



HARVEY SICKLER, Editor. TUNKHANNOCK, PA

Wednesday, Sept. 26th 1866.

FOR GOVERNOR, HON. HIESTER CLYMER, OF BERKS.

FOR CONGRESS, HON. W. M. ELWELL, of Columbia.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES, JOHN JACKSON, of Wyoming, and C. M. GERE, of Susquehanna.

FOR SHERIFF, M. W. DEWITT, of Tunk. Boro.

FOR PROTHONOTARY, E. J. KEENEY, of Braintrim.

FOR ASSOCIATE JUDGE, GORDON PIKE, of Northmoreland.

FOR REGISTER AND RECORDER, O. L. PARRISH, of Monroe.

FOR TREASURER, JEREMIAH OSTERHOUT, of Tunk. Twp.

FOR COMMISSIONER, G. W. SHERWOOD, of Falls.

FOR CORNER, A. H. BOLLES, of Meshoppen.

FOR ADDITOR, JAMES R. ROBINSON, of Forkton.

Are You Assessed? If not attend to the matter before Saturday night. Monday will be too late.

THE CONGRESSIONAL NEGRO EQUALITY PYRAMID. \$4000.00 extra pay to congressmen for Legislating for the negro—extending their privileges and abridging those of white men.

\$300.00 Bounty for negro soldiers the boys in black \$100.00 bounty for 3 year white soldiers, the boys in blue. And 2 year white men \$50.

Will the white soldiers of Wyoming County, will white men, anywhere, vote to prop up and sustain such a pyramid of injustice and wrong? Let them answer at the polls on the second Tuesday of October next.

The Deserter Law. The deserter law passed by the last Legislature, to give effect to a law of congress on the subject with the decisions upon it, has received a very careful examination by R. R. Little Esq., the result of which he makes public in this week's Democrat.

This opinion and argument is necessarily brief—stiffly so—but is irresistibly conclusive. We hope all into whose hands it falls will read and preserve it for reference, on the day of election. Let it be shown to those Judges and Inspectors, if any there be, who, disregarding their oaths and the constitution, may be disposed to deny any constitutionally qualified citizen the right of suffrage.

Let them not, when brought up for trial—as they have heretofore done—plead ignorance of their duties as an excuse for malfeasance in office. If, in defiance of the Constitution, and the laws, and in defiance of recent decisions of the supreme and district courts upon this question, they persist in denying to any one who is thus qualified the right to vote, let them be dealt with according to law.

It may be asked by some, why, if this law is null and void, the sheriff of the several counties insert it in their proclamations. We answer that the Legislature has full power to direct what shall appear in such proclamation. They might, if they chose, direct a congratulatory address to the King of Hayti, to be thus published. But a disunion Legislature has not the power to set at naught a plain provision of the Constitution. That is above them—and until changed by a vote of the people must stand as the supreme authority on all subjects embraced therein.

On the Duty of Election Boards in Reference to Accepting or Rejecting votes of Alleged Deserters.

Mr. Editor: Having been consulted by several officers of Election Boards, in different Districts of this County, in reference to their duty under the late Act of Assembly which purports to disfranchise all persons whose names appear upon certain rolls lately furnished by the Adjutant-General, and having promised to examine the question at an early day and make known to them through the medium of the County papers, or otherwise, the result of such examination, I herewith submit the following opinion, in fulfillment of my promise.

The recent Act of Assembly derives its vitality, if any it has, from the Act of Congress of 3d March, 1865, which imposes forfeiture of rights of citizenship as an additional penalty for the crime of desertion, and extends such penalty to all persons duly enrolled who shall depart their several Districts with intent to avoid any draft, &c.

This act of Congress has received a judicial construction from the Supreme Court of this State since the passage by the Legislature of the Act of Assembly now under consideration. It is probable that the members of the late Legislature would have spared themselves the pains bestowed upon this statute if they had had an opportunity to examine the decision of the Supreme Court before its passage.

This Act of Assembly forbids election officers "to receive any ballots from any persons embraced in the provisions and subject to the disability imposed, by said Act of Congress," and imposes certain penalties for a violation of its provisions. It also imposes similar penalties upon all persons so disqualified, who shall vote, or offer to vote at any election, as well as upon all persons who shall "persuade or advise" any election officer to receive the vote of any such person or persons.

