



The Democrat.
 HARVEY SICKLER, Editor.
 TUNKHANNOCK, PA.
 Wednesday, Oct. 7, 1863.

S. M. Pettenuil & Co.,—No. 37 Park Row New York, & 6 State St Boston, are our Agents for the N. B. Democrat, in those cities, and are authorized to take Advertisements and Subscriptions at our lowest Rates.

DEMOCRATIC STATE NOMINATIONS.

FOR GOVERNOR,
 HON. G. W. WOODWARD,
 OF PHILADELPHIA.

FOR JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT
 WALTER H. LOWRIE,
 OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.
 GEORGE D. JACKSON,
 OF SULLIVAN COUNTY.

JOHN C. ELLIS,
 OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

COUNTY TICKET.
 FOR SHERIFF,
 AHIRA GAY,
 OF MESHOPPEN.

FOR PROTHONOTARY,
 H. L. FURGERSON,
 OF FALLS.

FOR REGISTER AND RECORDER,
 O. L. PARRISH,
 OF MONROE.

FOR COMMISSIONER,
 EDWIN STEPHENS,
 OF NICHOLSON.

FOR CORONER,
 DR. J. C. BECKER,
 OF TUNKHANNOCK BORO.

FOR AUDITORS,
 HENRY NEWCOMB,
 OF CLINTON, 3 YEARS.

E. D. FASSETT,
 OF WINDHAM, 1 YEAR.

Democratic State Central Committee.

- The following is the State Central Committee as appointed by Hon. FINDLAY PATTERSON, of Washington county, who, as President of the late Democratic Convention, was authorized by a resolution of the body to announce the Committee. It consists of a Chairman, and Representatives of the several Senatorial Districts into which the State is divided:
- Hon. CHARLES B. BIDDLE, Chairman.
 - 1st Dist. { Theodore Cuyler, Philadelphia.
 - { Robert J. Hemphill, Philadelphia.
 - { John Fullerton, Jr., Philadelphia.
 - { Isaac Leech, Philadelphia.
 - 2d " John D. Evans, Chester county.
 - 3d " Wm. H. Witte, Montgomery county.
 - 4th " Wm. T. Rogers, Bucks county.
 - 5th " Thos. Heckman, Northampton county.
 - 6th " Heister Clymer, Berks county.
 - 7th " William Randall, Schuylkill county.
 - 8th " Asa Packer, Carbon county.
 - 9th " Michael Myler Sullivan county.
 - 10th " Stephen S. Winchester, Luzerne county.
 - 11th " Mortimer F. Elliot, Tioga county.
 - 12th " John H. Humes, Lycoming county.
 - 13th " William Elliot, Northumberland county.
 - 14th " Samuel Hopburn, Cumberland county.
 - 15th " William M. Brishin, Lebanon county.
 - 16th " { George Sanderson, Lancaster co.
 - { James Patterson, Lancaster co.
 - 17th " John F. Spangler, York county.
 - 18th " Henry Smith, Fulton county.
 - 19th " J. Simpson Aries, Huntingdon county.
 - 20th " William Bigler, Clearfield county.
 - 21st " Thos. B. Sawright, Fayette county.
 - 22d " W. T. H. Bauser, Green county.
 - 23d " { Geo. W. Cass, Allegheny county.
 - { James P. Barr, Allegheny county.
 - 24th " James Campbell, Butler county.
 - 25th " David S. Morris, Lawrence county.
 - 27th " Thos. W. Grayson, Crawford county.
 - 28th " Kennedy L. Flood, Jefferson county.

Another Lie Nailed.

The following letter has been handed to the Editor of the Wyoming Republican, for publication in his issue of this week.

