

Letter from Mr. Campbell to Mr. Austin, dated Sept. 26, 1855.

CHARLES ANDERSON, Esq., Cincinnati, O.

Dear Sir—A friend has placed in my hands the Daily Cincinnati Gazette of yesterday morning, containing two columns of very curious matter, addressed to me, over your signature. In replying to it, I have neither time nor inclination to follow you through the serpentine route you have taken to shield yourself from the just responsibilities of your erratic position. Your evasions expose themselves—most of your subterfuges are too puerile to require the dignity of comment—your ill-natured grumblings and your ungenerous sarcasms only tend to betray enmity towards me that may have been hitherto concealed; and your silly effort to lead me responsible for wrongs (real or imaginary), which others may have perpetrated in reference to your Trimble meeting at Hamilton, I regard as inconsistent with a genuine manhood, and unworthy of you.

In a very brief note, couched in the most respectful language, (such as I deemed due to private friendship,) I "corrected" or "denied." (I care not which expression is adopted,) erroneous statements, which you made in a public speech at Lebanon, and which you acknowledge were repeated at other points. I did this, not that what you said affected me, but because those statements were prejudicial to Mr. Chase. Silence on my part would have been gross injustice to him. With my positive denial of the truth of your statements before you, instead of retracting them, I would rather betake myself to a long, lame, and impotent defense. You not only seek to cast the responsibility of these statements upon others, but you retail the fresh sayings and "hints" of Tom, Dick and Harry, which are equally untrue, and tend to injure you and innocent parties who have no identity with our controversy.

Here, you shelter yourself behind the ponderous proportions of my friend General Geiger, who in epaulettes, with flaming sword in hand, had fall of "challenges," and "pocket full of rocks," goes forth seeking who may devour? There, you bring to your aid the well known gallantry of our mutual friend, Captain DeWolfe, who is always ready for war? Now you tell us that some one horse politician has said at a cross-road meeting, and, anon, of that which is of more interest to me, what you have said and done! You disclose to the eye of the world what you said "in the office of the Hamilton Hotel," during your "four hours" so jeaned there, and what others said to you, carefully concealing, however, the names of those whose statements you seem to endorse. Now, my dear Sir, this rule of controversy may be as entirely consistent with your vaunted Kentucky frankness, but you must pardon me for refusing to adopt it, and for declining to meet any new issues you have thus presented. The only point of controversy, now, is with you, and with you it must be settled, whether you take refuge under the coat-skirt of our gallant friend General Geiger, in the circle of the *Say Night* friends, under whom you fraternized at Hamilton, with cover of the saying of bar-room politicians at Columbus, or behind the men of Straw, to whom you so often refer. You may

write in and write out, having the reader still in doubt, whether you made the track, or going South or coming back.

Still, I take you to the starting point of my first note to you. In your speech at Lebanon, for the purpose of injuring Mr. Chase, you asserted four propositions, with which you identified my name:

- 1. That I went to the Columbus Convention (July 13), as a delegate from a Lodge in Butler county.
- 2. That I there held a letter which I proposed to submit to the Convention.
- 3. That Mr. Chase refused to allow me to present that letter.
- 4. That Mr. Chase said, in reference to it, "I leave it with you."

Now, Sir, I emphatically denied the truth of these propositions. Instead of evincing a friendly confidence in my veracity, and the frankness of a "plain blunt man that speaks his right out," by retracting the statements—*as it which I deemed as like due to me and to yourself, as a gentleman of "high points"—you artfully pursued another course.* In that speech you did not give any as your author; but spoke as from your own knowledge. Your effort thought attempt to throw the responsibility on other persons, whom I might or might not deem it proper to notice thus publicly, does not, in my judgement, argue much for the many independence and true chivalry which have hitherto been regarded as your characteristics. Again, I pronounce one of those propositions untrue, regardless of the particular person who may have manufactured or peddled them out. In the sincerity of friendship, I expressly stated that I did not believe the misrepresentation to be wilful on your part; but now that my peremptory denial is not sufficient to induce you to withdraw the assertions, and, inasmuch as you have asserted new matters, equally destitute of truth, without any authority other than that of persons whose names you do not give, I must be permitted to withdraw that expression of belief, and to leave the point as to your design—an open question, to be controlled by such facts as you may see fit to bring to bear upon it.