By the very terms of this statute we are referred to the Act of Congress before mentioned for a specification of the class of persons intended to be embraced in its provisions, and the Supreme Court has decided in the case of Huber vs. Reilly, that this class only includes such persons as have been duly convicted by a court martial, lawfully constituted, of the offence of desertion.

The Supreme Court recognizes the power of Congress to impose a forfeiture of the right to vote as a part of the penalty for the offence of desertion, but distinctly holds that neither this nor any other part or portion of the penalty prescribed by law can be imposed until a Court Martial duly constituted shall have determined the guilt of the offender—that this Act of Congress must be considered in connection with other Acts relating to the same subject, constituting together, a system defining the offence, and its punishment, and prescribing the tribunal authorized to take cognizance of it—that this whole subject belongs, not to State, but to Federal jurisdiction—that Congress can no more pass over to state tribunals of any sort jurisdiction of offences against the United States than the State authorities can convey to the Federal courts jurisdiction of offences against the State—that the penalties can not be imposed in part by one tribunal and in part by another, and that in no case can a Board of election officers be considered a competent court for the trial of persons charged with this offence, and the imposition of any part of the penalty prescribed therefor.

And why should not this be so held?—The Constitution of this Commonwealth provides, among other things, that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall have information of the nature and cause of the accusation, in order that he may be prepared to meet the same. This statute provides for no actual previous notice to him of any sort of accusation. The constitution gives to him the right to meet the witnesses against him face to face. The statute makes imperfect lists manufactured ex parte and upon mere hearsay prima facie evidence of guilt. The constitution gives to him the right to compulsory process to secure the attendance of his own witnesses. The statute gives to this newly invented court no power to issue any process whatever for such purpose, nor any power to enforce obedience thereto. The constitution gives to him the right to a trial "by due process of law." The Supreme Court says that a trial by the Election Board is not by due process of law. The constitution declares that no person shall be twice put in jeopardy for the same offence. The statute proposes to inflict the "additional penalty" on a conviction by an election board, leaving the remainder to the tribunal having jurisdiction of the offence.

And what a tribunal is created by this act of assembly for the trial of persons accused of this offence! The officers composing it, though unsworn to try issues in criminal cases, may act both as prosecutors and as judges. Without power to enforce attendance of witnesses, to make and preserve a record of trials, convictions and acquittals, their judgment, when rendered, in binding upon no other tribunal. At the next election a new set of judges try the accused again for the same offence, and perhaps impose another fraction of the same penalty. In case of acquittal in bar by a former board, he cannot plead such acquittal of another prosecution for the same offence. Indeed, the idea of such a court for such a purpose would be laughable if it had not been dignified by the legislative assent.—It would be ridiculous if it were not monstrous. Says Mr. Justice Strong in the case before cited, "It would be very absurd to suppose that two trials and two condemnations for one crime were intended, or that it was designed that a criminal might be sentenced in one court to undergo part of the punishment denounced by the law, and be punished in another court by the imposition of the remainder." Probably these modern courts would find, in the more populous districts, but little time for the performance of their ordinary and legitimate duties after trying and passing judgment upon all those parties who are made guilty, prima facie, by having their names written in the book of the Adjutant-General.—Their judicial machinery would be required to move with very great rapidity to enable them to "clear the docket" within the time allowed them, without troubling themselves with the little duties that have heretofore devolved upon election boards. As the accused has a right, guaranteed by the constitution, to be defended by counsel, it might be advisable in this connection, to consider how many cases could be tried within the hours limited by the law, under the most rapid mode of administering justice recognized in our criminal jurisprudence; but as I desire to be brief, I waive this inquiry, and state briefly the conclusion to which I have arrived—namely:

1. That if a duly authenticated record of the trial and conviction by a Court Martial of any person who may offer his vote at any election shall be produced before the officers conducting such election, and such record shall show the approval of the finding and sentence of such court by the President or the Secretary of War, or Navy, as the case may be, it will be the duty of such election board to reject such vote.

2. That "for the conviction and sentence of such a court there can be no substitute." It follows that the rejection of any vote upon such ground of challenge in the absence of such record evidence of trial and conviction would be unlawful.

In view of the grave responsibilities, civil as well as criminal, incurred by election officers through the unlawful denial of the right of suffrage, as well as of the penalties threatened by the recent legislation for the reception of votes of persons therein specified, I have deemed this question one of too great importance to be lightly considered, or to be viewed from a mere partisan standpoint, and have therefore given to it such careful examination and consideration as I have been able to bestow. For myself, I have no doubt of the correctness of the conclusion above stated.

