





THE FREE PRESS.

ORANGE COUNTY, N. C.

Thursday Morning, August 27.

ELECTIONS.

And still the cry is, VICTORY! VICTORY!

NORTH CAROLINA.

Was in the Raleigh Register of Friday last complete returns from all the State except Tyrrell county. The majority for Morehead, the Whig candidate for Governor, is 8,465, and Tyrrell, it is stated, will give a Whig majority of 400, making the entire majority 8,865.

The Legislature will stand, 101 Whigs to 66 Van Burenites—making a Whig majority of 35 on joint ballot.

This is the first time in the political career of North Carolina, and removes all doubt as to which party her vote will be given to at the approaching election for President. Her position is now so clearly defined that no one will again doubt her claim to a place in the front rank of Whig States.

The Raleigh (N. C.) Register says, "Gen. Harrison is stronger in North Carolina, than we ever saw highly prized. Instead of his or any other Whig candidate, carrying Old Tip, the Hero has carried them, by the total loss of his popularity. Mark this prediction. Our majority in the Fall will be considerably greater for President than it is now."

KENTUCKY.

Complete returns are not yet received—eleven counties remaining to be heard from. The Whig majority for Governor will be between 15 and 13 thousand. The result shows how decisive are the calculations of the friends of the Administration in the present presidential contest. They had indulged the belief that Kentucky, in consequence of the nomination of Harlan instead of Fremont, would refuse to go heartily into the support of Harrison, and that by taking advantage of the disaffection which was supposed to exist, they could carry the State for Van Buren. The election of Kentucky Argus was revived and the late defaulting Postmaster at Winchester sent from Washington to edit a Whig paper in that place. The Argus is now a Whig paper, and the disappointment, let the Whig majority show.

INDIANA.

Complete returns from all the counties except four show a majority for Bigler, the Whig candidate for Governor, of 9,983 votes.

The New Albany Gazette of the 18th says that parties in the next Legislature of Indiana will stand as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Whig, V. B. Senate, 71, 31; H. of Representatives, 199, 97.

Whig majority of joint ballot, 72.

ALABAMA.

The Mobile Register of the 21st, in publishing complete returns of the election for members of the Legislature, states the aggregate to be 47 Whigs and 53 Van Burenites in the House. The Senate consists of 20 Van Burenites and 13 Whigs. V. B. majority in the House, therefore, is 6, and in the Senate 7.

MISSOURI.

In 13th of the Van Buren majority was 6,355 in Missouri. The Whigs have no doubt gained ground, but whether enough to justify a hope of the State in November, the full returns must determine.

ILLINOIS.

The "Pocah (Ill.) Register, (published by Samuel C. Edwards, of Winchester) gives up the Legislature to the Administration, but publishes a table, showing in 40 counties a net Whig gain of 120,000 in the last election. The Van Buren majority of the popular vote in the State, it is ascertained, will be small, probably not more than a thousand; if so, the Register says, "no may claim the State as carried by the Harrison in November, as a change of about six votes in each county would give him the majority. Van Buren's majority in 1839 was about 200,000."

Inspected with the last Presidential election the State, it is ascertained, will be small, probably not more than a thousand; if so, the Register says, "no may claim the State as carried by the Harrison in November, as a change of about six votes in each county would give him the majority. Van Buren's majority in 1839 was about 200,000."

MISSOURI.

In 13th of the Van Buren majority was 6,355 in Missouri. The Whigs have no doubt gained ground, but whether enough to justify a hope of the State in November, the full returns must determine.

ILLINOIS.

The "Pocah (Ill.) Register, (published by Samuel C. Edwards, of Winchester) gives up the Legislature to the Administration, but publishes a table, showing in 40 counties a net Whig gain of 120,000 in the last election. The Van Buren majority of the popular vote in the State, it is ascertained, will be small, probably not more than a thousand; if so, the Register says, "no may claim the State as carried by the Harrison in November, as a change of about six votes in each county would give him the majority. Van Buren's majority in 1839 was about 200,000."

MISSOURI.

In 13th of the Van Buren majority was 6,355 in Missouri. The Whigs have no doubt gained ground, but whether enough to justify a hope of the State in November, the full returns must determine.

ILLINOIS.

The "Pocah (Ill.) Register, (published by Samuel C. Edwards, of Winchester) gives up the Legislature to the Administration, but publishes a table, showing in 40 counties a net Whig gain of 120,000 in the last election. The Van Buren majority of the popular vote in the State, it is ascertained, will be small, probably not more than a thousand; if so, the Register says, "no may claim the State as carried by the Harrison in November, as a change of about six votes in each county would give him the majority. Van Buren's majority in 1839 was about 200,000."

