

WILLIAM J. BROWN, Editor. AUSTIN H. BROWN, Publisher. THE INDIANA STATE SENTINEL: A GAZETTE OF THE PEOPLE. OFFICE IN THE TOMLINSON BUILDINGS, Corner of Washington Street and Hickory Alley, SIGN OF THE HICKORY POLE. AUSTIN H. BROWN, Publisher. The Weekly Indiana State Sentinel, TO SINGLE SUBSCRIBERS, IS ONLY ONE DOLLAR A YEAR! Eleven Copies for Ten Dollars!! TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE IN ALL CASES. THURSDAY MORNING, SEPT. 23, 1852.

The "Bowl" broken at the Fountain—More Soup getting Spilt. It seems that though the Whig party in Maryland are about to go, in haste, for Pierce and King. The following changes of distinguished Whigs—who have heretofore been recognized as leaders of the Whig party in that State—have been published in the last few days.

The Baltimore Argus, on Thursday, the 9th instant, published a long letter, written by Hon. Edward Long, late Whig member of Congress, of Somerset county, Maryland, to James M. Buchanan, Esq., of Baltimore, in which he renounces Whiggery, denounces Scott, and declares himself for Pierce and King. We published an extract from his letter yesterday.

On the next day, the 10th instant, the Argus published a letter from WASHINGTON ABRAMS, Esq., giving good and substantial reasons for abandoning the Whig party and its Presidential nominee. The Argus says that Mr. Abrams is a gentleman extensively known in Baltimore as an active, intelligent business man, and of whose influence will be felt in the circle where he moves.

The Argus, of the same date, also says: "We have another letter from a member of the bar, whose brother has long been amongst the most active of the Whig managers, and who was last fall a candidate upon their ticket for a high and respectable office, who also renounces the Whig party."

Mr. COTTRAN, the present Whig member in Congress, from the district formerly represented by Mr. LONG, has also come out in support of Pierce and King. GEORGE W. LUTHERAN, Esq., a wealthy and distinguished German merchant, and formerly a Whig candidate for the Legislature, also, recently, declared for Pierce, and is actively sustaining his election and affording most efficient aid to the Democratic party. The Argus says:

"Mr. Lutheran's accession to carry only one of the most striking events of the campaign, indicative, we trust, of a returning sense amongst mercantile men, of the truth of Democratic principles."

In addition to these, and to crown all, the Washington Daniel, of the 14th instant, publishes a letter of HENRY CLAY, in which he renounces the Whig party. Mr. Jenifer is one of the oldest and most influential Whigs in Maryland—probably the most talented Whig in the State. He says:

"The object and delight of the Free-soilers and Abolitionists, were to break down Mr. Webster and Mr. Fillmore, because they had advocated and carried into effect the provisions of the Compromise Law. They quitted upon General Scott to accomplish that object. Those who voted against the platform, still voted for General Scott, and his 'acceptance' of it has made no change in their views. Hence, it is clear that they have expectations from his election, which may or may not be realized. It is deeply to be regretted, that he who has gained for himself so enviable a name by his gallant deeds in war, and his rendered civil services, should now be placed in a distasteful position. Under all the circumstances, I look upon the nomination of Gen. Scott as unfortunate for himself, unfortunate for the country, and, should he be elected, unfortunate for the party."

Entertaining these views, I should be unworthy the generous confidence of my friends if I suppressed the expression of them—although I am aware in doing so, I subject myself to the attacks of those who love party more than principle, consider it a virtue to denounce every man who has the temerity to avow opinions contrary to theirs."

The Journal and Judge Woodward. On last Monday morning, the Journal, to sustain its charge of Nativism against Hon. G. W. WOODWARD, the Democratic nominee for Supreme Judge in Pennsylvania, published what purported to be an extract of a speech, delivered by Judge Woodward, in the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention. We publish below a letter from Judge Woodward that will forever put to rest the charge of Nativism against him, except from such sheets as the Indiana Journal. We have not the slightest expectation that the Journal will cease its charges, though it knows perfectly well that they are utterly false. The following letter, however, will satisfy all honest men, and it is them also we wish to satisfy. We take the letter from the Pittsburgh Post. It is in answer to one written to him by a number of the citizens of Pittsburgh, in reference to the charge of Nativism, which had been made against him by the Pittsburgh Gazette, copying, we suppose, from the Indiana Journal:

PITTSBURGH, Sept. 14, 1852. Gentlemen:—The official duties which brought me to Pittsburgh, keep me constantly engaged. My answer to your letter must, therefore be brief. From my earliest youth to this present moment, I have been an earnest and hearty supporter of the Democratic Party, and an equally zealous opponent, so far as my political action could decorously and properly go, of Nativism. I have opposed it, I am not and never have been a "Nativist American," in any political sense, any more than I am or have been a Whig, Anti-Slavery, or an Abolitionist.