I may add that in the absence of record evidence of trial and conviction by court martial of the offence of desertion, there is no safer guide for election officers in the performance of their duties than that afforded by the Constitution and general election laws of this Commonwealth, with which they have long been familiar.

R. R. LITTLE.

What they Offered in 1864. In July, 1864, Mr. Horace Greeley the editor of the New York Tribune, which paper now opposes President Johnson's policy, because, as it alleges, it is too favorable to the South, wrote the following to President Lincoln:

MY DEAR SIR: I entreat you, in your own time and manner, to submit overtures for pacification to the Southern insurgents which the impartial must pronounce frank and generous. If only with a view to the momentous election soon to occur in North Carolina, and of the draft to be enforced in the free states, this should be done at once. I would give the safe conduct required by the rebel envoys at Niagara, upon their parole to avoid observation and to refrain from all communication with their sympathizers in the loyal states; but you may see reasons for declining it. But whether them, or otherwise, do not, I entreat you, fail to make the southern people comprehend that you and all of us are anxious for peace, and are prepared to grant liberal terms. I venture to suggest the following plan of adjustment.

1. The Union is restored and declared perpetual. 2. Slavery is utterly and forever abolished throughout the same. 3. A complete amnesty for all political offences with a restoration of all the inhabitants of each state to all the privileges of citizens of the United States. 4. The Union to pay four hundred million dollars (\$400,000,000) in five per cent. United States stock to the late seceding states, loyal and seceding alike, to be appointed pro rata, according to their slave population respectively by the act of 1861, in compensation for the losses of their loyal citizens by the abolition of slavery.

The said states to be entitled henceforth to representation in the House on the basis of their total, instead of their federal population the whole being now free.

5. A national convention, to be assembled as soon as may be, to ratify this adjustment and make such changes in the constitution as may be deemed advisable.

Yours, truly, HORACE GREELEY.

It will be seen by the reader that the foregoing letter was written when the war was at its most fearful height. Then Horace Greeley was regarded by his friends as one of the most loyal men in the country.—Now that peace once more reigns supreme this same Horace Greeley says the Union is not restored, and that a complete amnesty for all political offences "with restoration of all the inhabitants of each State to all the privileges of citizens of the United States" ought not to be allowed the citizens of those States. The question then arises who have changed. Is it Greeley, or is it Johnson? Is Greeley, the exponent of Radical ideas for the last ten years, right, or is he wrong? If he is right then, the Democracy and conservatives are right now, and Greeley and his satellites are wrong now. There is no way of escaping the conclusion.

CALIFORNIA, O. K.—The California election has gone in favor of the Administration largely. The Legislature stands as follows: Council, seven Democrats and three Republicans, House, seventeen Democrats and three Republicans. The Radicals counted on California with certainty, but there's "a many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip."

THE DIFFERENCE.—Would not every workingman—laborer and artisan—like to vote for himself seventeen months back pay and increased sixty per cent. at that? That is what the Radical Congress has done. And, what is more, every workingman—every laborer and artisan—will have to pay his share of the tax required to make up this extra compensation. How do you like it fellow-citizens?

Justice they say is blind; how then is she to discover that one man is white and another colored?—N. Y. Tribune. Horace evidently thinks it is a hard conundrum but we answer promptly. "By the smell."—Northolk Virginian.

Republicans, are you in favor of enforcing negro suffrage upon the Southern States, while you oppose it in your own? If so, Mercur the candidate of the Radicals, is your man.

Our theory of Government has no place for a State except in the Union.—H. W. Beecher.

Our Candidate for Governor.

In no gubernatorial canvass which has ever taken place in our good old Commonwealth, have the Democracy less to do in defence of their standard bearer. We have long regarded the nomination of Mr. Clymer as the best that could have been made, because of the purity of his whole life; his ability as a statesman, his unblemished legislative record, and his great personal popularity. In no person that we know are all these essential requisites so thoroughly blended as in the case of our present candidate. His nomination was most fortunate for the party, and there is no person the Radicals would not have preferred to have seen placed in nomination. Within the field we regard our success as absolutely certain. His record is of such a character that even his political enemies are forced to concede all that is claimed by his most ardent friends. We have taken the pains to preserve what the Radical press were forced to say of him at the time of his nomination. They are so different from some of the feeble efforts of the Radical press that they cannot but have their effect upon the public mind.

