminate three times a week if we are to believe Administration reports of victories.

4. That we should abstain from rejoicing over victories gained in a civil war.

We beg our readers to remember that this man who vetoed such a resolution and for such reasons is not the Mayor of Richmond and the apologist of Jeff Davis, but the Chief Magistrate of New York City and an ardent supporter of McClellan. But it is not strange that he should oppose any rejoicing over our victories. They are doubtless the salvation of our Country but they are equally the destruction of his party's hopes for success. This gentleman only acts the part of a prudent politician. He believes that the success of the Democratic Party is essential to the well being and prosperity of the country and he believes that the country is entirely comprehended and included in the squad of politicians who manage the said party. All rejoicing over our successes is an admission that those who participate in them believe our Government is in the right and that rebellion ann treason are wrong and should be overthrown. This admission no copperhead desires to make. Their party is committed to the principle that the war is an unjustifiable and wicked attack on our Southern brethern by a set of fanatics who are interested only in the elevation of the negro and therefore they can do nothing which will evince their approval of it. The victories that drive rebel hordes from the borders of the loyal States or establish the authority of the Government in the heart of the rebellion produce no joyous feelings in the hearts of men who declare that the war is a failure, and who expect to rise to power *because* rebels have successfully resisted the enforcement of the laws. Copperheads fully realize that their efforts and those of the rebels have a common object and therefore never permit themselves to rejoice over the defeat of their own chosen allies.

But our Democratic Mayor holds it wrong to rejoice over victories gained in a civil war. Of course it is. What business have loyal men to rejoice when their worst enemies are defeated? What cause of joy has New York City because the force that has invaded the North, burning our towns and plundering our citizens has been defeated and driven in confusion and disorder from our borders? If we were engaged in a war of conquest, waged for the purpose of wresting from a neighboring power some of her own territory then we might very properly rejoice over our victories. But as these are only victories over traitors who have stolen our property, attacked our Government, and murdered our friends and relatives, we should indulge in no manifestations of joy but receive the tidings of success in sullen silence in order that the feelings of these dear rebel brethern should not be unnecessarily wounded. Such are the teachings of the patriots who lead the Democracy. Such is their love for traitors that not even the victories that free their homes from danger can cause them to rejoice at the triumph of our cause. Are they not meaner traitors than those whose defeat they mourn?

Gen. Hooker on McClellan.

The Copperhead papers assert that General Hooker has come out in support of General McClellan, and that he addressed a Democratic club which called upon him while lately on a visit to a town in New York. We do not know what the political feelings of General Hooker are, but as we have not been told what remarks he made on that occasion, we presume that they were patriotic and consistent with his profession as a true soldier and ardent lover of the Union. Long John Wentworth, of Illinois, addressed a Democratic meeting at Chicago, on the evening previous to the Copperhead Convention, and yet John is a firm supporter of Mr. Lincoln and the war policy, so that the peace men must not conclude that every man who speaks at one of their meetings, or addresses Democratic clubs, is going to vote for their mongrel ticket. We do know, however, what Gen. Hooker said of Gen. McClellan, on one occasion, while giving his testimony before the Committee on the Conduct of the War, and now extract a few of the questions and answers:

Question.—To what do you attribute the failure of the peninsular campaign?

Answer.—I do not hesitate to say that it is to be attributed to the want of generalship on the part of our commander.

Question.—Where was the Commander-in-Chief during the battle of Malvern Hill?

Answer.—I understood that he was on board the gunboats.

Question.—Had the retreat of the enemy at Malvern Hill been followed by our whole force, what would have been the probable result?

Answer.—Richmond would have been ours without doubt.

Question.—Instead of that you fell back Harrison's Landing?

Answer.—Yes, sir; we were ordered to retreat, and it was like the retreat of a whipped enemy. We retreated like a parcel of sheep, everybody on the road at the same time.

THE REBELLION ENGINEERED BY DEMCCRATS.

Senator SUMNER addressed the Union Ratification Meeting in Faneuil Hall last Wednesday, in a campaign speech as effective as his higher parliamentary orations. He fastened on the pro-slavery Democracy the crime of engineering this Rebellion. Read his summary of the evidence against them?

Look at the Rebellion from beginning to end, and you will find that it has been engineered by Democrats.

You cannot forget that James Buchanan, a Democrat, was President surrounded by a Democratic Cabinet, while the Rebellion was allowed to organize and together strength without interruption.

Wherever you look now in the Rebellion, there you find the old Democracy, into which is absorbed John Bell and his followers, arrayed against their country.

