

BUCHANAN AND BRECKINRIDGE.

THE DEMOCRATIC HAND-BOOK,

COMPILED BY

MICH. W. CLUSKEY,

OF

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C.

RECOMMENDED BY THE

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

The success of the Democracy essential for the preservation of the Union and the protection of the integrity of the Constitution.

WASHINGTON:
PRINTED BY R. A. WATERS.
1856.

This page in the original text is blank.

P R E F A C E

TO THE

DEMOCRATIC ELECTORAL HAND-BOOK.

The demand for authentic documents disproving the unprecedented charges against the Democratic candidate, and refuting the unblushing pretensions of the Black Republican Know-Nothing nominees for the Presidency, has rendered it important in the opinion of leading members of the Democratic party, that some compilation of argument and fact derived from indisputable authorities should be prepared and published.

In the execution of this work, selections have been made from the works of the Democratic leaders—Leaders who represent the uniform and united opinions of the Democracy, North and South, whilst the motives of those patriotic citizens who have forgotten the prejudices of party, to bestow their support upon the only National candidate, are illustrated in the speeches and letters of the old line Whigs, vindicating their course of action in that respect.

The Electoral Hand Book, will be found to contain, also, the most important enactments and reports bearing upon the great issues of the day, with a mass of other matter sufficient to furnish any enquirer with the means of making up an impartial opinion upon the questions involved in the canvass, and to furnish speakers and writers with the material for defence or assault.

The author can only add, that having access to the whole magazine of political missiles, proper for employment in the present campaign, and enabled by his position and pursuits, to furnish any specific information from the published political records of the country, it will afford him pleasure to communicate any answer to any inquiry which may be made of him, and which is not satisfactorily responded to in the "Hand-Book."

Appealing to the magnanimity of his fellow-democrats to attribute any omission, to the hurried manner in which he is necessitated to prepare his work, he submits it for their judgment and use.

This page in the original text is blank.

THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

The excitement created by the repeal of a geographical line, the existence of which Mr. Jefferson said "would be recurring on every occasion, and renewing irritations, until it would enkindle such mutual and moral hatred as would render separation preferable to eternal discord," has induced us to republish the unfortunate act of Congress which first gave existence to what was called the Missouri Compromise line.

Missouri having applied for admission into the Union as a State, the House of Representatives, on the 16th of February, 1819, passed a bill providing for her admission, and affixing as a condition thereof, the prohibition of slavery within her limits. On the 27th of February, 1819, the Senate struck out of the bill the clause prohibiting slavery, and thus amended, sent it back to the House. On the 2d of March, 1819, the House refused to concur in the amendment of the Senate. On the same day the Senate insisted upon its amendment, and the House adhered, so that bill was lost.

On the 6th of January, 1820, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate reported a bill from the House admitting Maine into the Union, which contained no prohibition whatever, with an amendment admitting Missouri without any clause concerning slavery. It was then that Mr. Thomas introduced as an amendment what is called the Missouri Compromise which was adopted, and the bill as amended, passed the Senate on the 18th of February, 1820. The bill came to the House. After numerous messages between the two Houses, informing each other of their disagreements, and after motions had passed both Houses to insist on their respective positions, a joint committee of conference was appointed. Whilst this committee was in session, an independent bill to admit Missouri was taken up in the House and passed, containing a clause prohibiting slavery in said State, which was sent to the Senate, amended by it, and returned. Upon its return, the managers of the conference reported, that the Senate recede from its amendment to the bill admitting Maine, and that the House bill, admitting Missouri, should be amended by striking out the clause prohibiting slavery, and inserting in lieu thereof, what is now known as the Missouri Compromise. The bill thus framed, was, after one disagreement on the part of the two Houses, passed, and is as follows:

AN ACT to authorize the People of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories.

SEC. 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the inhabitants of that portion of the Missouri Territory included within the boundaries hereinafter designated, be, and they are hereby authorized to form for themselves a Constitution and State Government; and to assume such name as they shall deem proper; and the said State, when formed, shall be admitted into the Union, upon an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever.