MISSOURI.

In 13th of the Van Buren majority was 6,355 in Missouri. The Whigs have no doubt gained ground, but whether enough to justify a hope of the State in November, the full returns must determine.

ILLINOIS.

The "Pocah (Ill.) Register, (published by Samuel C. Edwards, of Winchester) gives up the Legislature to the Administration, but publishes a table, showing in 40 counties a net Whig gain of 120,000 in the last election. The Van Buren majority of the popular vote in the State, it is ascertained, will be small, probably not more than a thousand; if so, the Register says, "no may claim the State as carried by the Harrison in November, as a change of about six votes in each county would give him the majority. Van Buren's majority in 1839 was about 200,000."

MISSOURI.

In 13th of the Van Buren majority was 6,355 in Missouri. The Whigs have no doubt gained ground, but whether enough to justify a hope of the State in November, the full returns must determine.

ILLINOIS.

The "Pocah (Ill.) Register, (published by Samuel C. Edwards, of Winchester) gives up the Legislature to the Administration, but publishes a table, showing in 40 counties a net Whig gain of 120,000 in the last election. The Van Buren majority of the popular vote in the State, it is ascertained, will be small, probably not more than a thousand; if so, the Register says, "no may claim the State as carried by the Harrison in November, as a change of about six votes in each county would give him the majority. Van Buren's majority in 1839 was about 200,000."

MISSOURI.

In 13th of the Van Buren majority was 6,355 in Missouri. The Whigs have no doubt gained ground, but whether enough to justify a hope of the State in November, the full returns must determine.

ILLINOIS.

The "Pocah (Ill.) Register, (published by Samuel C. Edwards, of Winchester) gives up the Legislature to the Administration, but publishes a table, showing in 40 counties a net Whig gain of 120,000 in the last election. The Van Buren majority of the popular vote in the State, it is ascertained, will be small, probably not more than a thousand; if so, the Register says, "no may claim the State as carried by the Harrison in November, as a change of about six votes in each county would give him the majority. Van Buren's majority in 1839 was about 200,000."

more Indian-butcheries. A number of Indians, in their canoes, attacked Indian Key, (in Florida) on the night of the 10th inst., and after murdering the inhabitants and burning their dwellings, set fire to the whole settlement, consisting of about thirty houses, and a store and a mill. The only opposition the Indians met with, is described in a letter from Key West, as follows: "A Tex. Table Key, a U. S. post, about one mile and a half from Indian Key, there were about 150 soldiers, and a Doctor of the U. S. Army. The Doctor, so soon as he heard of the attack, with five of his invalids, and a Mr. Housman, pushed towards the scene of action, in a large, in which were mounted a few pieces of artillery, and a few men, which they discharged on approaching the place, and then retreated. The Indians dropped their plunder, and walked as far as they could towards the boats, distributing themselves and firing, by which they wounded one of the Doctor's men, and obliged him to halt. The Indians remained at Indian Key until the following day at noon, when they left for the main."

GEN. HARRISON AND A STANDING ARMY.—Mr. Smith, of Culpeper, in his speech at the Plowing Spring, stated as an evidence that Gen. Harrison is a Federalist, in favor of a standing army. "A standing army," he said, "is a Delegate in Congress from the North-western Territory, in 1800, against the reduction of the standing army," and that the proposition to reduce the army "was defeated by a party vote, the Democrats voting in favor of reducing the army, and the Federalists against it." Mr. Smith, however, failed to state that the army was reduced to 10,000 men, and that three thousand three hundred and ninety-nine men, but TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND, as proposed by Mr. Van Buren—that we were then a party of Federalists with France—and that the inhabitants of the North-western Territory, embracing the present States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan, and the Territories of Wisconsin and Iowa, were correctly represented by Gen. Harrison, as being much more willing to bear their share of the expense of maintaining this force, than to see it reduced or abandoned at that crisis in our foreign relations.

