

THE REVIEW.



CRAWFORDSVILLE

Saturday Morning, Feb. 27, 1858.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY
CHARLES H. BOWEN.

The Crawfordsville Review, furnished to subscribers at \$1.50 in advance, or \$2.00 per annum in advance, or \$2.00 per annum in advance, or \$2.00 per annum in advance.

S. H. PERRY, South East corner Columbia and Main streets, Cincinnati, Ohio, is our Agent to receive advertisements.

CIRCULATION
LARGER THAN ANY PAPER PUBLISHED IN
CRAWFORDSVILLE.

Advertises call up and examine our list of
SUBSCRIBERS.

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

For Secretary of State,
DANIEL McCLURE, of Morgan.

For Auditor of State,
JOHN W. DODD, of Grant.

For Treasurer of State,
NATHANIEL CUNNINGHAM, of Vigo.

For Superintendent of Public Instruction,
SAMUEL L. RUGG, of Allen.

For Attorney General,
JOSEPH E. McDONALD, of Montgomery.

For Judges of the Supreme Court,
SAMUEL E. PERKINS, of Marion.
ANDREW DAVISON, of Decatur.
JAMES M. HANNA, of Vigo.
JAMES L. WORDEN, of Whitley.

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION.

That met in the Court House last Saturday, was neither as largely attended nor as enthusiastic as was anticipated. In another place we notice the "platform" it adopted and published. The event of the day was a speech from our distinguished townsman, Col. Henry S. Lane.

We are induced to notice the gentleman's effort on the occasion with some particularity, partly because of his prominence, and partly on account of the indication it gave as to the tendency of his party.

We had reason to think that he would "show his hand," according to the vulgar phrase; scores came there to catch "the cue" from him; how they were satisfied, we do not know; we were disappointed—such is our honest confession. Evidently, the Col. had no cue to give; his own mind was not positively made up. With the U. S. Senate in expectancy, he had reached a fork in the road, and was pondering the fingerboards—one inscribed, "Washington, via Cincinnati Platform," the other, "Washington, via Philadelphia Platform."

Which should he travel? Which was the surest? His mind was not exactly made up, we say; by way of a compromise, he would try one road a little while, then return and take the other. Very naturally, he didn't make much headway on either—Such, in truth, is the predicament of the Republican party.

"Popular Sovereignty" has suddenly dazzled their eyes. All at once it has become a holy principle; a fundamental doctrine of the government; the very question our father's shed their blood for in an ancient day. They oppose "Popular Sovereignty"? Oh, no! They are ready to fight for it now. To hear them talk, one would fancy himself safe in offering a reward for a Republican who had ever opposed it. So it is with the "low-cunning" fellows; those that aspire to nothing above an Assessorship; the happy irresponsible, Alas, for such as Lane! Alas, for Lane particularly! He sees the noble principle and longs to embrace it; he waves his hat and kisses his hand to it; he shouts in its honor; shining and glorious with the national sanction, it overpowers him, and he spits out in his hands and grinds his teeth, and dashes out in swift pursuit of it. He gets but a few steps when something "fetters him up standing"—he looks back—there is a rope knotted round his leg and hithered to the centre post of the Philadelphia Platform—a nice little rope curiously made of famous material, imported originally from Africa, and sometimes used to stuff in people's eyes, when it has the virtue of enabling them to look upon a negro as the equal of a white man—an elegant rope tied round Lane's leg by Josh. Giddings that day they sat down together to make the Philadelphia Platform.

Seriously speaking, however, throughout his whole speech we felt assured he would give twice his fortune—aye, ten Banks—if he could undo the work of the 17th June, 1856—if he had not, by accepting the Presidency of the Philadelphia Convention, indissolubly linked his fame, honor, and fortune to the platform of abolition principles that day erected. His party may desert it; he cannot; they may even plant themselves upon the Cincinnati Platform; he never can; the President of the Philadelphia Convention is a doomed man—doomed to the life-long maintenance of the mulatto child born to him that 17th of June.