The 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th sections of the law, embrace mere matters of detail, having no connection with the great question which is now agitating the country. The 8th section, which is what is generally known as the Missouri Compromise, is as follows:

SEC. 8. *And be it further enacted,* That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and

thirty minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby forever prohibited; *Provided always*, That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed, in any state or territory of the United States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid. [Approved 6 March, 1820.]

The action of Congress after the passage of the foregoing act rejects the idea that it was a compact, or that the Missouri Compromise embraced in the 8th section thereof was at all a condition to the subsequent admission of Missouri. After the enactment of that law, Missouri applied for admission as a state, and her application was rejected. Congress disregarded the act establishing the geographical line and shut the door on Missouri. The following act was afterwards passed and she was admitted :

RESOLUTIONS.

[No. 1.] RESOLUTION providing for the Admission of the State of Missouri into the Union, on a certain Condition.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Missouri shall be admitted into this Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever, upon the fundamental condition, that the fourth clause of the 26th section of the third article of the constitution submitted on the part of said state to Congress, shall never be construed to authorize the passage of any law, and that no law shall be passed in conformity thereto, by which any citizen, of either of the states in this Union, shall be excluded from the enjoyment of any of the privileges and immunities to which such citizen is entitled under the constitution of the United States: *Provided*, That the legislature of the said state, by a solemn public act, shall declare the assent of the said state to the said fundamental condition, and shall transmit to the President of the United States, on or before the fourth Monday in November next, an authentic copy of the said act; upon the receipt whereof, the President, by proclamation, shall announce the fact; whereupon, and without any further proceedings on the part of Congress, the admission of the said state into this Union shall be considered as complete. [Approved. 2 March, 1821.]

From this it will be seen that the only condition under which Missouri was admitted, is contained in the proviso of the last act, which Missouri in her acceptance of the terms of admission denied the right of the United States to make whilst she nevertheless yielded and became a part of the Union. The effect of this condition was to force Missouri to agree to admit within her limits to the same privileges which white citizens of other states might have, the negro where he is recognised as a citizen by any state.

Mr. Jefferson's opinion of the enactment of a geographical line in the country referring to that instated by the Missouri act of 1820.

THOMAS JEFFERSON to WM. SHORT.

MONTICELLO, April 13, 1820.

DEAR SIR: * * * * Although I had laid down as a law to myself, not to write, talk, or even think of politics, to know nothing of public affairs, and therefore had ceased to read newspapers, yet the Missouri question aroused and filled me with alarm. The old schism of Federal and Republican, threatened nothing, because it extended in every State, and united them together by the fraternalization of party. But the coincidence of a marked principle, moral and political, with a geographical line, once conceived, I feared would never more be obliterated from the mind; that it would be recurring on every occasion, and renewing irritations, until it would enkindle such mutual and moral hatred as would render separation preferable to eternal discord. I have been the most sanguine in believing that our Union would be of long duration. I now doubt it much and see the event at no great distance, and the direct consequences of this question not by the tide which has been so confidently counted on—the laws of nature control this—but by the Potomac, Ohio and Missouri, or more probably the Mississippi,

upwards to our northern boundary. My only *comfort and confidence* is that I shall not live to see this; and I envy not the present generation the glory of throwing away the fruits of their father's sacrifices of life and fortune and of rendering desperate the experiment which was to decide ultimately, whether man is capable of self-government. This treason against human hope will signalize their epoch in future history as the counterpart of their predecessors.

THOMAS JEFFERSON to JOHN HOLMES.

MONTCELO, April 20, 1820.

I thank you, dear sir, for the copy you have been so kind as to send me of the letter to your constituents, on the Missouri question. It is a perfect justification to them. I had for a long time ceased to read newspapers, or pay any attention to public affairs, confident they were in good hands, and content to be a passenger in our bark to the shore from which I am not far distant. But this momentous question, like a fire-bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the *Knell* of the Union. It is hushed indeed for the moment, but this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper. An abstinence, too, from this act of power, would remove the jealousy excited by the undertaking of Congress to regulate the condition of the different descriptions of men composing a State. This certainly is the exclusive right of every State, which nothing in the Constitution has taken from them and given to the General Government. Could Congress, for instance, say that the non-freemen of Connecticut should be freemen, or that they shall not emigrate into any other State.

EXTENSION OF THE MISSOURI LINE TO THE PACIFIC.