The Philadelphia Ledger in announcing the choice of the Convention pays him the following tribute:

"Mr. Clymer belongs to one of the oldest Pennsylvania families. He is a lawyer and a citizen of excellent reputation, and has for several years represented Berks county in the State Senate."

The Pittsburg Gazette an intensely radical paper, says:

"His family have for several generations been settled in this Commonwealth, and members thereof have at times borne conspicuous parts in public affairs. One of them was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and under the articles of Confederation served as a member of Congress."

He is possessed of wealth and enjoys a high social position. An active business man, he has participated wisely and liberally in many enterprises for the development of that portion of the State in which he resides. Though a leading man in his party his abilities are not extraordinary.—He has, however a pleasing presence and address, and a reputation that does not connect him with unclean legislation."

The Philadelphia Inquirer, another paper of the same sort was compelled by truth to say:

"The Democratic Convention of Pennsylvania transacted its business with little difficulty, and has, perhaps, placed in nomination the best candidate that could have been selected from the ranks of the party. Mr. Clymer is a gentleman of excellent character and of fine abilities. There is no doubt that he will do credit to the office, should it be his fortune to be elected."

The Evening Telegraph, another Radical paper published in Philadelphia, said:

"Mr. Clymer is a thoroughly Pennsylvanian—a Democrat so deeply instilled as to have remained faithful among the faithless in our recent party racking troubles; and yet no word of dishonorable reproach has ever been breathed against him. He is an able man, a shrewd politician and a safe and cautious partisan leader.—We do not say he is the best man of his politics in the State, but we think he is one of the very few who can concentrate the entire vote of the Democratic party in the coming contest. In this matter he will have the eminent aid of his friend and former colleague in the State Senate, Hon. Wm. A. Wallace, Chairman of the Central Committee, through whose indefatigable efforts Mr. Clymer's nomination was secured. He is a man of considerable executive ability. His experience in the State Senate will enable him to appreciate and grasp every interest of our great Commonwealth and wield the charge with propriety. If elected he will make an excellent Democratic Governor."

Even Forney, of the Press, was forced to tell the truth in the following language:

"It gives us great pleasure to bear testimony to the high personal character of Hon. Hiester Clymer, the Democratic candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania. General Geary may well say that he has a 'foeman worthy of his steel.' Occupying positions exactly to the reverse on all the great questions of the day, these two representative men will doubtless conduct the canvass in that spirit which should characterize a great controversy between principles that are eternally and unequivocally hostile."

And last of a great number who thus spoke of him the New York Tribune, which is acknowledged by the Radicals as very good authority, says:

"We do not often find a chance to praise the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, but we never leave one unimproved; and we are now enabled to gratify our natural inclination with a good conscience.—Their nomination of Hiester Clymer for Governor is one that it was eminently fit that they should make. For, in the first place he is a good citizen, of fair abilities, and reputable character."

Mr. Clymer was in all things in perfect accordance with nine-tenths of his party, is their proper representative, and will poll their full vote. There is no cheat in his nomination, which makes a square, clear issue. If he gets beaten, it will be because the people are not of his school, but believe in upholding the Union."

Horace Maynard, one of Brownlow's pimps from Tennessee who has been making a tour through the northern states to enlighten white men as to their duties in the coming elections, in a speech at Athens, Tennessee on the 21st ult. said:

"I am an Abolitionist, and have always been one. I was accused of being one when I first emigrated to this State. The charge was just; I was full and running over with Abolitionism, but I denied it for policy sake, I am proud to-day that I have been classed among that persecuted set, and deem it the highest compliment to be denounced as such. And I tell you, gentlemen, that in a short time all this complaint about negro equality will be done away with. Some months since it was said that the negro would not be suffered to testify in your courts—that his oath would not be granted him."

"But how stand matters to-day? He is not only permitted to testify in your courts with impunity, but there is every evidence that he will soon be on a SOCIAL EQUALITY WITH THE WHITE MAN IN YOUR STATE. Yes, gentlemen, IN A SHORT TIME HE WILL MARRY AND INTERMARRY IN YOUR FAMILIES. It is a little objectionable to-day, but you will soon get over this, and the PERSECUTED NEGRO WILL BE WELCOME TO YOUR PARLORS. This will be the result of the political and social changes of the next few months."

Of course such speakers are appropriate to grace (!) a Geary meeting. White men and patriots would be out of place.

THE PATRIOTS AND HEROES FOR JOHNSON.