To the Wyoming Republican:

I saw in your paper of the 30th ult., an attack upon Ahira Gay, the Democratic candidate for Sheriff, signed ALVA BRUSH; and referring to myself, my brother, Edwin, and a son of Mr. Brush, as witnesses. Being thus brought before the public as giving credit to Mr. Brush's libel upon Mr. Gay, I feel bound to say that his statement is not true. Mr. Brush was, at that time plainly under the influence of liquor. In a subsequent conversation, when Mr. Brush remarked upon this subject, we (my brother and myself) told Mr. Brush that his statement was untrue, and yet he refers to us as witnesses of its truth. My brother is still absent in the army, or his testimony would be added to mine upon this subject.—Mr. Brush further stated, in that conversation that he meant to publish his statement in case Mr. Gay should come up for office.

H. M. JAQUES.
 Lemon, Oct. 5, 1863.

Rev. L. Peck on the Cause of the War.

We learn that, on Sunday last, Rev. Mr. Peck of this Borough, in the pulpit of the Methodist church, undertook to show that the abolitionists of the North were not responsible for the war—that they were in no way connected with its cause; and to sustain this position, quoted the following extract from a speech of A. H. STEPHENS of Georgia—the same extract that has appeared for some time past at the head of the Wyoming Republican—viz: "Can either of you to-day name one governmental act of wrong deliberately and purposely done by the Government at Washington of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge an answer."

This speech was delivered in 1860 prior to the inauguration of any federal Republican administration, and with the view of defeating the efforts of the secession party of that State to take it out of the Union. He was speaking of "governmental acts," not at all of the acts of the abolitionists of the North, who up to that time had never been in control of the government. In asking "what right the north had assailed," he had reference solely to the government, and its acts in reference to their rights—thus showing, that, as yet, there was no justification for secession; and in the same speech, indicating his belief that in the Union and under the Constitution was the surest hope of a vindication of their rights in reference to their domestic institutions.

If the Rev'd gentleman had thought proper to read the whole speech, his hearers would have learned how far Mr. Stephens holds him and such as he irresponsible for the troubles which they have brought upon the country. At the very time that Mr. Stephens was laboring thus against secession, Horace Greeley was advocating the right to secede. See N. Y. Tribune, in Fall and Winter of 1860-61. Mr. Peck must indeed be hard pushed for proofs in support of his shaky position. The abolitionists not responsible? Let us see.

Negro Slavery only exists in the Southern section of the Union. It is therefore a sectional institution. The abolition, or republican party is based upon the idea of hostility to this institution. It is therefore a sectional party. Slavery is not, and never was a national institution. To drag this subject, therefore, into the national politics was as great a wrong to the South as would have been an attempt on its part to force into the national politics an issue involving the rightfulness of an institution belonging only to the North. The creation of a sectional party in the North, based upon the idea of hostility to an institution of the South, naturally and inevitably resulted in the forming of a sectional party at the South, based upon the support of that institution. There, then, was just the state of things which Washington and Jackson warned the American people to beware, and which they earnestly admonished them to avoid. There was the North arrayed against the South—the South against the North.

At the North, was cultivated a feeling of hatred of the South; at the South, a feeling of hatred towards the North. First came a division of the churches. This feeling of mutual hatred was nursed in Congress, in the pulpit, on the stump, everywhere. After the separation of the churches it increased rapidly. Democrats following the lead of Washington and Jackson, sought to keep this baneful subject out of the national politics, Webster, Clay, and many other Whigs labored to the same end. But through the pulpit and the press the agitation was continued year after year, until this feeling of deep and bitter animosity culminated in disunion, as the Fathers of the Republic predicted. It was the sectional quality of these parties, North and South, that made them dangerous, and finally fatal to the Union—the raising an issue involving the right of one section to control its own institutions, and thus arranging each section in an attitude of hostility to the other. This outline will be recognized by every candid man as a true history of the rise, progress, and result of this most miserable and disastrous sectional agitation. And yet Mr. Peck and his party are "in no way responsible" for such result.—Oh no! They were only carrying out the "higher law" doctrine. Or the Rev'd gentleman will never find excuse or justification of his party in anything ever said by A. H. Stephens.—That party, certainly, at that time, was not the government.