On the 10th of August 1848, in the Senate of the United States, the Oregon bill being under consideration, the question was taken on the amendment extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, and it was decided in the affirmative as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Borland, *Bright*, Butler, Calhoun, Cameron, Davis of Miss., Dickinson, Douglas, Downs, Fitzgerald, Foote, Hannegan, Houston, Hunter, Johnson of Maryland, Johnson of Louisiana, Johnson of Georgia, King, Lewis, Mangum, Mason, Metcalf, Pearce, Sebastian, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, and Underwood—33.

NAYS.—Messrs. Allen, Atherton, Baldwin, Bradbury, Breese, Clarke, Corwin, Davis of Mass., Dayton, Dix, Dodge, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Niles, Phelps, Upham, Walker, Webster and Wescott—22.

“The Bill with this amendment came before the House on the next day, and the amendment of the Senate extending the Missouri line to the Pacific was non-concurred in by the following vote:

YEAS—Messrs Adams, Atkinson, Barringer, Barrow, Bayly, Beale, Bedinger, Birdsall, Boccock, Botts, Bowdon, Bowlin, Boyd, Boydon, Brodhead, Chas. Brown, A. G. Brown, Buckner, Burt, Cabell, Chapman, Chase, Beverly L. Clarke, Clingman, Howell Cobb, Williamson R. W. Cobb, Cocke, Crozier, Daniel, Donnell, Garnett Dusan, Alexander Evans, Featherston, Flournoy, French, Fulton, Gayle, Goggin, Greene, Willard P. Hall, Haralson, Harmanson, Harriss, Haskell, Hill, Hilliard, Isaac E. Holmes, Geo. S. Houston, Chas. J. Ingersoll, Iverson, Andrew Johnson, Robert W. Johnson, Geo. W. Jones, John W. Jones, Kaufman, Thomas Butler King, Ligon, Lumpkin, McDowell, McKay, McLane, Meade, Morehead, Outlaw, Pendleton, Phelps, Pillsbury, Preston, Rhett, Roman, Sheppard, Stanton, Stephens, Thomas, Jacob Thompson, J. B. Thompson, Robert A. Thompson, Tompkins, Toombs, Venable, Wallace and Woodward—82.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Ashmun, Bingham, Blanchard, Brady, Butler, Canby, Cathcart, F. Clark, Collamer, Collins, Conger, Cranston, Crowell, Cummins, Darling, Dickey, Dickinson, Dixon, Duer, Daniel Duncan, Dunn, Eckert, Edsall, Edwards, Embree, Nathan Evans, Faran, Farelly, Ficklin, Fisher, Freedly, Fries, Gott, Gregory, Grinnell, Hale, Nathan K. Hall, Hammons, Jas. G. Hampton, Moses Hampter, Herby, Henry, Elias B. Holmes, John W. Houston, Hubbard, Hudson, Hunt, Joseph R. Ingersoll, Irvin, Jenkins, Kellogg, Kennen, D. P. King, W. T. Lawrence, Sydney Lawrence, Uincoln, Lord, Lynde, Ma-

clay, McClelland, McClernand, McIlvaine, Job Mann, Horace Mann, Marsh, Marvin, Miller, Morris, Mullen, Murphy, Nelson, Nes, Newell, Nicoll, Palfrey, Peaslee, Peck, Petrie, Pettitt, Pollock, Putnam, Reynolds, Richey, Robinson, Rockhill, Jno. A. Rockwell, Rose, Root, Rumsey, St. John, Sawyer, Schenck, Sherrill, Sylvester, Slingerland, Smart, Caleb B. Smith, Robert Smith, Truman Smith, Starkweather, Andrew Stewart, Chas. E. Stuart, Strohm, Strong, Tallmadge, Taylor, James Thompson, Richard W. Thompson, William Thompson, Thurston, Tuck, Turner, Van Dyke, Vinton Warren, Wentworth, White, Wick, Williams and Wilmot.—121.