Here I might close this response, regarding as I do, all your other collateral matters as immaterial and not pertinent to the issue, and your long list of interrogatories with a bad sense, seeking to avoid the real point in controversy. But, in setting forth the *prima facie* which attended your meeting at Hamilton, you again make an assertion to the injury of another person who is your friend, more than to my annoyance. I allude to Mr. Haley, the editor and proprietor of the Hamilton Intelligence. You say in reference to the notice of that meeting:

"It was hinted to me, as a proprietor of that paper, you had forbidden any such notice to be published in it."

On this charge I move the "previous question," which cuts off all debate! I pronounce it an unmitigated lie! It is a meanness, stamped on the very front with the cowardice of a "kink" instead of the boldness of a positive charge! It is a doubtless, as I am neither a proprietor of that paper, nor have I forbidden the notice. Understand me, my dear Sir, I intend the author of the "hint" to take to himself a

lone the full force of the epithet. It is possible that some people may think that it might be justly applied to any one who would give publicity to a falsehood, withholding the name of his author, when the means of ascertaining the truth were before him; but "for the sake of that same friendship," I will attribute any error of yours in this respect to the well known impossibility of your disposition. The truth is, I have not been a proprietor of the *Intelligence* for eighteen years, and during that time have not "forbidden" the publication of any notice in its columns. The injustice of this statement will be more apparent, when I assure you that for two weeks preceding your Hamilton meeting, I was absent from home—a fact which you may have known.

I think, my dear Charles, that even in your schoolboy days, when first we met, you would have been ashamed of the course of reasoning you now adopt to prove that I should make public a private letter. True, Mr. Chase and I have had correspondence, and I have on my files some very interesting private letters from you, touching political affairs. Would you justify me in publishing them to your prejudice, upon the pretext that in my judgment, or in the opinion of some other person, they might contain sentiments of dangerous tendency?

Your attempt at justifying yourself in resorting to that old liar, Madam Rumor, for the contents of Mr. Chase's letter, rather than to my "left breast pocket," which you so carefully tread, has its other peculiarities. One of them is that you informed some friends at the Hamilton Hotel, what "line of remark" you would pursue. Now, Sir, whatever may be your notions of propriety, I must say that I do not play eaves-dropper around the Hotels, nor could I consent to cross-examine our "mutual friends," who have enjoyed the rich intellectual treats which your well known conversational accomplishments furnish, to ascertain what was said concerning me.—God knows I hear and read concerning me, without *hunting up* new sources of vexation.

Another singular auxiliary you summon to extricate yourself from the entanglement of your own net, in your statement of our accounts on the score of *etiquette*, &c., and your taunt to me about "Congressional usages of ceremony!" In what possible way can you interest the readers of the *Gazette* in regard to my not calling on you, your hotel, is not perceptible to me. I dismiss the matter, therefore, by saying that I have always despised that cold system which opens a book account, and, in fact, a correct business sheet in reference to the etiquette of making calls. I apprehend, would show you to be a defaulter in this regard.

You have no just ground of complaint against me because your audience at Hamilton was represented as a Locofoco meeting. Such is the fact. I have the authority of the President of the Trimble meeting for stating that the hand-bills calling it were printed by a Locofoco, at the Locofoco printing-office, at Locofoco expense, and that there was not another Trimble man, of whom to make a Secretary, until he paid a boy the sum of one dime to run down the material. I did not go to hear you, because in your audience were my bitterest enemies, some of whom would put *strichnine* into my coffee every morning if they could. There were those too, who when "many a time and oft" you made those Clay speeches here, would without a sigh have seen you tumbled into the Miami, with a mill-stone about your neck. You were there surrounded by some party backs as corrupt and vindictive as ever disgraced a county or plundered a people. I confess that in common with your friends here, deeply chagrined that you threw yourself into the embraces of such a congregation, and received, gratefully, the plaudits which sprang from the hope that you would be a good instrument to promote their vile purposes. I did purpose to absent myself, "in mere sorrow than in anger."