We conclude this article with the following:

Appeal to the Voters of Wyoming County.

Surely no candid man can doubt as to the cause that finally carried the South out of the Union. Wendell Phillips has often boasted that he labored for many years to bring the North out of it. During all that time the abolitionists were laboring in concert with him, and he with them. The so-called Republican party, from the day of its organization until the present, has labored in concert with both; making of these different elements one party. The leading and controlling spirit of this party have over and over again declared their hostility to the restoration of the Union under the Constitution, as it was. "The Union as it was" has become the theme of their constant ridiculing, and the Constitution as it is, "a mere parchment," the popular veneration for which is to them a subject of wonder. The grand result of the great struggle of 1776 is laughed at, derided, despised. Incredible as all this may seem to men who are willing to make any and every sacrifice for the preservation of the glorious work of the Fathers as they left it to us, it is the sad, sad truth. We say again that no candid man can doubt as to the cause that led the South into secession.—It was hatred of the North—kindled, nursed into warmth, and finally fanned into a consuming flame by the unceasing efforts of the men in the North who now constitute the so-called Republican party. For thirty

years this bad work of cultivating bad blood between the two sections of the country went on, until the people of the South, provoked beyond their powers of endurance, starting under a sense of wrong, insult, and contumely, insanely forgot their reverence for the Union, and madly declared eternal hostility—to what? To the Union, because of their hatred of that malignant party whose relentless pursuit and prosecution of its sectional purpose had finally brought them under the dominion of passion rather than of reason. They said "we have tried to live in peace with the Yankees," (as they denigrate this mischievous element "of the North,") but they have ever persisted in their efforts to interfere with our right of self-government; in subjecting us to insult and abuse; they desire to be rid of us, and we of them; having no sons of their own of which to repeat, they must even assert and exercise the right of repenting "of ours." They are too good, too pious, too religious, too much devoted to the "higher law," to remain in a Union with States whose domestic institutions do not square with their sacred notions, and we, therefore, take them at their word."

While some of the secession leaders have occasionally, in the advocacy of secession, add other reasons for that most unfortunate and ill-advised measure, as any man in the North weak enough to suppose that anything other than this long continued and malignant anti-slavery agitation could have ever united the South in favor of secession? That man must indeed be blinded by partisan feeling, or sectional bias, who fails to recognize in this miserable, sectional agitation the cause of secession; and therefore, of all the terrible calamities that have followed secession.

But, it will doubtless be said by these "loyal" agitators that this is evidence of "sympathy with secession," that it is "treasonable" to criticize their conduct, should contractors, army speculators, and the tens of thousands of government plunderers whom these miserable times have turned loose to prey upon the country, will, doubtless, express the same loyal and patriotic opinion.

It is false—false as the hearts that have conceived and often expressed this sentiment before. We have no hopes in this world that are not connected with the Union as our Fathers gave it to us. We denounce alike the cause and the effect, secession was a great wrong—a wrong for which even the so-called Vice President of the southern confederacy pretended no justification. But while it has no justification, it had a cause; and that cause was also a great wrong.

Fellow citizens, to deal successfully with the nation's troubles we must deal with their causes—a policy that ignores the true causes of the national trouble, will assuredly never furnish a successful remedy. You are about to perform the most important civil duty of the citizen at a time when incalculable interests must depend upon your action. The law expects each of you, in casting your ballots, to give expression to your own choice, your own sentiments; and it does not expect you to shun this duty. No true patriot can omit this duty without wronging himself, as well as his country. Under our system of government, it is to the collective wisdom of the people that the decision of all these questions must finally come. Let your action be such, then, as may save your country from secession at the South, and from sectional fanaticism, shoddy and wholesale plunder in the North.

ADVICE FROM THE ARMY.

Extract from a Private Letter.