The House having thus non-concurred with the Senate, the question was decided in the Senate, on the 12th of August, 1848, in favor of receding from its amendment, running the Missouri line to the Pacific, by yeas and nays, as follows:

YEAS.—*Messrs. Allen, Baldwin, Benton, Bradbury, Breese, Bright, Cameron, Clarke, Corwin, Davis, of Mass., Dayton, Dickinson, Dix, Dodge, Douglass, Felch, Fitzgerald, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hannegan, Houston, Miller, Miles, Phelps, Spruance, Upham, Walker and Webster*—29.

NAYS.—*Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Borland, Butler, Calhoun, Davis of Miss., Downs, Foote, Hunter, Johnson of Maryland, Johnson of Louisiana, Johnson, of Georgia, Lewis, Mangum, Mason, Metcalfe, Pearce, Rusk, Sebastian, Turney, Underwood, Westcott and Yulee*—25.

So the Senate receded, and the Compromise line was not extended.

By analyzing this vote it will be seen that upon its being first proposed in the Senate to extend the Missouri line to the Pacific, the entire North in that body with seven exceptions voted against it, whilst the entire South with one exception voted for it.

In the House the entire North with four exceptions voted against it, whilst the entire South with one exception voted for it.

Upon receding in the Senate the entire North voted to recede whilst the entire South with two exceptions voted against it.

NOTE.—Those in Italics are from the North. Those not in Italics are from the South.

LEGISLATION OF 1850, SUPERSEDING THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

We do not deem it necessary to burden this book with a publication of the whole of the Territorial laws of the memorable year 1850. The extracts bearing directly on the subject are all that is necessary.

The Act approved September 9, 1850, for the organization of the Territory of New Mexico, being a part of the act fixing the boundaries of Texas, contains the following proviso in its second section.

“Provided further, That when admitted as a State, the said Territory or any portion of the same shall be received into the Union, with or without slavery as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission.”

The Act approved the same day for the organization of the Territory of Utah, contains an identical provision with that cited from the New Mexico Act.

A portion of New Mexico lies north of 36.30. The whole of Utah lies north of that line.

THE WHIG AND DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS OF 1852 EN-
DORSE THE LEGISLATION OF 1850, SUPERSEDING THE
MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

We here subjoin the Whig platform of 1852. It will be seen that it fully endorsed the legislation of 1850, and afforded the South ample guarantees for the protection of its institutions.

NATIONAL WHIG PLATFORM OF 1852.

The Whigs of the United States, in convention assembled, firmly adhering to the great conservative republican principles by which they are controlled and governed, and now, as ever, relying upon the intelligence of the American people, with an abiding confidence in their capacity for self-government, and their continued devotion to the Constitution and the Union, do proclaim the following as the political sentiments and determinations, for the establishment and maintainance of which their national organization as a party is effected.

1. The Government of the United States is of a limited character, and it is confined to the exercise of powers expressly granted by the Constitution, and such as may be necessary and proper for carrying the granted powers into full execution, and that all powers not thus granted or necessarily implied are expressly reserved to the States respectively and to the people.

The State Governments should be held secure in their reserved rights, and the General Government sustained in its constitutional powers, and the Union should be revered and watched over as "the palladium of our liberties."

3. That while struggling freedom, everywhere, enlists the warmest sympathy of the Whig party, we still adhere to the doctrines of the Father of his Country, as announced in his Farewell Address, of keeping ourselves free from all entangling alliances with foreign countries, and of never quitting our own to stand upon foreign ground. That our mission as a Republic is not to propagate our opinions, or impose on other countries our form of government, by artifice or force, but to teach by example, and show by our success, moderation, and justice, the blessings of self-government, and the advantages of free institutions.

4. That where the people make and control the Government, they should obey its Constitution, laws, and treaties, as they would retain their self-respect, and the respect which they claim, and will enforce, from foreign powers.

5. Government should be conducted upon principles of the strictest economy, and revenue sufficient for the expenses thereof, in time of peace, ought to be mainly derived from a duty on imports, and not from direct taxes; and in levying such duties, sound policy requires a just discrimination and protection from fraud by specific duties, when practicable, whereby suitable encouragement may be assured to American industry, equally to all classes and to all portions of the country.

6. The Constitution vests in Congress the power to open and repair harbors, and remove obstructions from navigable rivers; and it is expedient that Congress shall exercise that power *whenever such improvements are necessary for the common defence or for the protection and facility of commerce with foreign nations or among the States*; such improvements being, in every instance, national and general in their character.