The charge of "Nativism" is attempted to be sustained by a motion which I made in the Reform Convention of 1837. That was simply a limitation of a motion made by Mr. Thomas, a Whig member from Chester county, and was calculated to compel his party (who were in majority in the Convention) to come up to the mark or back out. They chose the latter branch of the alternative, and my motion having answered its purpose, was withdrawn. The sin of introducing this subject into that body lies at the door of a Whig and not at mine.

The speech so often quoted against me, I am not responsible for. It was introduced into the Debates by a Whig Reporter in violation of the rules of the body which required him to submit it for revision before publication, and which he never did. I made some observations explanatory of my amendment of Thomas' motion, but that speech is not a fair report of them. My other speeches were submitted for revision. This one I never saw till the book was printed, and I have never ceased to condemn it.

During the session of the Convention, namely, on the 10th day of January, 1838, a member in debate alluded to the motion, not the speech, as indicative of hostility to foreigners. I promptly denounced the imputation, there in the face of the Convention, as I have done many a time since, as a gross misrepresentation. See Debates of the Convention, vol. 10, pp. 33-34.

I have retained the undiminished confidence of the Democratic members of the Convention, several of whom were adopted citizens, and all of them opposed to Nativism. Would this have been possible if the Whig reports of my sayings and doings had been true? The Native American Party itself is my witness. Seven years ago I was the caucus nominee for U. S. Senator. The county of Philadelphia was represented by Natives. They asked me whether, if elected by their votes, I would favor their measures for changing the naturalization laws. I answered them, and they threw every vote they could command against me, and called a shout of triumph over their victory.

You refer to statements in the Whig papers of this city. One of them was shown me a few days ago, in which was a copy of a letter written by me about a year ago, in which I repelled the imputation of Nativism as distinctly a lie. Now, the editor told his readers that the letter contains an admission that they themselves had at that time addressed to the rights of foreign born citizens. A copy of the letter thus misrepresented by the Pittsburgh Gazette, I send you herewith in the "Keystone," of September 23, 1852.

When men will allow their political passions to get the better of their veracity so far as to impel them to acts and assertions like this, it is easy enough to understand how and why I was misrepresented by a Reporter in the Convention, whose duty was to do so, and was just as strong as those which actuate my political opponents now.

It is with infinite reluctance I appear before the public at this time even in self-defense. A candidate for a judicial office, perhaps, more than any other candidate, is sensible as any man can be, that politics ought to be kept away as far as possible from judicial elections; but me too, of your friends, leave me no choice but to answer. I have answered by giving you briefly the truth. I give it because it is truth, and I accompany it with no appeal to party passion or prejudice.

If industrious defamations can succeed in representing men as having ever sustained any illiberal or proscriptionist, then the Truth and a Life are powerless against slander. There are some presses, and many men opposed to me, who are disposed to treat me as a fair and fair, and who will not descend to base applications to accomplish a party purpose. Such men and presses command my respect. Against others who are less scrupulous, I have no shield but the truth and my life, and I have no other recourse but to wait in patience, the verdict of the people.

Thanking you, gentlemen, for the kind feelings manifested in your letter, I am, with great respect, Your obedient servant, GEO. W. WOODWARD.

Friday Morning, Sept. 24, 1852. The Journal and its Witnesses. As we supposed, the Journal has produced its witnesses to prove that Gov. Wright had denounced Mr. Clay "as a blacking, Sabbath-breaker, and a murderer," and who are they? George K. Steele, Charles Grant, and N. Adams; three of the most deadly enemies, both personal and political, that Gov. Wright has on earth.

We have before us a letter from Gov. Wright, dated the 20th inst., in which he requests us to pronounce "a whole story, a fabrication. That the people of Indiana may know and understand the desperate extremities to which these men are driven, we append the certificates. Read them.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. DAN SIM—In reply to your note, I must say that I think Gov. Wright will not deny personally his unmitigated abuse of Mr. Clay in 1844. As I stated in my speech at Terre Haute, I have heard Gov. Wright say that Mr. Clay had been accused of the murder of Cilley, and that the blood of Cilley was on his hands. He also charged that he had bargained and intrigued with John Q. Adams for office, and in that he had acted the traitor to his country. That he was a black-slaver—a blacker—and that he could not have a black slave, he would have written on the wall. I have denied that the Governor had the right to come in as one of the chief mourners at Mr. Clay's death; and the only reason I had for making mention of it, I thought his eulogies gratuitous, and his tears crocodile. I do not know how you charge him with using, "Indeed, I have heard Mr. Wright, when speaking of that great and patriotic man (Henry Clay), make use of the most severe and bitter language I thought he had at his command, or could employ."