Col. Lane, in the course of his speech, declared himself in favor of popular sovereignty; in a moment after, without stretched arms, he vowed himself unalterably fixed on the Philadelphia Platform. Now, we ask, how can he stand on that platform and at the same time advocate the great principle of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill? It is well enough to refresh his memory, and that of every Fremontian, to the effect of the Philadelphia resolutions, They shall derive no credit for at-

REPUBLICANISM

IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The Republican Convention last Saturday adopted a series of resolutions, altogether out of jingle with the Philadelphia Platform, and their last State platform, and the resolutions lately passed by their friends in Lafayette and Indianapolis.

Here is the Preamble:

"Whereas, Evils, when they become habitual impair the moral honesty of society as well as the principles of parties, and as the evil counsels of the Retrogressive Democracy may produce a degree of oppression tantamount to a despotism, which despise the opinion that does not receive all its dogmas as orthodox, and as there is a faction in this government harmonizing with this Democracy, that claims for itself an aristocracy above the sovereign power of the whole people, and maintains the sophism that 'slavery is the natural and moral condition of the laboring man, whether white or black,' therefore,

We will liberally reward the ingenious reader who can make grammar or sense of such stuff. Who could have embodied such a paragraph?

"Resolved, That as Republicans we maintain as essential to the preservation of our institutions and freedom the liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence, embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and that the Federal Constitution and Union as framed and understood by the illustrious patriots with whom they originated shall be preserved."

What liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence do the gentlemen mean? The abolitionists go to that sacred instrument, and by what they call "a liberal construction," pretend to find there authority for the dogma of "nigger equality." We suppose that is one of the liberal doctrines adopted by our Republicans.

"Resolved, That we do now, as heretofore maintained, that the people of a Territory, when they come to form a Constitution preparatory to admission into the Union, have the right to form their own fundamental law, and we protest against the admission of any Territory into the Union as a State now or hereafter, whose Constitution and every part of it has not been first submitted to, and approved of, by a majority of the people of such Territory."

In this, too, there is a strong conflict of sense and grammar; but, giving it the liberal construction, it acknowledges the right of the people of a Territory to make their own constitution. Suppose, however, they should choose to adopt slavery as one of their institutions; then what? The boys are silent on that point. Are they still "unalterably opposed to the admission of any new slave States?" Their friends in Tippecanoe are; so are they in Marion; why didn't our fellows have the pluck to say something on that point?

"Resolved, That as a vast majority of the citizens of Kansas are opposed to the Lecompton Constitution, any attempt to force that odious swindle upon them, will and should be met by the determined opposition of all those who believe in the right of a free people to govern themselves."

That is right. But why didn't the fellows tell us whether or not they are in favor of an enabling act to allow the people of Kansas to make another constitution? They didn't dare to—they are in favor of the Topeka Constitution, which is as odious a swindle as the Lecompton.

"Resolved, That whilst we are unalterably opposed to any interference with slavery in the States where it legally exists except by the citizens of said States, still we shall forever resist its further extension into any territory now belonging to the United States, or which may hereafter be acquired on this continent."

Opposed to interference with slavery where it exists, are they? When did they dissolve partnership with Giddings? On the 17th of June, 1856, in national convention at Philadelphia, they declared it their duty to prohibit the extension or extension of slavery in the United States, by positive legislation. Now they turn tail on Fremont's platform. Can they expect us to confide in their present declaration? They have too much stock in the Under Ground Railroad yet.

Further, they will resist the further extension of slavery. How do they propose to resist it? The resolution says not. If their minds on this point have undergone no change since last year, we have a right to infer they intend the old modes of resistance, viz: unintermitted agitation of slavery—refusal to admit a new slave State.

"Resolved, That we believe the Constitution of the United States protects slavery where it exists by virtue of positive law, but that that sacred instrument carries slavery nowhere."

Good for them! They are now in favor of helping execute the Fugitive Slave Law. We'll test their sincerity the first time a runaway negro comes along this way.