7. The Federal and State Governments are parts of one system, alike necessary for the common prosperity, peace, and security, and ought to be regarded alike with a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment. Respect for the authority of each, and acquiescence in the constitutional measures of each, are duties required by the plainest consideration of national, of State, and individual welfare.

8. The series of acts of the 31st Congress, commonly known as the Compromise or Adjustment, (the act for the recovery of fugitives from labor included,) are received and acquiesced in by the Whigs of the United States as a final settlement, in principle and substance, of the subjects to which they relate, and so far as these acts are concerned, we will maintain them, and insist on their strict enforcement, until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation to guard against the evasion of the laws on the one hand. and the abuse of their powers on the other, not impairing their present efficiency to carry out the requirements of the Constitution, and we deprecate all further agitation of the question thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever,

or however made; and we will maintain this settlement as essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union.

The Democratic platform of 1856 embraces the whole of the platform of the same party in 1852, with the exception of the two following sections. See platform of 1856 in proceedings of National Convention, contained in this volume.

IX. *Resolved*, That the war with Mexico, upon all the principles of patriotism and the laws of nations, was a just and necessary war on our part, in which every American citizen should have shown himself on the side of his country, and neither morally nor physically, by word or deed, have given 'aid and comfort to the enemy.'

X. *Resolved*, That we rejoice at the restoration of friendly relations with our sister republic of Mexico, and earnestly desire for her all the blessings and prosperity which we enjoy under republican institutions; and we congratulate the American people upon the results of that war, which have so manifestly justified the policy and conduct of the Democratic party, and insured to the United States "indemnity for the past and security for the future."

Upon these platforms the two parties went into that contest—their candidates standing unequivocally upon their distinctive features. The candidate of no other party carried a single State. Every State in the Union endorsed one or the other of those platforms. Both platforms endorsed the Legislation of 1850. Therefore, every State endorsed the legislation of 1850.

THE NEBRASKA AND KANSAS ACT OF 1854.

This act contains the following section, repealing in direct terms the 8th section of the Act approved March 6th, 1820, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise.

"**SEC. 14.** * * * * * That the Constitution and all the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska (or Kansas, the language being the same in reference to both,) as elsewhere within the United States, except the 8th section of the act, preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March sixth, eighteen hundred and twenty, which, being inconsistent with the principles of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as recognised by the legislation of eighteen hundred and fifty, commonly called the compromise measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to revive or put in force any law or regulation which may have existed prior to the act of 6th March, 1820, either protecting, establishing, prohibiting, or abolishing slavery."

This act passed the House by a vote of 113 to 100—44 northern men, all Democrats, and 69 southern men voted for it in the House.—91 northern men and 9 southern men voted against it.

The final vote on its passage in the Senate, was 35 to 13.

In that body, 11 Southern men and 14 Northern men—the latter all Democrats, voted for it.—11 Northern men and 2 Southern men voted against it.

READ THE PLATFORMS OF THE OPPONENTS OF THE DEMOCRACY.

KNOW-NOTHING PLATFORM OF 1855.

1. The acknowledgment of that Almighty Being who rules over the Universe—who presides over the Councils of Nations—who conducts the affairs of men, and who, in

every step by which we have advanced to the character of an independent nation, has distinguished us by some token of Providential agency.

2. The cultivation and development of a sentiment of profoundly intense American feeling; of passionate attachment to our country, its history and its institutions; of admiration for the purer days of our National existence; of veneration for the heroism that precipitated our Revolution, and of emulation of the virtue, wisdom and patriotism that framed our Constitution, and first successfully applied its provisions.

3. The maintainance of the union of these United States, as the paramount political good; or, to use the language of Washington, "the primary object of patriotic desire." And hence—

First. Opposition to all attempts to weaken or subvert it.

Second. Uncompromising antagonism to every principle of policy that endangers it.

Third. The advocacy of an equitable adjustment of all political differences which threaten its integrity or perpetuity.

Fourth. The suppression of all tendencies to political division, founded on "geographical discriminations, or on the belief that there is a real difference of interests and views" between the various sections of the Union.