In the last week's Republican we find with the above caption, an extract from a letter, signed "James C. Hastings," in which he exhorts his father and every body else to vote for Curtin. A friend has handed us a letter of a later date, written by this same James C. Hastings to his mother, here, from which we make the following extract:

CAMP NEAR CELPEPPER, VA.,
 Sept. 22d 1863.

DEAR MOTHER: Tell Pap, that I say if he has any feeling for his three sons in the army, he will vote for A. G. Curtin, for Governor of Pennsylvania. And if he hasn't let him vote for Woodward. I will remember the chap! He sent me to bed for thirty days, to please old Loda Sharp and Porter Mares! He might go to hell, before I would vote for him.

J. C. HASTINGS.

In justice to the H. N. George W. Wood ward, our candidate for Governor, we feel bound to state, that he was never guilty of so gross an outrage on the personal liberties of the writer; who, it seems, has made a slight mistake in the matter of identity by confounding him with Warren J. Woodward, late President Judge of this district. The last named gentleman, some three years since, upon conviction, by a jury of the county, of feloniously abstracting sundry fowls from the hen-coop of one William Lee, of this Borough did sentence Mr. Hastings to thirty days, in our county Jail, as well as fully appear by the records of the court, reference thereto being had. For aught that appears in the letter before us, this "advice from the army," is not based upon anything Curtin has done for the soldiers, but only upon what the writer, through a mistake, supposes Woodward to have done to him. It is not on political but personal grounds that he opposes Woodward's election as Governor. He, doubtless, thinks, (and he is entirely correct in his opinion,) that in any future raids upon his neighbors hen-roosts, he would be more secure under the rule of Curtin, than that of Woodward. But we rather opine that the owners of slaughters, will not be moved by such considerations, or this "Advice from the army," to vote for A. G. Curtin, the candidate and patron of army contractors, state robbers and thieves generally.

See new advertisements in to-day's paper.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Democrat.

REV'D H. BROWN-COMBE.

DEAR SIR: In your very meek and gentlemanly reply to my ungentlemanly one of a prior date, you see fit to raise a personal issue rather than to discuss the question proposed. I have regretted from the outset that you should constantly thrust your official influence into this question instead of argument. This, sir, is what I understand by preaching oneself; and in the legal profession it is regarded as quite unprofessional. I shall not, therefore, declare my private opinion or belief on the slavery question, notwithstanding your patronizing exhortations to do so, as often repeated. I am not quite vain enough, to seek to rest a question of this kind on the counterbalancing opinions of myself and myself, notwithstanding your charges of a disposition to "exhibit my legal lore and logical acumen," and as you attribute this to my cowardice, I will add, that I deem it fortunate, if my sense of propriety would not so dictate, that the same "instinct" that prevented Fallstaff from striking the heir apparent, should also restrain me in this particular. I cannot see that your repeated declaration of your opinions is necessarily conclusive on the subject accompanied as it is with the astounding confession, that you are "not so ignorant" as to suppose that you are "infallible." I should really like to know by what system of extended induction you arrived at this same conclusion. Perhaps however, it was a mere slipping over the brim when the vessel was disbursted, that does not so truly denote the pressure that is within, as his which is continually oozing out at every pore. I am aware, too, that a writer in a recent number of the Republican, while not using you as "the man for the time—the right man in the right place," also said: "that, in these times, the people do not care so much about 'what God has decreed as what men are doing.'" Still I am inclined to think that there are some exceptions to this. I think the public would have more regard for the teachings of the Bible, than for any opinion that you, or any other man, might utter. For myself, at least, I must say, that I appreciate the assumptions on which your exhortations are based, and that the exhortations themselves "pass by me as the idle wind which I respect not." I hope you will have the good sense, sir, after having given the challenge, to proceed with the argument or desist with your exhortations.