The following list of true, tried and gallant soldiers have all expressed themselves in favor of the President's policy:

GEN. U. S. GRANT, GEN. W. M. T. SHERMAN, GEN. W. S. HANCOCK, GEN. GEO. B. MCCLELLAN, GEN. J. A. DIX, GEN. ROBT. PATERSON, GEN. G. A. CUSTER, GEN. L. H. ROSS, GEN. WM. MCANDLES, GEN. PETER LYLE, GEN. A. D. MCCOOK, GEN. GEO. W. CROOK.

GEN. DAN. E. SICKLES, GEN. J. H. McCLELLAND, GEN. D. N. COUCH, GEN. WM. B. FRANKLIN, GEN. G. K. WARREN, GEN. PHIL. SHERIDAN, GEN. T. L. CRITENDEN, GEN. O. B. WILCOX, GEN. JAS. C. MCKIBBIN, GEN. FRANK P. BLAIR, A. D. M. FARAGUT, GEN. SLOCUM, GEN. GRANGER, and 45 other Generals, and 90 Col. of the war Signals of the call at Cleveland.

Also the following prominent men of the country. Wm. H. SEWARD, EDGAR COWAN, HENRY WARD BEECHER, S. C. WELLS and RANDALS, SENATOR DOOLITTLE, RAYMOND, of the TIMES, chairman of the National Republican Committee, and thousands of others. Against the President and the Union are Thad. Stevens, John Forney, Beas Butler, Fred Douglass (the negro), and their treasonable followers.

Questions for General Geary.

Are you in favor of striking the word "white" out of the Constitution of Pennsylvania? Are you in favor of enforcing Negro Suffrage upon the Southern States? Are you in favor of the act recently passed at Washington giving to negroes equal civil rights with white men—commonly called the Civil Rights bill? Are you in favor of acts of the Legislature prohibiting street railway companies from excluding negroes from cars used by white persons? These questions will be open to Gen. Geary for succinct answers to the foregoing interrogatories.

The above questions have been standing at the head of the column of the Harrisburg Patriot & Union daily and weekly, in every issue since Aug. 7th. Thousands of Union soldiers, have over their own proper signatures asked the same questions. They have never been answered except by Geary in a speech at the Lochiel (Cameron) Iron works, published in Forney's Press, where he said:

"When the question of negro suffrage comes up, as it will probably in three or four years, I SHALL BE READY TO MEET IT AND I WILL SAY I AM NOT PREPARED TO DENY THAT RIGHT OF VOTING TO THE COLORED MAN.—Geary's Speech at Lochiel Iron Works.

The object of the War, as declared by Congress, July, 1861.

Resolved, That this war is not waged on our part in any spirit of OPPRESSION, or for any purpose of CONQUEST, or for interfering with the RIGHTS OR ESTABLISHED INSTITUTIONS of these States but to DEFEND AND MAINTAIN THE SUPREMACY OF THE CONSTITUTION, and to preserve the Union with ALL THE DIGNITY AND RIGHTS of the several States UNIMPAIRED

[The above resolution was introduced in the Senate by Andrew Johnson himself.]

According to the Radicals, all soldiers who vote on their side are heroes, and merit lasting honor; but those who sustain the President are secession sympathizers and unworthy of respect or gratitude. Their worth depends upon how they vote, not how they fought! This is the Radical criterion.

OF COURSE.—When General Custer was fighting as a soldier for the Union, the Radical journals applauded his bravery.—Now that he omits to follow their lead and is again fighting for the Union as an elector, they dub him coward and sneak. We think his bravery on all occasions will compare with that of his detractors.

READ! READ!! READ!!! Address of the State Central Committee.

DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE ROOMS, 823 WALNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA: The Democratic party in its platform of principles, adopted at Harrisburg, on the 5th day of March, 1866, resolved, 1. That the States whereof the people were lately in rebellion are integral parts of the Union, and are entitled to representation in Congress, by men duly elected, who bear true faith to the Constitution and laws, and in order to vindicate the maxims that taxation without representation is tyranny, such representatives should be forthwith admitted.

2. That the faith of the republic is pledged to the payment of the national debt, and Congress should pass all laws necessary for that purpose. 3. That the white race alone is entitled to the control of the government of the republic, and we are unwilling to grant to negroes the right to vote.

Upon this platform we placed our candidate for Governor, and with these principles we confidently look for success in this contest.