It was the proposition to reduce this standing army of 3,296 men, defeated by a party vote, as Mr. Smith asserted—the Democrats voting in favor, and the Federalists against it. On that occasion, the veteran Democrat, Gen. SAMUEL SMITH, of Maryland, not only voted, but spoke against the reduction, and voted against Gen. Harrison, and the Federalists. He was supported by Gen. GEORGE DIXON, James H. HARRISON, and Benjamin HUNGERFORD, and others. The Federalists, on the other hand, were supported by Gen. HARRISON on this question, as well as Gen. SMITH.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

But, whatever may have been Gen. Harrison's opinions and course in regard to a standing army of three thousand men, forty years ago, he is now decidedly opposed to the proposition of the Administration for a standing army of two hundred thousand men at the present time. In a speech delivered by Gen. Harrison, a few days since, at the celebration at Fort Greenville, his opposition to this monstrous scheme, as well as to his twin brother, the sub-treasury scheme, was emphatically avowed.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

more Indian-butcheries. A number of Indians, in their canoes, attacked Indian Key, (in Florida) on the night of the 10th inst., and after murdering the inhabitants and burning their dwellings, set fire to the whole settlement, consisting of about thirty houses, and a store and a mill. The only opposition the Indians met with, is described in a letter from Key West, as follows: "A Tex. Table Key, a U. S. post, about one mile and a half from Indian Key, there were about 150 soldiers, and a Doctor of the U. S. Army. The Doctor, so soon as he heard of the attack, with five of his invalids, and a Mr. Housman, pushed towards the scene of action, in a large, in which were mounted a few pieces of artillery, and a few men, which they discharged on approaching the place, and then retreated. The Indians dropped their plunder, and walked as far as they could towards the boats, distributing themselves and firing, by which they wounded one of the Doctor's men, and obliged him to halt. The Indians remained at Indian Key until the following day at noon, when they left for the main."

GEN. HARRISON'S ADOPTIONISM.—[The Gen. Harrison's Southern friends in Congress have been accused, with some reason and content, the charge of being "Abolitionists." It is not true that they have suffered more to support Southern Rights than any other person north of Mason and Dickson's line. Gen. Harrison's letter of June 11, 1840, must be read in connection with the following: "An I wrong, false-citizen, in applying the terms wretch, presumptuous, and unconstituted to the measures of the emancipators."—Gen. Harrison's Financier's speech, May, 1835.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

more Indian-butcheries. A number of Indians, in their canoes, attacked Indian Key, (in Florida) on the night of the 10th inst., and after murdering the inhabitants and burning their dwellings, set fire to the whole settlement, consisting of about thirty houses, and a store and a mill. The only opposition the Indians met with, is described in a letter from Key West, as follows: "A Tex. Table Key, a U. S. post, about one mile and a half from Indian Key, there were about 150 soldiers, and a Doctor of the U. S. Army. The Doctor, so soon as he heard of the attack, with five of his invalids, and a Mr. Housman, pushed towards the scene of action, in a large, in which were mounted a few pieces of artillery, and a few men, which they discharged on approaching the place, and then retreated. The Indians dropped their plunder, and walked as far as they could towards the boats, distributing themselves and firing, by which they wounded one of the Doctor's men, and obliged him to halt. The Indians remained at Indian Key until the following day at noon, when they left for the main."

GEN. HARRISON'S ADOPTIONISM.—[The Gen. Harrison's Southern friends in Congress have been accused, with some reason and content, the charge of being "Abolitionists." It is not true that they have suffered more to support Southern Rights than any other person north of Mason and Dickson's line. Gen. Harrison's letter of June 11, 1840, must be read in connection with the following: "An I wrong, false-citizen, in applying the terms wretch, presumptuous, and unconstituted to the measures of the emancipators."—Gen. Harrison's Financier's speech, May, 1835.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

more Indian-butcheries. A number of Indians, in their canoes, attacked Indian Key, (in Florida) on the night of the 10th inst., and after murdering the inhabitants and burning their dwellings, set fire to the whole settlement, consisting of about thirty houses, and a store and a mill. The only opposition the Indians met with, is described in a letter from Key West, as follows: "A Tex. Table Key, a U. S. post, about one mile and a half from Indian Key, there were about 150 soldiers, and a Doctor of the U. S. Army. The Doctor, so soon as he heard of the attack, with five of his invalids, and a Mr. Housman, pushed towards the scene of action, in a large, in which were mounted a few pieces of artillery, and a few men, which they discharged on approaching the place, and then retreated. The Indians dropped their plunder, and walked as far as they could towards the boats, distributing themselves and firing, by which they wounded one of the Doctor's men, and obliged him to halt. The Indians remained at Indian Key until the following day at noon, when they left for the main."