You are pleased to remind me that before our "divergence" in politics you made for me. Perhaps a correct bill of particulars in this respect as in the matter of *etiquette* in "calls," might not make me greatly your debtor. Still I have always felt and endeavored in a proper way to evince a gratitude for such services whether they were real or imaginary. But since you display your services whether they be real or imaginary, I must say that there is something *vener* under the "left breast pocket" that tells me you have thus taken your full pay and cancelled the obligation.

You deny being a "bitter opponent" of the American party, and I have seen to-day, in Sidney, large hand-bills convening a "Mass Meeting" of that party to be addressed by you. But such hand-bills prove nothing against stubborn facts. It is possible that I erred in saying you was a "bitter opponent;" and you may leave out the *adjective*. But sir, do you deny that you have been an opponent, and that you denounced the organization and its principles in strong terms? I violate no confidence. I am too scrupulous to relate your conversation in my own office, (in presence of others,) at my own table in presence of my family, and with me as we rode together over the fields, last summer. I simply ask, do you deny that you denounced the "American organization" in strong terms, or that you were the chosen orator of its opponents in Cincinnati at the last celebration of the anniversary of our National Independence? Did you never declare that it was your purpose to break up and destroy that party? If you cannot answer "no," please explain the process by which you are to be regarded otherwise than its enemy?

You charge upon me, that by the nomination of Mr. Chase, I have done much to injure that party. This assertion, if true, is answered by the fact, well known, that I was actively in the field attempting to prevent the injury of our country by your nomination, when you were enjoying the sea bath or the bracing atmosphere of West Point. Last year you fared as freely as I, even with "Abolitionists," "Arch-Angelists" and "Higher Law men." This year you are a bolter; (I will not say "sovereign.") You seem to play the game on the principle of "heads you lose, tails I win!" Fusion is with you a grand machine, until it does not turn out all its cards just as you could wish; then you curse it, and commence saving the Union! "Go!!" my dear Sir! I have seen the Union saved so often that I must advise you to *pick it down* well this time, and have good co-operation, so that it will save through the heat of next summer.

For notwithstanding all the smoke it is a very little fact, and the "corner" is the place where it should be kept. But you must drag it out, and you will die an unhappy man, unless I cease to be "unscrupulous in attempting to preserve my honor real and imaginary," and tell you something about that private letter of mine from Mr. Chase. The truth is, we had a little correspondence about *potatoes* and *politics*—principally about *potatoes*. You demand particulars and I must yield, or have a fuss! The following *colloquy* took place between Mr. Chase and I as we met in one of the streets of your city last spring:

Chase—"What are you doing since Congress adjourned?" Campbell—"Farming, planting corn and potatoes."

Chase—"That reminds me that I have received from the Patent Office, a barrel of imported potatoes. 'I'll send you some.'" Campbell—"Thank you, I will plant, cultivate, experiment and report the result."

Whereupon we separated. Chase proved unword on the potato question, forgetting to send them, and I wrote to him for them adding a paragraph on politics as it was my custom. He replied to both branches of my letter, but I got no potatoes! At Cleveland I read a paragraph from the political portion of his letter to three gentlemen of the American Organization, who visited my room in confidence, and under the sanctities of that Order. At the Columbus Convention (July 13), one of these gentlemen in a moment of excitement, violated that confidence, and undertook to repeat it contents. A dispute, and a question of veracity arose between him and Mr. Austin (whom you mention, and who is a stranger to me.) I was called on to make the letter public, and refused to do it as it was a private letter, on which the fate of the nation did not, in my judgement, depend. A little excitement grew up, and I tendered the letter to Mr. Chase, in the presence of Mr. Austin. He declined taking it, saying that he had written me in the freedom of private friendship, and that he would take back no private letter thus written, adding, in Mr. Austin's presence, "it is yours, and you can show it to him if you choose to do so." Thereupon I did refuse to show it, and returned it to my "left breast pocket."—Now, is not this a most terrible affair, well calculated to justify you in sounding the alarm that the Union is in danger.