"Resolved, That the pretended election of Bright and Fitch to the Senate of the United States was unconstitutional and revolutionary, alike disgraceful to the electors and to the elected."

We know they never liked that election. But it was so revolutionary, unconstitutional and disgraceful, why didn't their Senators do their sworn duty, and go down and join the Democracy in an old style election? Let us hear from them on that point.

"Resolved, That the charge made by the office holder's Convention at Indianapolis, on the 8th of January last, that the Republicans are in favor of placing negroes upon an equality with the whites, is a malicious falsehood, known to be such by its authors, and was put forth for electioneering purposes alone, and is worthy of the sources from which it emanated."

Terrific sarcasm, 'pon our word! We feel badly scorched. We are surprised at the audacity of the gentleman. Are they not in favor of giving negroes the rights of citizenship? If they are not, why don't

REPUBLICANISM

IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The Republican Convention last Saturday adopted a series of resolutions, altogether out of jingle with the Philadelphia Platform, and their last State platform, and the resolutions lately passed by their friends in Lafayette and Indianapolis.

Here is the Preamble:

"Whereas, Evils, when they become habitual impair the moral honesty of society as well as the principles of parties, and as the evil counsels of the Retrogressive Democracy may produce a degree of oppression tantamount to a despotism, which despise the opinion that does not receive all its dogmas as orthodox, and as there is a faction in this government harmonizing with this Democracy, that claims for itself an aristocracy above the sovereign power of the whole people, and maintains the sophism that 'slavery is the natural and moral condition of the laboring man, whether white or black,' therefore,

We will liberally reward the ingenious reader who can make grammar or sense of such stuff. Who could have embodied such a paragraph?

"Resolved, That as Republicans we maintain as essential to the preservation of our institutions and freedom the liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence, embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and that the Federal Constitution and Union as framed and understood by the illustrious patriots with whom they originated shall be preserved."

What liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence do the gentlemen mean? The abolitionists go to that sacred instrument, and by what they call "a liberal construction," pretend to find there authority for the dogma of "nigger equality." We suppose that is one of the liberal doctrines adopted by our Republicans.

"Resolved, That we do now, as heretofore maintained, that the people of a Territory, when they come to form a Constitution preparatory to admission into the Union, have the right to form their own fundamental law, and we protest against the admission of any Territory into the Union as a State now or hereafter, whose Constitution and every part of it has not been first submitted to, and approved of, by a majority of the people of such Territory."

In this, too, there is a strong conflict of sense and grammar; but, giving it the liberal construction, it acknowledges the right of the people of a Territory to make their own constitution. Suppose, however, they should choose to adopt slavery as one of their institutions; then what? The boys are silent on that point. Are they still "unalterably opposed to the admission of any new slave States?" Their friends in Tippecanoe are; so are they in Marion; why didn't our fellows have the pluck to say something on that point?

"Resolved, That as a vast majority of the citizens of Kansas are opposed to the Lecompton Constitution, any attempt to force that odious swindle upon them, will and should be met by the determined opposition of all those who believe in the right of a free people to govern themselves."

That is right. But why didn't the fellows tell us whether or not they are in favor of an enabling act to allow the people of Kansas to make another constitution? They didn't dare to—they are in favor of the Topeka Constitution, which is as odious a swindle as the Lecompton.

"Resolved, That whilst we are unalterably opposed to any interference with slavery in the States where it legally exists except by the citizens of said States, still we shall forever resist its further extension into any territory now belonging to the United States, or which may hereafter be acquired on this continent."

Opposed to interference with slavery where it exists, are they? When did they dissolve partnership with Giddings? On the 17th of June, 1856, in national convention at Philadelphia, they declared it their duty to prohibit the extension or extension of slavery in the United States, by positive legislation. Now they turn tail on Fremont's platform. Can they expect us to confide in their present declaration? They have too much stock in the Under Ground Railroad yet.

Further, they will resist the further extension of slavery. How do they propose to resist it? The resolution says not. If their minds on this point have undergone no change since last year, we have a right to infer they intend the old modes of resistance, viz: unintermitted agitation of slavery—refusal to admit a new slave State.