Look at individuals; you will find that the larger half, constituting the controlling power of the old Democratic party, is now in arms against their country.

Look at States; you will find that all now in rebellion were, at its outbreak, Democratic States.

It is natural that the Northern associates and allies of these Rebels should be engaged in devising apologies for rebellion.

Fellow-citizens, in all this vast Union, whether the Union as it was or the Union as it is, there is not a single Republican in arms against the Government, or by organizing with those who are. There is not a traitor among them. Here is a distinction between the two parties, which is as broad as the space between earth and Heaven.

It is because the Democratic Party is at this moment so utterly mischievous and disloyal, so really dangerous to our country, and so bitterly hostile to liberty, that I speak thus plainly. Soft words will not do in exposing that combination at Chicago where the two factions commingled into one. Call them, if you please, Pharisees and Sadducees. They are something more and something worse, if possible. They are the unarmed guerrilla bands of Jefferson Davis, who have stolen into the free States. I have used this language before. If I repeat it now, it is because I wish to put you on your guard against these criminal marauders who, at this moment of peril, are ready to prey upon their country.

☞ Suppose a Convention of Delegates from every part of the Southern Confederacy and representing a party that claimed to be able to elect a President, had met in a Southern City and had resolved that the war for Southern independence was a failure, and declared in favor of a cessation of hostility, how would their proceedings have been received at the North? Would we not have rejoiced over such news as much as we did over the fall of Atlanta or New Orleans! Would we not have called the brave Southerners our friends, and endeavored our utmost to promote their success in order that our cause might be benefitted by their accession to power! Would we not have regarded their declaration of principles as of more consequence to us than the re-inforcement of four armies? No one doubts that the powe of the Confederacy would have been diminished by the action of such a Convention and its chances of achieving its independence materially diminished. Well the Chicago Convention did for the Confederacy just what such a Convention held in the Confederacy would do for the Union. It declared the war for the Union a failure and advised a cessation of hostilities. It gave rebels to understand that a great party here in the North did not give the Government its support in the war against treason. It gave no condemnation of their treason and promised no effort to overcome them. It plainly admitted their success and our failure and declared that hostilities against them ought to cease. If such action by a great party in the South would benefit the Union cause, will not the action of this Chicago Convention benefit them? No wonder the rebel soldiers cheered when they learned how effectively their friends at Chicago had aided them.

General Sickles on the War.

Gen. Sickles has written a manly and patriotic letter, declining the Union nomination for Congress in the Ninth District. The following is an extract:

In declining the use of my name as a candidate for this high trust, I only adhere to a resolution formed when I entered the military service to retire altogether from politics while holding a commission in the army. This determination, with other considerations, had already constrained me, during the present canvass, to decline a similar request made by a number of my old and esteemed constituents in the Fourth District, who desired to present my name to the Democratic Convention. I yield to no citizen or soldier in my solicitude for the honurable termination of the war. The war was deliberately begun by the Rebels, and is persistently waged by them to conquer the Union. It is not so strange that our enemies should find allies among European antagonists of free institutions, but it will never cease to be a matter of humiliation and wonder that our own people could be seriously divided upon the question of submission or resistance. Let who will be for submission, I am for resistance as long as we have a battallion or a battlefield left.

Until the Constitution and Laws are vindicated in their supremacy throughout the land, the Government should be confided to no hands that will hesitate to employ all the power of the nation to put down Rebellion. The resources of the insurgents are already so far exhausted that they will give up the struggle as soon as a majority of the people at the ballot-box, seconding the martial summons of Farragut and Grant, demand the unconditional surrender of the enemy.

[From the New York Tribune.]

The October Elections.

The great central States of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana, hold elections in October, at which each of them will choose Representatives in the next Congress and the whole or a major portion of its next Legislature. Indiana elects this year a Governor, also; the others elected Governors last year for terms of two and three years respectively. New Jersey, Iowa, and perhaps one or two other States, formerly held elections in October, but have severally changed to the day fixed by Congress for the general choice of Presidential electors—the Thursday succeeding the first Monday in November—which falls this year on the 8th. The October elections aforesaid occur on the second Tuesday, which falls this year on the 11th.

Very great importance is naturally attached to the October elections. Occurring just four weeks before the Presidential, and in States which have usually decided our Presidential contests, their results are apt to be regarded as premonitory of the more important issue. That is to say: When the three States go decidedly the same way in October, it is generally presumed that the party which carries them will almost certainly elect its President: if two of them go decidedly one way, it is presumed that the party so favored has the better chance in November; while, if one goes each way and the third is equally divided, is is currently believed that the Presidential contest will be very close and of dubious issue.