Now old rumors' misrepresentations in reference to this letter, have caused you to do injustice to Mr. Chase, to me, and, I think, to your own character as a high-toned gentleman. It is not true that I ever proposed to submit it to the Convention. It is not true that Mr. Chase refused to have it submitted to the Convention. It is not true that he refused to allow Mr. Austin to read it; but, on the contrary, expressly told me I could show it to him if I chose. Knowing, as I do, all about this American organization, whilst I still refuse to publish any of my private correspondence on "potatoes and politics," I can with propriety declare, that Mr. Chase's correspondence with me is such as to satisfy me beyond a doubt, that, as a member of that party, I can as freely vote for him as for either of his opponents—one of them (Gov. Medill) being a determined foe to our principles, and the other (Ex Gov. Trimble) not a member of the Order. I hope you patriots who have lately taken the contract for saving the Union will now breathe more freely, with this assurance, which I give you honestly that there is not a line in the letter which tends to the disruption of our glorious confederacy!

In conclusion let me say that Mr. Chase was not a favorite candidate of mine for the nomination, and no one knows better than he, how steadfastly I opposed him. In supporting him, cordially as I do, it is neither expected that I thereby agree to endorse all his antecedents, or to approve of all his subsequent. I support him because he was nominated fairly; because I knew from personal observation, during six years in Congress, that he was a true and steadfast friend to all Western interests; devoted in his service to our State, and a sleepless sentinel, always, when the great interests of Cincinnati were at stake; because on all, or nearly all questions involving Slavery, including the measures of 1850, the Fugitive Slave Law, and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, he voted precisely as did the whole Whig party of the North, with only three exceptions; because he is opposed to the present oppressive system of taxation; because he is a gentleman and a scholar; and for various other reasons too tedious to mention.

You have seen fit, my dear Sir, to apply to me your old *lay-bear* charge, "Abolitionist," and I am told that in a speech in my district you said, or "hinted," that I supported Mr. Chase to get his support for some office. To all of which I reply—"yallah!" My opinions on the slavery question are well enough known to protect me from the charge of Abolitionism; and whoever charges me as a disunionist, I brand publicly as a liar.

You closed your letter by a rhetorical flourish, in which you represent me as a fly battering his wings against the cobweb worn around him by a wild old spider! I prefer to close mine, "for the sake of that same friendship," which I think you have so wantonly violated, by wishing you health and happiness, and a speedy recovery from that political insanity with which you seem to be afflicted.

Very truly, yours, &c. LEWIS D. CAMPBELL.

**TRIMBLE MEETING.** The Friends of ALLEN TRIMBLE, as a Candidate for Governor of Ohio, will hold a meeting at THE COURT HOUSE, in LANCASTER, On Friday Evening, Oct. 5. Hon. O. F. FISBACK, of Clearmont, Hon. F. CORWIN, of Clinton, and A. BANNING NORTON, Esq., of Franklin, will address the meeting. Sept. 27.

**A Word to Adopted Citizens.** The desperate struggles of 1848 in Europe are too fresh in our memory to need recapitulation. Brave men, harassed by the persevering tyranny of despots, whose thrones are supported neither by reason or justice, rose up to assert their rights against fearful odds; and although they kindled a fire that now only smoulders to burst forth with tenfold splendor when the proper moment arrives, yet in the interim many of the gallant asserters of human rights have chosen to take shelter beneath the broad flag of American freedom.