Mr. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

Whig Contradictions. It would keep one man employed to itemize all the contradictions of the Whig managers and the Whig press. At Washington they have a franking committee, with Truman Smith at the head, that sends pamphlets to certain neighborhoods in the North to prove that Gen. Pierce is a friend to the South; and the same committee sends pamphlets to the South, to prove that Gen. Pierce is an Abolitionist. The Whigs charged first that Gen. Pierce lashed on the battle-field, and coupled that charge with an insinuation that he setted cowardly. They next asserted that General Pierce never was in a battle, and encouraged a certain orator in going around and saying that Gen. Pierce's father was a Tory, when it is well known that old Ben. Pierce fought bravely at Bunker Hill. They charged that the last Democratic Legislature was in session a long time, and did nothing comparatively; but at the very next breath they say that the Legislature revised the laws, and that it will cost \$30,000 to publish the Revised Statutes. They must be very good in figures if they can show that the Revised Statutes of '43 cost \$15,000, and the Legislature of 1851-'2 did nothing, and that when the price of printing is the same now as it was then, that it will cost \$30,000 to publish the Revised Statutes of this session. This disease, which sprang up in certain quarters, appears to be contagious; and we see that our neighbor of the Journal has caught the complaint. When it suits him, he says that Pierce has been in office "about one year," while at other times he admits that he has been in office ten years, as will be seen by the two paragraphs placed in opposite columns:

"There is no difficulty in it." It turns out that Gen. answering it, so far as Gen. Scott, for forty-four years' Scott is concerned; but when service, has been paid \$251,286 70; Gen. Pierce has received \$20,373; and there- porter tell "Whig—why—before they say that Pierce ain't be a Democrat" is ought to be President, be about all the answer that he has not had so can be given. Very true—much money out of the but are there not hundreds Treasury? Pierce was one of thousands of Democrats in office, since ONE that don't deserve to be YEAR."—Indiana Journal, September 16.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

CHAS. GRANT. ROCKVILLE, Sept. 16, 1852. MR. J. D. DEFREES, Sr.—The Editor of the "State Sentinel," I see by your paper of recent date, denounces the charges therein published, respecting Mr. Joseph A. Wright, and says he is authorized so to do by Mr. Wright. It may be; but this much I can say, Mr. Wright has been accused, in his political speeches and conversations, to abuse the lamented Mr. Clay, that no man may have forgotten what he did say. This much I distinctly remember of hearing him say, that Henry Clay was guilty of the death of Cilley—that his hands were red with his blood.

SATURDAY MORNING, SEPT. 25, 1852. Whig Lies. The first Whig lie, on Gen. Pierce, after his nomination, was, that he was in favor of maintaining the religious test in his own State, which excluded members of the Catholic Church from holding certain offices. This was intended to secure the entire Catholic vote for General Scott. It was the first time in the history of the country that religious prejudices had been appealed to. But to use the language of the Boston Pilot, the great and influential organ of the Catholics: "It proved to be a very clumsy lie." The records proved that Pierce, as a member of the Convention, had voted and spoke in favor of the repeal of this odious provision. The entire Catholic press in the country joined in denouncing it as a falsehood. There ended that lie.

The next lie was that Pierce, as a General in the army, behaved cowardly on the battle fields of Mexico. This lie was not only met and promptly contradicted by every officer of the army, who served in that memorable campaign, but Gen. Scott, in a conversation with Col. Gorman, said: "A more gallant man, or a more honorable man, than Gen. Pierce, both in public and in private, I never knew." Here ended lie number two.

The next lie was manufactured for the southern market. It was the garbled and false report of the speech made by Gen. Pierce at New Boston, intended to show that he was opposed to the fugitive slave law. This was met by the prompt contradiction of General Pierce himself, in a letter to Mr. De Leon, and the certificate of one hundred persons who were present and heard the speech. So ended lie number three.

The next lie was a silly one, and showed the utter desperation of the party. The story was that General Pierce was slapped in the face by an officer of the army, and refused to resent it, refused to fight him. This story had its origin in an irresponsible and dirty campaign sheet published in Baltimore. The scene was laid on the night before Gen. Pierce left the city of Mexico. The officer was Col. Magnuson, now in the interior of California, but, fortunately, others were present with Gen. Pierce on that night, who have come forward promptly and stamped the whole story as a base lie. So terminated lie number four.