But you are astonished at my "audacity in presuming that" you "would stultify" yourself by accepting a proposition that would require you "to prove a negative." I think, Elder, you will come safely out of this astonishment on a moment's reflection. It is just as much of an affirmation to say that slavery is inconsistent with the Bible, as it is to say that it is consistent. All if in fact, it is much easier to prove it, as you can point directly to the contradiction, while, if nothing were said on the subject, it would still be consistent, and yet to prove it, would require the citing of every text. You say it is the same question that Bishop H. opens discussed. He states the question: "Whether it is a moral evil—a positive sin, to hold a human being in bondage, &c.?" Do you not wonder now, that I am not astonished at your audacity in supposing that I would stultify myself by consenting to accept your proposition to discuss a question that would require me to prove a negative—that it is not a sin to hold a human being in bondage? Sin is a transgression of the law. How easy then to show it. But how preposterous to undertake to show that there is no transgression. This would certainly be requiring a man to prove that he is not guilty. Still I am not astonished, Elder, for I recollect that it was one of the designed to reply your profession of whom Butler wrote:

"He would distinguish and divide
 A hair 'twixt south and south west side;
 On either of which he would dispute,
 Change hauls, and still continue."

The difference between a "twelve-hundred and twelve-hundred" is certainly a very trifling subject for you to talk about. And while you are exhorting me to "lay aside the law," I return the encouragement you extend to me in your "earl's" reply again, Sir, there is yet hope in your case."

In regard to your reference to the slave-trade, gambling and rum-selling, it is sufficient to say, that all the legislation upon these subjects, is restrictive; and that therefore the legal implication is, that they are wrong, while the provision in the constitution requiring the return of fugitive-slaves is protective and raises an opposite presumption. The two former are prohibited by our laws, federal and state, respectively, while this latter is restricted to a few individuals. Without our law, every person, if disposed, could engage in them. This does not appear to answer your purpose, Elder, but as you say, so say I, "try again, sir, there is yet hope in your case."

You say that my review of your sermon was an "outrage" on you. "I recalled for and ungentlemanly," and that the caption placed over it, viz: "Brown-combe's abolition sermon," was "false and slanderous." You then deny that you are an abolitionist.—that you ever have been such, or that you have ever preached abolitionism. Let us see, sir, on what grounds you base the "gentlemanly" charges of falsehood, and whether you are an abolitionist or not.

What did you mean, sir, when you said in your "card" in the Republican, that there was "hope in your case"—that I "might yet repent and become an abolitionist?" As in your egotism you said "the world still moves," did you not mean to say that I might yet become what you already were—an abolitionist? I shall expect, sir, to use your own language, "a prompt and categorical answer." You say "an abolitionist is one who advocates the extirpation of slavery whether it be right or wrong—legal or illegal, constitutional or unconstitutional." Is this, sir, the millennium you were forehad-

ing, the repentance to which you were exhorting me—the advocacy of a thing "whether right or wrong?" Is it in this that the world is to change? If so, will might your bucket in the Republican who thinks you are "the man or the times," declare that "there are those who have not without first inquiring what God has decreed?" But, sir, I do not charge you with this. I believe, that when you said that I "might repent and become an abolitionist," you meant to be understood, that you were one. You meant by the term, the same that I did, when I used it, a northern man who claims, and as far as may be in his power, exercises the right to interfere with this domestic institution of the South. This, you confess to be your position by stating that it is the position of the church to which you belong. I deny therefore that the caption was "false and slanderous," or affirm, that it was so, you were the first to aver it.