These popular calculations were based on a state of things which no longer exists—wherein the States lately in revolt were expected to vote nearly solid for the Democratic National ticket. This year, if we exclude the States which are or have been in rebellion, there are but 241 votes to be cast, whereof 117 are a majority; so that Fremont, who received 114 votes in 1856 would have been almost elected in the now loyal States, though both Pennsylvania and Indiana were against him. If the results of the late election afford any criterion; Lincoln and Johnson are morally certain of the following votes outside of the contested Middle States:

Maine	7	Ohio	21
New Hampshire	5	Michigan	8
Massachusetts	12	Wisconsin	8
Rhode Island	4	Minnesota	4
Connecticut	6	Iowa	8
Vermont	5	Kansas	3
New York	33	California	5
Delaware	3	Oregon	3
Maryland	7	West Virginia	5
Total	147, or 30 more than a majority.		

Still, a decided triumph of the Opposition in all the October elections would inspirit and animate them as to render the Presidential contest thenceforth most vehement and cast some doubt over the result; for the speakers and writers on that side would plausibly say, "If we could carry these States, why not New York, Connecticut, Michigan, Delaware and California, giving us, with New Jersey, Kentucky and Missouri, a clear majority?"

Let us consider, then, the aspects of the pending October elections:

PENNSYLVANIA.—This State elects no officer this year by general ticket, so that it may be difficult to collect her verdict from the results as they may transpire. But it is well known that, in 1862, she chose to Congress twelve members of either party—two of the Republicans (Messrs. Hale and Tracy) being elected over the regular Republican candidates, mainly Democratic votes; while one of the Democrats (Joseph Bailey) was, in like manner, chosen by Republican votes over the regular Democratic candidate. At that election the Democrats had 3521 majority on the State ticket (Auditor General) in a total of 431,756 votes. The aggregate poll of the State, at her most recent elections, was as follows:

	Repub. Un.	*Dem.*
1860 Oct. Gov. Curtin	262,493.	Foster 230,230
Nov. Pres. Lincoln	268,030.	Confusion 208,412
1861 Leg. Legislature chosen.		Republican majority.
1862 Oct. Aud. Cochran	215,616.	Sleaker 2,0,140
1863 Oct. Gov. Curtin	269,496.	Woodward 254,171

A great many soldiers last year came home to vote, nearly all of whom voted for Curtin. They now vote in the field, and it is claimed that a majority there will vote for McClellan! We do not believe it; but the result will show.

The total candidates for Congress, with the vote of their respective districts in 1862, are as follows:

Unionist.	Vote in '62.	Democratic.	Vote in '62.
1 John M. Butler	6,273	*Samuel J. Randall	7,720
2 *Charles O'Neill	8,014	William M. Reilly	6,068
3 *Leonard Myers	8,236	Chas. Buckwalter	8,243
4 *Wm. D. Kelley	8,946	George Northrup	8,118
5 *M. R. Thayer	9,605	Henry P. Ross	9,543
6 *George Bullock	8,092	*John D. Stiles	11,310
7 *J. M. Broomall	9,891	.....	6,445
8 Wm. B. Holster	4,828	*Syd. E. Acona	10,022
9 *Thad. Stevens	11,174	.....	6,660
10 Howell Fisher	8,518	*Myer Strouse	9,220
11 J. L. Selfridge	2,922	*Philip Johnson	11,870
12 W. W. Ketchum	9,641	*Charles Donahon	11,408
13 U. S. Mercer	9,404	.....	7,905
14 Jno. F. Miller	10,108	*William H Miller	10,620
15 *Joseph Bailey†	8,898	A. J. Glossbrenner	12,875
16 W. H. Koontz	10,420	*Alex. H. Coffroth	10,903
17 Ab'm. A. Baker	7,556	Robert L Johnson	8,328
18 Step. F. Wilson	9,516	.....	8,884
19 *G. W. Schofield	9,953	William Bigler	9,462
20 *Amos Myers	12,404	.....	11,586
21 Smith Fuller	10,009	*John L. Dawson	10,234
22 *J. K. Moorhead	8,037	James H. Hopkins	5,978
23 *Thos. Williams	8,089	.....	7,635
24 *U. V. Lawrence	9,547	*Jesse K. Lazear	9,031
Total	210,778		220,617

* Members of the present House.
† In these districts, the contest for Congress in '62 having been independent of politics, we give the vote for Auditor instead.
‡ Messrs. Bailey (War Democrat) and Glossbrenner (regular Democrat) were rival candidates in '62, as now. Bailey received the Republican vote, and was elected by 11,905 votes to 9,740. The vote in the above table is that for State Auditor.