"Resolved, That we believe the Constitution of the United States protects slavery where it exists by virtue of positive law, but that that sacred instrument carries slavery nowhere."

Good for them! They are now in favor of helping execute the Fugitive Slave Law. We'll test their sincerity the first time a runaway negro comes along this way.

"Resolved, That the pretended election of Bright and Fitch to the Senate of the United States was unconstitutional and revolutionary, alike disgraceful to the electors and to the elected."

We know they never liked that election. But it was so revolutionary, unconstitutional and disgraceful, why didn't their Senators do their sworn duty, and go down and join the Democracy in an old style election? Let us hear from them on that point.

"Resolved, That the charge made by the office holder's Convention at Indianapolis, on the 8th of January last, that the Republicans are in favor of placing negroes upon an equality with the whites, is a malicious falsehood, known to be such by its authors, and was put forth for electioneering purposes alone, and is worthy of the sources from which it emanated."

Terrific sarcasm, 'pon our word! We feel badly scorched. We are surprised at the audacity of the gentleman. Are they not in favor of giving negroes the rights of citizenship? If they are not, why don't

REPUBLICANISM

IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The Republican Convention last Saturday adopted a series of resolutions, altogether out of jingle with the Philadelphia Platform, and their last State platform, and the resolutions lately passed by their friends in Lafayette and Indianapolis.

Here is the Preamble:

"Whereas, Evils, when they become habitual impair the moral honesty of society as well as the principles of parties, and as the evil counsels of the Retrogressive Democracy may produce a degree of oppression tantamount to a despotism, which despise the opinion that does not receive all its dogmas as orthodox, and as there is a faction in this government harmonizing with this Democracy, that claims for itself an aristocracy above the sovereign power of the whole people, and maintains the sophism that 'slavery is the natural and moral condition of the laboring man, whether white or black,' therefore,

We will liberally reward the ingenious reader who can make grammar or sense of such stuff. Who could have embodied such a paragraph?

"Resolved, That as Republicans we maintain as essential to the preservation of our institutions and freedom the liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence, embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and that the Federal Constitution and Union as framed and understood by the illustrious patriots with whom they originated shall be preserved."

What liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence do the gentlemen mean? The abolitionists go to that sacred instrument, and by what they call "a liberal construction," pretend to find there authority for the dogma of "nigger equality." We suppose that is one of the liberal doctrines adopted by our Republicans.

"Resolved, That we do now, as heretofore maintained, that the people of a Territory, when they come to form a Constitution preparatory to admission into the Union, have the right to form their own fundamental law, and we protest against the admission of any Territory into the Union as a State now or hereafter, whose Constitution and every part of it has not been first submitted to, and approved of, by a majority of the people of such Territory."

In this, too, there is a strong conflict of sense and grammar; but, giving it the liberal construction, it acknowledges the right of the people of a Territory to make their own constitution. Suppose, however, they should choose to adopt slavery as one of their institutions; then what? The boys are silent on that point. Are they still "unalterably opposed to the admission of any new slave States?" Their friends in Tippecanoe are; so are they in Marion; why didn't our fellows have the pluck to say something on that point?

"Resolved, That as a vast majority of the citizens of Kansas are opposed to the Lecompton Constitution, any attempt to force that odious swindle upon them, will and should be met by the determined opposition of all those who believe in the right of a free people to govern themselves."

That is right. But why didn't the fellows tell us whether or not they are in favor of an enabling act to allow the people of Kansas to make another constitution? They didn't dare to—they are in favor of the Topeka Constitution, which is as odious a swindle as the Lecompton.

"Resolved, That whilst we are unalterably opposed to any interference with slavery in the States where it legally exists except by the citizens of said States, still we shall forever resist its further extension into any territory now belonging to the United States, or which may hereafter be acquired on this continent."