Where else could they flee and be at rest? What is the magic word that spans European despots with dread, and hope like a rainbow of promise, and arches overclouded prospects of the Caspian to the Hebrides? The word is *America*. This is the sheet anchor of hope to the oppressed in Europe; and the despots know it.—Blot out the United States of America from among the nations, and where shall the Archimedean lever be placed which is to overthrow the despots of Europe?—Where else has republicanism gained a firm foothold? It is from her soil alone that the thunder of defiance is launched at all those usurpers who claim to rule by hereditary right and by the grace of God. Facts are stubborn things, and we have to deal with facts when we speak of the political world. Temporary evils there may be even in a republican government; they are inseparable from our finite condition. The world is not yet perfect. To frame a Utopia out of the imagination is one thing; to reduce it to practice is another. Moonshine rampants will not resist the bayonets of grandfathers. Grape-shot and general pay no respect to poetical rhapsodies.

The *suas culottes* of France will break up all the established usages. They understand too much at once, and disgusted the middling classes. Ambitious demagogues took advantage of their simplicity and a despotism was established on the ruins of popular freedom. The people's idols throws off the mask, and we have an emperor in the furious republican. France has twice mocked the hopes of the liberals—and as soon as Louis Napoleon had overwhelmed the patriots and established himself in power, he flew to Rome to sustain another pillar of despotism—to put down the revolution in Italy and establish the political power of the Pope against the people.

America alone defies the power of European despots. The armies of Louis Napoleon will not overthrow republicanism in America—although no one doubts his will to crush out every vestige of freedom in this land, and set up a despot over the people, who would rule with an iron hand and a bloody scepter. He must first reduce Sabastopol. Soldiers cannot now be spared to put down liberty and establish despotism in the United States.

The Pope of Rome is a despot, and the instrument of despots. He cannot put down liberty in United States with the sword.—He has other means at his disposal—will he fail to use them? Ask history—ask what he has done for Italy. Listen to the dying groans of Italian patriots! The Pope wields a power which can not be opposed by batteries or resisted by breast works. We are in little danger from the Italian prince in open warfare. If ever the liberties of this country are destroyed by European despots, it must be in the way of intrigue, by the secret machinations of some influential class working upon the hopes and fears of those who trust them.

A double power is wielded by the despot of Rome, and it is impossible to separate their operation, which is one and indivisible in action, though theory may divide them. The component parts of the atmosphere are named separately by the chemist, but the action of the air includes them all under one. An army of influential men are at work on our soil, the head of whom wields the cloven power of a temporal and spiritual prince. His authority is supreme—he is he in the place of God. He unites in himself both the temporal and spiritual power. Will he teach his servants that it is wrong to unite the spiritual and temporal power? Will he tell the Jesuits to discourage all such unholy unions, while his own example teaches a doctrine precisely the reverse?

What could be more injurious to the cause of human liberty in Europe than the destruction of American freedom? The triumph of an Italian potentate in this country would trample out the last spark of hope in the breast of the European radical.

Those who oppose the insidious attempts of the Pope upon American principles, republican institutions, and religious toleration, take the same ground that was taken by the patriots of Hungary and Italy.—They oppose the political assumptions of the Italian despot. They war upon no man's religion; but they insist that the U. S. shall be ruled by men who own no allegiance to foreign rulers. As they contend for pure American principles in opposition to all foreign influence, they are properly termed the American Party.

Patriots—ye who have fled from your homes because liberty had no longer an altar in your native home, because your blood was sought by the inveterate foes of truth and justice, will you invite the despot to scatter his incendiaries over the land of your adoption; to send lither his borders of satellites, who, by appealing to the superstitious sentiment, would persuade them as followers that, in poisoning the fountains of freedom, they are doing God a service? Would you aid in establishing in this country the very power that has sent you forth exiles from the home of your fathers? To prevent this, and nothing more, is the aim of the American party. We war not with the Roman Catholic Church as a spiritual institution. To do so, would be to assail the very foundation of our own government. Our opposition is to that principle of the Roman Catholic church which makes the Pope a prince, having charge of the temporal affairs of his subjects, and which aims to make every Catholic on the globe one of the loyal subjects of this prince, bound to do his bidding.