What lie will next be hatched? Something may be expected in a few days. The Whigs are becoming desperate, and will resort to desperate means. The lies already fabricated prove that they will stop at nothing.

When a man that has, by any chance, been elected to the United States Senate, stoops so low as to represent that Gen. Scott is in favor of so amending the Naturalization laws as to require foreigners to serve one year in the army or navy previous to becoming citizens, he ought to be denounced as "base and dishonest." The act is dishonest, and therefore base, and the more so, because done by one whose position is looked upon as respectable.—Indiana Journal.

Now let us see how General Scott stands on this question. The record will prove whether it is Judge Douglas or John D. Defrees that is "base and dishonest." Here is the first section of Gen. Scott's bill:

Sec. 1. Be it enacted, &c. That any alien, being a free white person, and who shall come into the United States six months or less before the passage of this act, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof after a residence therein of at least three years, and one year at least after declaring his bona fide intention of becoming a citizen; in the manner and form, and upon the other conditions, not herein stated, as prescribed by the act entitled, "An act to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and to repeal the act heretofore passed on that subject," which was approved April 14, 1802; provided, that no alien arriving in the United States after six months from the passage of this act, shall ever acquire the right to vote, except in the manner herein prescribed, for any elector of President or Vice President of the United States; for any member of the House of Representatives of the same; for any Governor, Lieutenant Governor, member of the Legislature, Judge of any Court of record, or Sheriff, in any State or Territory of the United States; or for any Mayor, Independent, President, Alderman, Assistant Alderman, or Common Councilman of any city, borough, or incorporated town or village, in any of the said States or Territories; or within the District of Columbia; but all aliens admitted to naturalization under the foregoing provisions and limitations shall enjoy every other right and privilege of native born citizens, which is not expressly limited or withheld by the Constitution of the United States.

Here is the third section, which contains the exactions:

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That every free white alien, being a male, and of at least seven years of age, who shall, in time of war, engage to serve the United States against their enemies, for at least two years, or during the war, or who, in time of actual war, shall serve the said States faithfully two years, or to the end of the war, in any company or corps of war, in the army or navy of the said States, shall, on obtaining the certificate or certificates of faithful service, signed by the commanding officer or officers of such company or companies, vessel or vessels of war, and countersigned by the next higher officer in the army or navy, under whom, if any, such alien has served, shall be admitted, on presenting such evidence to any court designated in the act heretofore recited, to all the rights and privileges of citizenship at any time conferred by the act, on simply taking the oath of allegiance to the United States, and making the renunciation enjoined in the said act.

And here is his letter of acceptance:

A Square Back Out. Eight or ten days ago it was announced through the Sentinel, and by handbills, that Thomas A. Hendricks would address the people of this city, on last Saturday night. Presuming that at a public meeting of that character Mr. Bradley would be permitted to participate, it was announced that he too would address our citizens on the same evening. He did not suppose that to such an arrangement there would have been any objection on the part of Mr. Hendricks or his friends.

To prevent any reply on the part of Mr. Bradley, the notice for Mr. Hendricks was so changed, as that he would address the Democratic Club, and not the public. Of course Mr. Bradley, by such an arrangement, was prevented from replying to Mr. Hendricks. Mr. Bradley then proposed to Mr. Hendricks to make arrangements to canvass such part of one of the District as neither of them had been present in. This proposition, so fair and proper, was declined by Mr. Hendricks. It is very evident from these facts that Mr. Hendricks does not wish to meet Mr. Bradley on the stump. In this, no doubt he has shown discretion to be the better part of valor.—Ind. Journal.

Now let us have the facts! Mr. Hendricks had been invited to address the Democratic Club. Bradley had addressed the Whig Club several times. No Democrat was permitted to go and answer him; but when Mr. Hendricks in pursuance of his invitation came to address the Democratic Club in this city, Bradley, with an impudence peculiar to the man, insisted on his right to come into the Democratic Club and reply to Mr. Hendricks. This the officers of the Club of course opposed and Bradley left Washington he had made, and published his appointments. He did not then know that Mr. Bradley was the candidate. If Bradley had desired to meet Mr. Hendricks he had nothing to do but attend his appointments, but instead of this he made his own appointments, for Shelby county, speaking there whilst Mr. Hendricks was canvassing Morgan and Hendricks. This is what the Journal calls looking out.