What does the public understand by preaching abolitionism or by political preaching? Is it not the agitation of the question in Northern pulpits, where the institution does not exist and where, therefore, agitation can only have a political effect, by bolstering up a political party, based solely on its hostility to the institution? Did you not confess to this, and regarding in the introductory part of your discourse by telling that silly story about the merchant's striking out of front windows in his sign to please different individuals, until it was all effect? Did you not also confess that you were going to preach abolitionism, thus understood, by regarding the disapproval of the public—in not following the example of the merchant—So impressed are you with this understanding that you seem to think that I have made this charge against you. You seem also to think that I have declared it "improper to discuss" this question of slavery. If you did not, you ought to have known that I have said no such thing. Are not these your own admissions, that you were going to preach politics, or abolitionism, as understood by the public? And, sir, if this is not the true definition of abolitionism, and of preaching abolitionism, did you ever know an abolitionist? Would you acknowledge yourself a methodist, whether methodism be right or wrong, legal or illegal, constitutional or unconstitutional? I have too much respect for you to believe, for a moment that you would acknowledge yourself anything on any such basis. But you do acknowledge yourself a methodist, and quote your Discipline, making it your duty as a minister, to seek the extirpation of slavery by all lawful and christian means. To this doctrine you say you "most heartily subscribe," and now, sir, let me ask you, if you do not in so doing, admit yourself, over your own signature, an abolitionist? Was not this the repentance to which you said I might yet attain, and which was to make me an "abolitionist?" But, sir, if subscribing to this doctrine or embracing it, constitutes an abolitionist, would not preaching it constitute preaching abolitionism? I ask this question with all due respect to your comparative denial that you are an abolitionist, or that you have preached abolitionism. When you have answered this question, truly and fairly, you will have determined at whose door the gentlemanly charge of falsehood and slander belongs. And now, sir, since you appear not to be at all backward in making charges, I have you will no longer persist in my review of your sermon which even you did not charge freely. If there are any other falsehoods and slanders, contained in it, point them out, with the same freedom that you have these, and if they prove to be so, I will make the *quodlibet* honorable; but if the charges themselves prove to be "false and slanderous," as they are, you may very well consider your course.

This is deemed a sufficient reply to your gentlemanly charges of falsehood and slander. But independent of your own confessions, have not the courts a right to call you an abolitionist? Suppose that a political party was formed at the South upon the idea of establishing *anarchism* as the only lawful religion of the North; and Southern preachers and laymen persistently agitated this subject, (assuming the right to do so) with a view to such a result, seeking to force it upon us in defiance of our right to decide such matters for ourselves; would we not denounce all advocates and supporters of such a policy *mormonists*? Would such an epithet be false and slanderous? And let me further ask, would not we of the North assert our right to control our own institutions with vigor and earnestness? But, were it not for your definition of an abolitionist, I might anticipate, as a reply, that abolitionism is right and mormonism wrong, and that therefore the argument is not sound. But who gave to any abolitionist the right to justify his action under this distinction? The State governments, as one having exclusive control of such matters, are independent of each other as those of Great Britain and the United States. In the case of the southern man, would it be right to decide upon, or to interfere with our action, with the same reason we have no right to interfere with their action upon the subject of slavery. What then must be the result of this agitation in States where the institution does not exist? It is productive of any results, in extirpating slavery? It must be in plain violation of the rights of independent states, and of the laws of the land. Is such agitation, then, within the very terms of your discipline—"to seek its extirpation by all lawful and christian means?" I concede, your legal right to talk about the institution, but insist that, if it has any practical effect in extirpating the institution, such effect would be in violation of the laws regulating the rights of independent states, and therefore unchristian. But, sir, aside from this, would it be within the terms of "christian means?" Where do you find an authority for it, either in the example or teachings of Christ and his apostles? They re-