enter into a dispute with the sons of the land that offers them a home in the hour of adversity, for the possession of office! Let your own judgment and reason guide you in your decision of this question, as you will heads will fall all the odium of the battle, while, even though you succeed in gaining a temporal triumph, the demagogues who urge you on will reap all the profit. If you like our country and its institutions, you desire to become citizens, take the necessary steps to do so, and having become so, drop every other name but that of an American citizen; for you may rest assured that it is the only course that will be of permanent and lasting benefit either to yourselves or those who may come after you. If you are Catholics because you believe in that system of religion, let it be so; but do not be led into quarrels with Americans because they denounce the Pope for attempting to interfere with the temporal affairs out of his own dominion. Remember that the American Revolution, to which Americans owe their freedom, is yet fresh in our recollection, and that the native sons of our soil are justly jealous of anything that has even the appearance of an interference with their rights and privileges. As good Catholics as any of you, were, in 1848, in Rome itself, opposed to the meddling of the Pope in temporal affairs, and drove him out of Italy. Had it not been for the aid of French bayonets, treacherously sent to Rome, Italy would have been free to-day, and, by her example, would have cheered and aided the great cause of European Democracy to maintain itself against the power of despotism. Intelligent adopted citizens should ponder these facts. We do not come begging your votes, and yet you will find in the end that the American party are your best friends, because they are the friends of the land that gave their birth, and offers you an asylum. So long as the country is safe and her rulers pure and patriotic, we shall be able to defy despotism and to shield all who take refuge on our shores. Because we prefer to have Americans in office—men who know no other birth place and worship at no other altars than such as are reared in our own soil, is no proof that the American party are quite the candidates for some of our best would represent, in terms that insult the intelligence of those whom they address. We are in favor of having Americans elected to important offices; and we believe that your own good judgment will acknowledge not only our right to have it so, but also the correctness of the doctrine. Those of you who are desirous of trying to put down Americans, will oppose the American party and the American ticket, and thus contribute the doubtful and wavering among native born citizens of the necessity of their union and your overthrow. And just as soon as the political demagogues who are now urging you on to a fight with Americans and your power gone, they too will desert you. Again we would say, in all kindness and sincerity to adopted citizens, discard all other names and designations except that of American citizen. Drop your Irish, German, French, and other foreign designations, and become a part and parcel of this great republic of the people, if you would enjoy in peace and quietness the blessings that are offered to you by our laws and institutions.—*Sunday Dispatch.*

Spain must be a capital place for sinners. Instead of going to the "ancient Nicholas," when they commit a crime in this land of love and olive, they go to the Pope, it seems, for a dispensation, pay him the price fixed for the offence, purchase immunity for another piece of guilt or two in advance, and go home happy—poorer in pocket, but infinitely richer in the luxury of sinful indulgences!

It seems unkindness to make a remark of this kind, we admit, because it appears to tread unjustly and ungenerously a most extensive church in the Christian communion. But, in the first place, we never jest of such serious importance; and, in the next place, we have no wish to accuse the Roman Catholics, as a church, of what may possibly be as new a piece of intelligence to many of its members as it is to us, 'tho' common as it does, in a shape of unquestionable credibility.

The Pope of Rome and the government of "Her Most Catholic Majesty" are no longer friends. The Pope threatens and Spain rebels. The one demands and the other demurs. This accusation and that retort. Rome talks of excommunication, and Spain points to the immense sums paid per annum by Spanish subjects into the coffers of the Pope for *licences* to *viva*. Nay, more—she offers to pay the exact amount to the world (and as every real has to be laid out through the embassy, where it is duly registered, the prof is not difficult), and then leave it to the communication of a church is worth that establishes moral laws merely to raise a revenue by selling, to all who can afford to purchase it, the privilege of their violation.