Opposed to interference with slavery where it exists, are they? When did they dissolve partnership with Giddings? On the 17th of June, 1856, in national convention at Philadelphia, they declared it their duty to prohibit the extension or extension of slavery in the United States, by positive legislation. Now they turn tail on Fremont's platform. Can they expect us to confide in their present declaration? They have too much stock in the Under Ground Railroad yet.

Further, they will resist the further extension of slavery. How do they propose to resist it? The resolution says not. If their minds on this point have undergone no change since last year, we have a right to infer they intend the old modes of resistance, viz: unintermitted agitation of slavery—refusal to admit a new slave State.

"Resolved, That we believe the Constitution of the United States protects slavery where it exists by virtue of positive law, but that that sacred instrument carries slavery nowhere."

Good for them! They are now in favor of helping execute the Fugitive Slave Law. We'll test their sincerity the first time a runaway negro comes along this way.

"Resolved, That the pretended election of Bright and Fitch to the Senate of the United States was unconstitutional and revolutionary, alike disgraceful to the electors and to the elected."

We know they never liked that election. But it was so revolutionary, unconstitutional and disgraceful, why didn't their Senators do their sworn duty, and go down and join the Democracy in an old style election? Let us hear from them on that point.

"Resolved, That the charge made by the office holder's Convention at Indianapolis, on the 8th of January last, that the Republicans are in favor of placing negroes upon an equality with the whites, is a malicious falsehood, known to be such by its authors, and was put forth for electioneering purposes alone, and is worthy of the sources from which it emanated."

Terrific sarcasm, 'pon our word! We feel badly scorched. We are surprised at the audacity of the gentleman. Are they not in favor of giving negroes the rights of citizenship? If they are not, why don't

REPUBLICANISM

IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The Republican Convention last Saturday adopted a series of resolutions, altogether out of jingle with the Philadelphia Platform, and their last State platform, and the resolutions lately passed by their friends in Lafayette and Indianapolis.

Here is the Preamble:

"Whereas, Evils, when they become habitual impair the moral honesty of society as well as the principles of parties, and as the evil counsels of the Retrogressive Democracy may produce a degree of oppression tantamount to a despotism, which despise the opinion that does not receive all its dogmas as orthodox, and as there is a faction in this government harmonizing with this Democracy, that claims for itself an aristocracy above the sovereign power of the whole people, and maintains the sophism that 'slavery is the natural and moral condition of the laboring man, whether white or black,' therefore,

We will liberally reward the ingenious reader who can make grammar or sense of such stuff. Who could have embodied such a paragraph?

"Resolved, That as Republicans we maintain as essential to the preservation of our institutions and freedom the liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence, embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and that the Federal Constitution and Union as framed and understood by the illustrious patriots with whom they originated shall be preserved."

What liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence do the gentlemen mean? The abolitionists go to that sacred instrument, and by what they call "a liberal construction," pretend to find there authority for the dogma of "nigger equality." We suppose that is one of the liberal doctrines adopted by our Republicans.

"Resolved, That we do now, as heretofore maintained, that the people of a Territory, when they come to form a Constitution preparatory to admission into the Union, have the right to form their own fundamental law, and we protest against the admission of any Territory into the Union as a State now or hereafter, whose Constitution and every part of it has not been first submitted to, and approved of, by a majority of the people of such Territory."

In this, too, there is a strong conflict of sense and grammar; but, giving it the liberal construction, it acknowledges the right of the people of a Territory to make their own constitution. Suppose, however, they should choose to adopt slavery as one of their institutions; then what? The boys are silent on that point. Are they still "unalterably opposed to the admission of any new slave States?" Their friends in Tippecanoe are; so are they in Marion; why didn't our fellows have the pluck to say something on that point?

"Resolved, That as a vast majority of the citizens of Kansas are opposed to the Lecompton Constitution, any attempt to force that odious swindle upon them, will and should be met by the determined opposition of all those who believe in the right of a free people to govern themselves."

That is right. But why didn't the fellows tell us whether or not they are in favor of an enabling act to allow the people of Kansas to make another constitution? They didn't dare to—they are in favor of the Topeka Constitution, which is as odious a swindle as the Lecompton.