GEN. HARRISON'S ADOPTIONISM.—[The Gen. Harrison's Southern friends in Congress have been accused, with some reason and content, the charge of being "Abolitionists." It is not true that they have suffered more to support Southern Rights than any other person north of Mason and Dickson's line. Gen. Harrison's letter of June 11, 1840, must be read in connection with the following: "An I wrong, false-citizen, in applying the terms wretch, presumptuous, and unconstituted to the measures of the emancipators."—Gen. Harrison's Financier's speech, May, 1835.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

more Indian-butcheries. A number of Indians, in their canoes, attacked Indian Key, (in Florida) on the night of the 10th inst., and after murdering the inhabitants and burning their dwellings, set fire to the whole settlement, consisting of about thirty houses, and a store and a mill. The only opposition the Indians met with, is described in a letter from Key West, as follows: "A Tex. Table Key, a U. S. post, about one mile and a half from Indian Key, there were about 150 soldiers, and a Doctor of the U. S. Army. The Doctor, so soon as he heard of the attack, with five of his invalids, and a Mr. Housman, pushed towards the scene of action, in a large, in which were mounted a few pieces of artillery, and a few men, which they discharged on approaching the place, and then retreated. The Indians dropped their plunder, and walked as far as they could towards the boats, distributing themselves and firing, by which they wounded one of the Doctor's men, and obliged him to halt. The Indians remained at Indian Key until the following day at noon, when they left for the main."

GEN. HARRISON'S ADOPTIONISM.—[The Gen. Harrison's Southern friends in Congress have been accused, with some reason and content, the charge of being "Abolitionists." It is not true that they have suffered more to support Southern Rights than any other person north of Mason and Dickson's line. Gen. Harrison's letter of June 11, 1840, must be read in connection with the following: "An I wrong, false-citizen, in applying the terms wretch, presumptuous, and unconstituted to the measures of the emancipators."—Gen. Harrison's Financier's speech, May, 1835.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

more Indian-butcheries. A number of Indians, in their canoes, attacked Indian Key, (in Florida) on the night of the 10th inst., and after murdering the inhabitants and burning their dwellings, set fire to the whole settlement, consisting of about thirty houses, and a store and a mill. The only opposition the Indians met with, is described in a letter from Key West, as follows: "A Tex. Table Key, a U. S. post, about one mile and a half from Indian Key, there were about 150 soldiers, and a Doctor of the U. S. Army. The Doctor, so soon as he heard of the attack, with five of his invalids, and a Mr. Housman, pushed towards the scene of action, in a large, in which were mounted a few pieces of artillery, and a few men, which they discharged on approaching the place, and then retreated. The Indians dropped their plunder, and walked as far as they could towards the boats, distributing themselves and firing, by which they wounded one of the Doctor's men, and obliged him to halt. The Indians remained at Indian Key until the following day at noon, when they left for the main."

GEN. HARRISON'S ADOPTIONISM.—[The Gen. Harrison's Southern friends in Congress have been accused, with some reason and content, the charge of being "Abolitionists." It is not true that they have suffered more to support Southern Rights than any other person north of Mason and Dickson's line. Gen. Harrison's letter of June 11, 1840, must be read in connection with the following: "An I wrong, false-citizen, in applying the terms wretch, presumptuous, and unconstituted to the measures of the emancipators."—Gen. Harrison's Financier's speech, May, 1835.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.

more Indian-butcheries. A number of Indians, in their canoes, attacked Indian Key, (in Florida) on the night of the 10th inst., and after murdering the inhabitants and burning their dwellings, set fire to the whole settlement, consisting of about thirty houses, and a store and a mill. The only opposition the Indians met with, is described in a letter from Key West, as follows: "A Tex. Table Key, a U. S. post, about one mile and a half from Indian Key, there were about 150 soldiers, and a Doctor of the U. S. Army. The Doctor, so soon as he heard of the attack, with five of his invalids, and a Mr. Housman, pushed towards the scene of action, in a large, in which were mounted a few pieces of artillery, and a few men, which they discharged on approaching the place, and then retreated. The Indians dropped their plunder, and walked as far as they could towards the boats, distributing themselves and firing, by which they wounded one of the Doctor's men, and obliged him to halt. The Indians remained at Indian Key until the following day at noon, when they left for the main."

GEN. HARRISON'S ADOPTIONISM.—[The Gen. Harrison's Southern friends in Congress have been accused, with some reason and content, the charge of being "Abolitionists." It is not true that they have suffered more to support Southern Rights than any other person north of Mason and Dickson's line. Gen. Harrison's letter of June 11, 1840, must be read in connection with the following: "An I wrong, false-citizen, in applying the terms wretch, presumptuous, and unconstituted to the measures of the emancipators."—Gen. Harrison's Financier's speech, May, 1835.

It is any thing more needed to show the inadequacy of that vote of Gen. Harrison's, in 1800, to prove that he is a Federalist now, and in favor of a standing army? We think not.