All this looks like romanism. It looks like a revival of some of the atavistic and ancient columns of revered debaters more anxious for effective arguments than irrefutable facts. But, in the present case, the government of Spain deliberately endorses the accusation, and the official organ at Madrid publishes the tariff of prices affixed by the Pope himself to each particular kind of iniquity. Even the perusal of certain liberal-toned books is set down as an offence only to be indulged in by the payment of a specified sum; and while the poor are left to the tender mercy of the common enemy of man in the world to come for the slightest peccadillo, the rich are permitted to read "Marshall's Life of Washington," for instance, upon handing over to the exchequer of the Pope about eleven dollars; to "infringe the vows of virginity" for twenty seven dollars, and to do anything else that a depraved appetite may suggest for an amount in due proportion!

Decidedly, this is the most convenient kind of Christianity extant. We should be sorry to suppose that the Catholic church in this country disposes, in this fashion, of dispensations for the perpetration of such flagrant social wrongs. But, that it does make merchandise of its permission to sin, in Spain, is beyond all question; and, that the immunity is purchased of the Pope himself, the head of the Catholic church throughout the world, the representative of God on earth, is a charge publicly proclaimed by the government of Catholic Spain; and the point of venality we are willing to leave between it and the church in question.

As the American party in this country have no other object in view than to secure the permanent establishment of a free and republican government, we are not disposed to quarrel with any man who is willing to support the same principles, and who is willing to do so in any manner that he may think proper. We are not disposed to quarrel with any man who is willing to support the same principles, and who is willing to do so in any manner that he may think proper.

As the American party in this country have no other object in view than to secure the permanent establishment of a free and republican government, we are not disposed to quarrel with any man who is willing to support the same principles, and who is willing to do so in any manner that he may think proper.

As the American party in this country have no other object in view than to secure the permanent establishment of a free and republican government, we are not disposed to quarrel with any man who is willing to support the same principles, and who is willing to do so in any manner that he may think proper.

**To the American Party in Ohio.** A feeling but a stern and positive sentiment could have impelled us to this public duty, had we not been so warmly supported by you, amidst the heat of an exciting political campaign, such as we have not seen since the late presidential election. We are, therefore, under deep obligations to you for the extraordinary course being pursued by you in support of the American party. We are, therefore, under deep obligations to you for the extraordinary course being pursued by you in support of the American party.

The day of election will soon be on us; if you have the strength to stand by the American party, you will have the strength to stand by the American party. We are, therefore, under deep obligations to you for the extraordinary course being pursued by you in support of the American party.

Several communications intended for the Gazette, have been crowded out by other matter. They will appear in next Saturday's "Clipper."

We understand that Mr. Geo. Price, Medill's two dollar hireling, is going about telling our Irish fellow citizens, that he is a Catholic. We should like to know when he joined the Catholic church.

**NOTICE.** On the 26th ult., by Rev. S. M. Bright, Mr. EDWIN I. WRIGHT and Miss ANN M. BOWERS, both of Fairless county, Ohio, were solemnly and lawfully married.

**NOTICE.** On the 12th inst., by the Rev. J. Schlosser, Mr. J. B. SPANGLER of Franklin Co., to Miss HELEN HUBBARD, of Warren county, Ohio, was solemnly and lawfully married.

**NOTICE.** On the 12th inst., by the Rev. J. Schlosser, Mr. J. B. SPANGLER of Franklin Co., to Miss HELEN HUBBARD, of Warren county, Ohio, was solemnly and lawfully married.

**NOTICE.** On the 12th inst., by the Rev. J. Schlosser, Mr. J. B. SPANGLER of Franklin Co., to Miss HELEN HUBBARD, of Warren county, Ohio, was solemnly and lawfully married.

**NOTICE.** On the 12th inst., by the Rev. J. Schlosser, Mr. J. B. SPANGLER of Franklin Co., to Miss HELEN HUBBARD, of Warren county, Ohio, was solemnly and lawfully married.