buked sin whenever they found it, to the face of the transgressor, though they were unprincipled, babbling and bawling at the stake; but they also reproved evil speaking and backbiting. The commission is to preach the gospel "to every creature," not about them. How keen the rebuke of preaching to men about slavery—who are in no way responsible for it—contained in the injunction, to "shake off the dust of your feet" against those who do not receive you. In accordance with this I find in the discipline you quote, among the "rules for a preacher's conduct," the following: "Speak with freedom; because your word, especially, would cut as into a canker. Keep your thoughts within your own breast, till you come to the person concerned." Thus, sir, your abolition preaching, authorized by the example of Christ, condemned by his precepts and forbidden by the rules prescribed for you by the church of which you say, you have the "honor of being a member?" and verily, sir, I think you have more honor of the Church, that prescribed such rules, than the Church has of you, who violate them. How truly have the "evil words" so persistently spoken of the people of the South, taken as death a canker," into the very hearts of the people of that portion of our country, and how truly are they now preying upon the very vitals of the nation.—How broad cast the ruin and dismay thus brought to our country by those whose mission it was to have preached "good tidings"—"good will on earth and peace among men." I confess, sir, that I am astonished, that you, who have condemned this as the true cause of our troubles, should now undertake to justify it, and in your practice out-herald even herod. Is it that the times are not congenial to the exercise of christian virtues, and the maintenance of a christian spirit? Was it this that led Wesley, the founder of the *methodism*, in the dark days of the American revolution, to speak of Washington and his countrymen, in their efforts to establish this government, as *rebels*, with as much bitterness, as possible, as you now preach about democrats, who are endeavoring to sustain it, as they bequeathed it to us, denouncing them as "Copperheads?" Why is it, sir, that the ministers of your church, more than those of any other are given over to this *infatuation*. Is it, sir, that you see in these times an opportunity of making war upon a portion of a church, the duty of which you had not the patriotism to maintain? Remember, Sir, that your pastoral exhortations of patriotism, under these circumstances, are looked upon with suspicion.

And now, Sir, since you have seen fit to charge me with falsehood and slander, in the caption of the review of your sermon, overlooking the fact, that in that review, I noticed the charge made by you against a brother of misquoting the Scriptures, without any proof whatever—a matter that ought to have attracted your attention, as the charge was one that required vindication or retraction at the hands of any honorable man—I now, sir, call your attention to it. And as you seem so anxious to become a martyr—dearing your reputation to act only on the defensive, while making groundless charges of falsehood and slander upon others—I now say, sir, that when you charged Bishop Hopkins with misquoting the Scriptures, standing as you did upon the watchtower, in the presence of your Maker, you lied in your very throat.

Very truly yours,
 J. DEWITT.
 Tunkhannock, Oct. 5th, 1863.

NEWTON, Oct 5 1863
 FRIEND SICKLER

DEAR SIR: My son Isaac wrote you a letter some time since, and you published it in your excellent Democratic paper. He told you all about the desecration of the Presbyterian church in this place, about the stealing of books, &c. I tell you it has kicked up a big time here. Our good old pastor, Rev. J. B. A. Lewis, abiding Isaac most outrageously. It was so pretty hard language for a pastor I tell you, he gets on his old horse, (Never is his name,) I know him by the tail, (that is the horse), then he goes it from house to house, abusing my son for telling the truth, in fact, the truth nearly crazes the old man, he tells people that he has written to you to know why Isaac is, but that you pay no attention—he takes on so Isaac said he would write you again and tell of some of his actions. But as Isaac is young I told him I would write myself, as I sign my name, and then the pastor would know who Isaac is, as I am his father,—that is your politics my letter. You see some time ago there was a tearing up of cushions in the church at this place. Well it did look as though there had been a tugger camp meeting inside, the books were stolen, Bible and all. As I am bound to tell you the truth all about it, I must say the best I can do is called Black Republican are awful liars, at least the liars we have in Newton-on.—So they set to work about this matter, and got up a big lie, the crew had done a mean and it must be charged on the Democrats, so they published in the smart meeting at Pittston, and in the Black Republican at Tunkhannock, that the Copperheads in Newton had desecrated a church, had tore up the cushions belonging to Republicans and stole all the books. Now there never was a book he conceived in the heart of fallen man. I tell you upon my honor as a man that the cushions belonging to Republicans were not touched. And there is not one of the whole black crew that dare come before the public and own his or her own name say, I am a Republican and owned a cushion in the Presbyterian church at Newton and had it destroyed. If there is one person wise enough to do so, the good people of Newton will prove him or her a liar. This is not the first time Black Republican scamps have committed mean acts and then charged it on Democrats. Cushions were tore up and stolen, but they did not belong to Black Republi-