Pierce and King in Oregon. By the last mail we received our files of Oregon papers. Among them are the Oregon Weekly Times, published at Portland, and the Oregon Statesman, published at Oregon City. They both display at the head of their columns the names of Pierce and King. The "Times" says, in relation to the ticket:

"Although Oregon has no electoral vote to give in the coming election for President and Vice President, an interest in the result, equal to the State which has the right to vote. If Oregon had a vote to give, there is no doubt which way it would be cast. Before another Presidential election rolls round Oregon will be a State, and although we have no voice, we feel that general sympathy for the success of the Democratic ticket, which pervades the communities and States of our more fortunate favored friends. We therefore raise the names of Pierce and King at our most heart—hoping the ticket triumphant success."

The "Statesman" says: "We raise at our most heart the names of the candidates of the American Democracy for President and Vice President of the United States. Although the gallant Democrats of Oregon will not be permitted to cast for them their suffrages, yet they will, as they have an interest in their election as do those of any portion of the nation. And could their voice be heard on the first Tuesday in November, it would speak in thunder tones the condemnation of an administration and party which has covered and cursed our far-off home with maladministration and misrule. If they have no voice, they have a common interest, in the success of a common cause. Their hearts are in the contest, though their hands are tied, and they will join in the shouts which will echo through the Union, and from extreme to extreme extol the harmony and unanimity of our nation, which has ever made Democracy inviolable, and which speaks the triumphant election of Franklin Pierce and Wm. R. King."

Whig Electioneering at the South. Truman Smith's Whig Executive Committee, at Washington, has published a document for the "Southern trade," entitled "Gen. Pierce and his Abolition allies," designed to prove that he has been a uniform abolitionist. This document it is their intention to put into the hands of every Southern voter. Simultaneously, they are claiming that Scott is the peculiar friend of Southern institutions, and himself a slaveholder. To prove this, we copy the following from the Columbus Argus, a Whig paper published at Columbus, Mississippi. This is a specimen of southern electioneering:

"We certainly have reliable authority for stating that Scott owns slaves. We have not only been told so by his near relatives who know, but a correspondent of the Baltimore Sun, writing from Old Point Comfort, where Gen. Scott has been preparing for a time, writes: 'I was conducted to Gen. Scott's apartments by a colored boy of his own.' We suppose no more."

"It is being said in Pierce's favor, that his sister married a man who fought at Fort Mifflin. With equal propriety we might say that Scott is interested in slavery because a brother of his who owns a large plantation in Perry county, Alabama, owns a large number. 'Scott has a sister living in Marengo, who also owns slaves. All his relations own slaves and are as anxious that he does himself' own them. Scott has owned slaves, and because he said in his Abolition letter in 1843, that 'he owned no slaves' at that time, it is no reason that he owns none now. Many persons among us might have said the same thing in 1843, who cannot now say it."

David P. Holloway. This gentleman professes to be opposed to all wars and was particularly hostile to the Mexican War. In the Senate and in the columns of his paper, the Richmond Palladium, he permitted no opportunity to pass without condemning the War as unjust and wicked. If the Senate be fully imbued every sentiment in the infamous speech of Tom Corwin, and charged American soldiers with being "men and women slayers" in that campaign—with robbing churches and desecrating the Temples of the living God.

Now, this same man is the most zealous supporter of Gen. Scott, in Indiana. Hear what he says of the General's campaigns in Mexico: "Subsequently, he took charge of the campaign of Mexico. With the embarrasment of a 'fire in the rear' from an imbecile, if not a wicked administration at home, he embarked for Vera Cruz. Loaded and that part which was by many considered impregnable. Then Carrizal, Guadalupe, and Chantla, Molino del Rey—Chapultepec, and his entry into the city of Mexico, forms a train of victories that challenge comparison with the proudest successes of a Napoleon or a Wellington."

He does not pretend to claim for his candidate a single civil qualification, but "he has filled the measure of his country's glory upon every battle field." That is enough for this war-hating, hero-despising Quaker—Dave Holloway.

Thomas D. Walpole, addressed a small crowd of people in this city, on Saturday last. We did not hear him, nor have we seen any one who did hear the whole of his harangue. Therefore we merely give the substance of what he said, and that in the evening Dr. Barga set up a balloon—therefore we conclude the whole affair ended in gas.—Richmond Palladium.

And in the evening the malicious Whigs cut his buggy to pieces. This is an incident not mentioned by the Palladium. It shows how desperate the Whigs are getting.

Gen. Cass on the Stamp. The Michigan paper contains a list of fourteen mass meetings at which Gen. Cass is to speak.