OHIO was formerly preponderantly a Whig State, and has been usually Republican since the formation of that party in 1854. In 1862 she went wrong, choosing *fourteen* Democrats to *five* Republicans to Congress, by an aggregate majority of 5,717. Last year she went heavily against the "Peace" party, but more especially against Vallandigham, their candidate for Governor,—61,920 on the Home and 39,179 on the absent Soldiers' vote—total, 101,099. It is not likely that so large a majority will soon again be given by her for any party. Her aggregate vote at the recent elections has been as follows:

	Repub. Un.	*Dem.*
1860 Oct. J'go Brinckerhoff	312,854	Smith 199,038
Nov. Pres't Lincoln	231,610	All others 210,831
1861 Oct. Gov. Tod	206,907	Jarrett 151,791
1862 Oct. Sec. Kennon	178,755	Armstrong 184,332
1863 Oct. Gov. Brough	288,661	Val'dam 187,562

The candidates for Congress in the several districts respectively in 1862, are as follows:

Dists.	Union.	Vote in '62	Dem.	Vote in '62.
1	Benj Eggleston	6,418	Geo. E. Pugh	7,545
2	R. B. Hays	7,081	Joseph C. Hutter	7,212
3	*R. C. Schenck	13,027	David A. Houk†	11,779
4	Wm. Lawrence	9,435	*J. F. McKinney	10,218
5	M. H. Walker	9,292	*F. C. Loblonde	10,561
6	R. W. Clark	9,320	*Chil. A. White	10,087
7	S. Shellabarger	10,100	*Samuel S. Cox	10,372
8	Jas. R. Hubbell	8,042	*Wm Johnson	9,012
9	R. P. Buckland	10,523	War'n P. Noble	11,700
10	*Jas. M. Ashley	10,398	†Amer. V. Rice	7,701
11	Henry S. Brady	8,741	*W. A. Hutchins	8,005
12	J. E Stevenson	8,087	*Wm. S. Fleck	13,721
13	Columbus Delano	9,695	Charles Follot	12,763
14	Martin Welker	10,454	*Jacob Blue	10,143
15	T. A. Plants	9 183	*Jas R. Morris	10,332
16	John H. Bingham	9,913	*Jos. W. White	12,299
17	*Eph. R. Eckley	10,018	J. H. wallace	9,699
18	*R. P. Spaulding	9,293	Jos. H. Wade	4,183
19	*Jas. A. Garfield	13 183	Halsey H. Moses	6,763
	Total	177,579		184,196
	Opposition majority on Congress			6,717

* Members of the present House.
† Three candidates running for Congress in this District, we are obliged to give the vote on the State ticket.

We guess there will be some beneficent changes in the delegations from this State. Let the returns show that we are not mistaken in our calculation.

INDIANA is the arena of a desperate and doubtful contest. She must have more than thirty thousand of her legal voters in camp to-day, whereof we are confident that less than two thousand are Democrats—and none of them are allowed to vote, save at the poll of their respective homes, where not one-tenth of them can be at their State election. From this distance, it looks as if the odds were greatly against our side; but other Union candidates, especially those for Congress, are making a gallant canvass, and are hopeful of good results. Could her soldiers vote, we should have no fear as to Indiana, though she went heavily wrong in 1862. Her aggregate vote at her recent elections is as follows:

1861 Oct. Gov Lane	136,725	Hendricks	126,968
" Nov. Pres't Lincoln	139 033	All others	133,110
1862 Oct. Sec. Wells	118,547	Anthon	128,109

1863 Election for local offices only—Union gain.

The rival candidates for Congress now, and the vote of their respective districts at the last election, (1862) are as follows:

Dis.	Repub. Un.	Vote.	Democrat.	Vote.
1	Cyrus M. Allen	9,583	Wm. E. Niblack	11,063
2	Wm. W. Curry	6,211	Michael E. Kerr	10,011
3	Ralph Hill	10,141	*W. H. Harrington	11,554
4	J. H. Farquhar	7,992	George W. Berry	10,926
5	*Geo. W. Julian	9,272	James Brown	7,414
6	*Chen Dumont	12 25	George B. Smith	10,951
7	R. D. Washburne	9,576	*Dan. W. Voorhees	12 457
8	*Godlove S. Orth	12,632	Jas. F. Harney	11,181
9	*Schuyler Colfax	14 775	David Turpie	14,546
10	Jos. H. Defrees	11,317	*Jos. K. Edgerton	12,053
11	T. N. Stillwell	12,219	*Jas. F. McDowell	13,142