Our opponents in their Convention, held at Harrisburg on the 7th day of March, 1866, also adopted a platform, and nominated a candidate. The principles they enunciated appear to be lost sight of, and the proposed constitutional amendment takes their place as the rule of Radical orthodoxy, and to it their candidate gives his unhesitating support.

Negro equality and negro suffrage are the essential elements in that amendment. By it the negro is made the equal of the white man in all his "privileges and immunities." The right of Pennsylvania to make laws to regulate the migration of negroes into the State is denied and she is deprived of her just share of representation in Congress unless her constitution be amended and the negro allowed to vote.

The Radical candidates for Governor and for United States Senator, their leaders of public sentiment, their speakers and their newspapers are open advocates of this amendment, and their practice accords with their profession, for they mingle with the negro in social intercourse, in political conventions, and in public processions.

We hold that the negro is not the equal of the white man, and, whilst we accord to him freedom and protection of person, with the right to enjoyment of the fruits of his labor and aid in intellectual advancement, we affirm that our own race is entitled to control the entire machinery of the government.

Sustain this amendment, and you give the negro the right to aid in governing you; defeat it, and you maintain your own right of sovereignty.

EVERY MAN WHO VOTES FOR GEARY OR FOR A RADICAL CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS, VOTES AS DISTINCTLY FOR NEGRO SUFFRAGE AND NEGRO EQUALITY AS IF THEY WERE PRINTED ON HIS BALLOT. DEMOCRATS OF PENNSYLVANIA!

Power is no longer against you, but ranges itself upon your side. Opportunities for fraud do not exist. Aid comes to you from the ranks of the enemy. No Democrat who voted for McClellan votes against you now; your brethren are aroused from the Larks to the Delaware. A changed of five per cent. upon the vote of 1864 will sweep your opponents out of existence.—You can count it in every election district in the Commonwealth; and if you will but execute the details of your organization, success is certain.

Faith in your principles, courage for the contest, and a determination to poll every conservative vote, are the only requisites to an assured victory. By order of the Democratic State committee. WILLIAM A. WALLACE, chairman.

Language of Andrew Johnson. "WHATEVER BATTLES I FIGHT, I DESIRE, TO FIGHT IN THE UNION PARTY; (AND NO ONE, AFTER WHAT I HAVE BEEN THROUGH, WILL QUESTION MY DEVOTION TO THE UNION), BUT THE UNION PARTY IS NOT THE PARTY OF THE RADICALS?"—ANDREW JOHNSON, March 23, 1866.

"IT IS TRUE I STATED THAT: [that what battles he fought would be within the Union party]; BUT WHEN I SAID THE UNION PARTY, I DID NOT MEAN THE MEN WHO ARE ENDEAVORING TO BREAK UP THIS UNION, BUT THE MEN WHO STAND BY ME!"—ANDREW JOHNSON, March 23, 1866.

"I BELIEVE THE MAINTENANCE OF THIS UNION DEPENDS UPON THE POLICY WHICH I HAVE INDICATED TO CONGRESS, AND THOSE WHO SUSTAIN THAT POLICY ARE MY FRIENDS, AND THOSE WHO OPPOSE THAT POLICY I CERTAINLY HAVE NO DESIRE TO SEE ELECTED TO ANY OFFICE!"—A. DREW JOHNSON, March 23, 1866.

Gen. E. L. Dana, late Colonel of the 143d, the hero of two wars, is still doing good service in the cause of the union and the constitution. At a grand turnout of the boys in blue, of Scranton city and vicinity held a few days since he was the principal speaker and made one of the most telling speeches of the campaign.—The Register in its report of the meeting says: His speech throughout was very able and replete with many elegant passages. Coming from the lips of one who participated in all the great battles in which the army of the Potomac was engaged, from the bloody engagement at Fredericksburg, under Burnside, to the final surrender of Lee's army to Gen. Grant, at Appomattox Court House, it could not fail to have great weight with the battle-scarred heroes who listened to its delivery. The remarks of the speaker in relation to the position occupied by Generals Grant, Sherman, Dix, and a host of other brave and gallant men through whose efforts the rebellion was successfully put down, elicited hearty cheers. He closed by calling on his old comrades in arms to rally around their commander-in-chief, President Johnson, in the great battle now being fought to maintain the supremacy of constitutional liberty.

A SLIGHT DIFFERENCE.—While President Johnson, Grant and others were paying their respects to the memory of the White Douglass, Anna Dickinson, Brownlow & Co., were paying their respects to Black Douglass, in Philadelphia.