"Resolved, That whilst we are unalterably opposed to any interference with slavery in the States where it legally exists except by the citizens of said States, still we shall forever resist its further extension into any territory now belonging to the United States, or which may hereafter be acquired on this continent."

Opposed to interference with slavery where it exists, are they? When did they dissolve partnership with Giddings? On the 17th of June, 1856, in national convention at Philadelphia, they declared it their duty to prohibit the extension or extension of slavery in the United States, by positive legislation. Now they turn tail on Fremont's platform. Can they expect us to confide in their present declaration? They have too much stock in the Under Ground Railroad yet.

Further, they will resist the further extension of slavery. How do they propose to resist it? The resolution says not. If their minds on this point have undergone no change since last year, we have a right to infer they intend the old modes of resistance, viz: unintermitted agitation of slavery—refusal to admit a new slave State.

"Resolved, That we believe the Constitution of the United States protects slavery where it exists by virtue of positive law, but that that sacred instrument carries slavery nowhere."

Good for them! They are now in favor of helping execute the Fugitive Slave Law. We'll test their sincerity the first time a runaway negro comes along this way.

"Resolved, That the pretended election of Bright and Fitch to the Senate of the United States was unconstitutional and revolutionary, alike disgraceful to the electors and to the elected."

We know they never liked that election. But it was so revolutionary, unconstitutional and disgraceful, why didn't their Senators do their sworn duty, and go down and join the Democracy in an old style election? Let us hear from them on that point.

"Resolved, That the charge made by the office holder's Convention at Indianapolis, on the 8th of January last, that the Republicans are in favor of placing negroes upon an equality with the whites, is a malicious falsehood, known to be such by its authors, and was put forth for electioneering purposes alone, and is worthy of the sources from which it emanated."

Terrific sarcasm, 'pon our word! We feel badly scorched. We are surprised at the audacity of the gentleman. Are they not in favor of giving negroes the rights of citizenship? If they are not, why don't

REPUBLICANISM

IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The Republican Convention last Saturday adopted a series of resolutions, altogether out of jingle with the Philadelphia Platform, and their last State platform, and the resolutions lately passed by their friends in Lafayette and Indianapolis.

Here is the Preamble:

"Whereas, Evils, when they become habitual impair the moral honesty of society as well as the principles of parties, and as the evil counsels of the Retrogressive Democracy may produce a degree of oppression tantamount to a despotism, which despise the opinion that does not receive all its dogmas as orthodox, and as there is a faction in this government harmonizing with this Democracy, that claims for itself an aristocracy above the sovereign power of the whole people, and maintains the sophism that 'slavery is the natural and moral condition of the laboring man, whether white or black,' therefore,

We will liberally reward the ingenious reader who can make grammar or sense of such stuff. Who could have embodied such a paragraph?

"Resolved, That as Republicans we maintain as essential to the preservation of our institutions and freedom the liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence, embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and that the Federal Constitution and Union as framed and understood by the illustrious patriots with whom they originated shall be preserved."

What liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence do the gentlemen mean? The abolitionists go to that sacred instrument, and by what they call "a liberal construction," pretend to find there authority for the dogma of "nigger equality." We suppose that is one of the liberal doctrines adopted by our Republicans.

"Resolved, That we do now, as heretofore maintained, that the people of a Territory, when they come to form a Constitution preparatory to admission into the Union, have the right to form their own fundamental law, and we protest against the admission of any Territory into the Union as a State now or hereafter, whose Constitution and every part of it has not been first submitted to, and approved of, by a majority of the people of such Territory."

In this, too, there is a strong conflict of sense and grammar; but, giving it the liberal construction, it acknowledges the right of the people of a Territory to make their own constitution. Suppose, however, they should choose to adopt slavery as one of their institutions; then what? The boys are silent on that point. Are they still "unalterably opposed to the admission of any new slave States?" Their friends in Tippecanoe are; so are they in Marion; why didn't our fellows have the pluck to say something on that point?

"Resolved, That as a vast majority of the citizens of Kansas are opposed to the Lecompton Constitution, any attempt to force that odious swindle upon them, will and should be met by the determined opposition of all those who believe in the right of a free people to govern themselves."

That is right. But why didn't the fellows tell us whether or not they are in favor of an enabling act to allow the people of Kansas to make another constitution? They didn't dare to—they are in favor of the Topeka Constitution, which is as odious a swindle as the Lecompton.

"Resolved, That whilst we are unalterably opposed to any interference with slavery in the States where it legally exists except by the citizens of said States, still we shall forever resist its further extension into any territory now belonging to the United States, or which may hereafter be acquired on this continent."

Opposed to interference with slavery where it exists, are they? When did they dissolve partnership with Giddings? On the 17th of June, 1856, in national convention at Philadelphia, they declared it their duty to prohibit the extension or extension of slavery in the United States, by positive legislation. Now they turn tail on Fremont's platform. Can they expect us to confide in their present declaration? They have too much stock in the Under Ground Railroad yet.

Further, they will resist the further extension of slavery. How do they propose to resist it? The resolution says not. If their minds on this point have undergone no change since last year, we have a right to infer they intend the old modes of resistance, viz: unintermitted agitation of slavery—refusal to admit a new slave State.

"Resolved, That we believe the Constitution of the United States protects slavery where it exists by virtue of positive law, but that that sacred instrument carries slavery nowhere."

Good for them! They are now in favor of helping execute the Fugitive Slave Law. We'll test their sincerity the first time a runaway negro comes along this way.

"Resolved, That the pretended election of Bright and Fitch to the Senate of the United States was unconstitutional and revolutionary, alike disgraceful to the electors and to the elected."

We know they never liked that election. But it was so revolutionary, unconstitutional and disgraceful, why didn't their Senators do their sworn duty, and go down and join the Democracy in an old style election? Let us hear from them on that point.

"Resolved, That the charge made by the office holder's Convention at Indianapolis, on the 8th of January last, that the Republicans are in favor of placing negroes upon an equality with the whites, is a malicious falsehood, known to be such by its authors, and was put forth for electioneering purposes alone, and is worthy of the sources from which it emanated."

Terrific sarcasm, 'pon our word! We feel badly scorched. We are surprised at the audacity of the gentleman. Are they not in favor of giving negroes the rights of citizenship? If they are not, why don't

REPUBLICANISM

IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The Republican Convention last Saturday adopted a series of resolutions, altogether out of jingle with the Philadelphia Platform, and their last State platform, and the resolutions lately passed by their friends in Lafayette and Indianapolis.

Here is the Preamble:

"Whereas, Evils, when they become habitual impair the moral honesty of society as well as the principles of parties, and as the evil counsels of the Retrogressive Democracy may produce a degree of oppression tantamount to a despotism, which despise the opinion that does not receive all its dogmas as orthodox, and as there is a faction in this government harmonizing with this Democracy, that claims for itself an aristocracy above the sovereign power of the whole people, and maintains the sophism that 'slavery is the natural and moral condition of the laboring man, whether white or black,' therefore,

We will liberally reward the ingenious reader who can make grammar or sense of such stuff. Who could have embodied such a paragraph?

"Resolved, That as Republicans we maintain as essential to the preservation of our institutions and freedom the liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence, embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and that the Federal Constitution and Union as framed and understood by the illustrious patriots with whom they originated shall be preserved."

What liberal doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence do the gentlemen mean? The abolitionists go to that sacred instrument, and by what they call "a liberal construction," pretend to find there authority for the dogma of "nigger equality." We suppose that is one of the liberal doctrines adopted by our Republicans.

"Resolved, That we do now, as heretofore maintained, that the people of a Territory, when they come to form a Constitution preparatory to admission into the Union, have the right to form their own fundamental law, and we protest against the admission of any Territory into the Union as a State now or hereafter, whose Constitution and every part of it has not been first submitted to, and approved of, by a majority of the