Fifth. The full recognition of the rights of the several States, as expressed and reserved in the Constitution; and a careful avoidance, by the General Government, of all interference with their rights by legislative or executive action.

4. Obedience to the Constitution of these United States as the supreme law of the land, sacredly obligatory upon all its parts and members; and steadfast resistance to the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. Avowing that in all doubtful or disputed points it may only be legally ascertained and expounded by the Judicial power of the United States.

First. A habit of reverential obedience to the laws, whether National, State, or Municipal, until they are repealed or declared unconstitutional by the proper authority.

Second. A tender and sacred regard for those acts of statesmanship, which are to be contra-distinguished from acts of ordinary legislation, by the fact of their being of the nature of compacts and agreements; and so, to be considered a fixed and settled national policy.

5. A radical revision and modification of the laws regulating immigration, and the settlement of immigrants—offering the honest immigrant, who, from love of liberty or hatred of oppression, seeks an asylum in the United States, a friendly reception and protection, but unqualifiedly condemning the transmission to our shores of felons and paupers.

6. The essential modification of the Naturalization Laws.

The repeal by the Legislatures of the respective States, of all State laws allowing foreigners not naturalized to vote. The repeal, without retrospective operation, of all acts of Congress making grants of land to unnaturalized foreigners, and allowing them to vote in the Territories.

7. Hostility to the corrupt means by which the leaders of party have hitherto forced upon us our rulers and our political creeds.

Implacable enmity against the present demoralizing system of rewards for political subserviency, and of punishments for political independence.

Disgust for the wild hunt after office which characterizes the age.

These on the one hand. On the other—

Imitation of the practice of the purer days of the Republic; and admiration of the maxim that "office should seek the man, and not man the office," and of the rule that the just mode of ascertaining fitness for office is the capability, the faithfulness, and the honesty of the incumbent candidate.

8. Resistance to the aggressive policy and corrupting tendencies of the Roman Catholic Church in our country by the advancement to all political stations—executive, legislative, judicial, or diplomatic—of those only who do not hold civil allegiance, directly or indirectly, to any foreign power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and who are Americans by birth, education, and training—thus fulfilling the maxim, "AMERICANS ONLY SHALL GOVERN AMERICA."

The protection of all citizens in the legal and proper exercise of their civil and religious rights and privileges; the maintainance of the right of every man to the full, unrestrained, and peaceful enjoyment of his own religious opinions and worship, and a jealous resistance of all attempts by any sect, denomination, or church, to obtain an ascendancy over any other in the State, by means of any special privilege or exemption, by any political combination of its members, or by a division of their civil allegiance with any foreign power, potentate, or ecclesiastic.

9. The reformation of the character of our National Legislature, by elevating to that

dignified and responsible position men of higher qualifications, purer morals, and more unselfish patriotism.

10. The restriction of executive patronage—especially in the matter of appointments to office—so far as it may be permitted by the Constitution, and consistent with the public good.

11. The education of the youth of our country in schools provided by the State; which schools shall be common to all, without distinction of creed or party, and free from any influence or direction of a denominational or partisan character.

And, inasmuch as Christianity, by the Constitutions of nearly all the States: by the decisions of the most eminent judicial authorities, and by the consent of the people of America, is considered an element of our political system, and as the Holy Bible is at once the source of Christianity, and the depository and fountain of all civil and religious freedom, we oppose every attempt to exclude it from the schools thus established in the States.

12. The American party, having arisen upon the ruins, and in spite of the opposition of the Whig and Democratic parties, cannot be held in any manner responsible for the obnoxious acts or violated pledges of either. And the systematic agitation of the Slavery question by those parties having elevated sectional hostility into a positive element of political power, and brought our institutions into peril, it has, therefore, become the imperative duty of the American party to interpose, for the purpose of giving peace to the country and perpetuity to the Union. And as experience has shown it impossible to reconcile opinions so extreme as those which separate the disputants, and as there can be no dishonor in submitting to the laws, the National Council has deemed it the best guarantee of common justice and of future peace, to abide by and maintain the existing laws upon the subject of Slavery, as a final and conclusive settlement of that subject, in fact and in substance.

And regarding it the highest duty to avow their opinions upon a subject so important in distinct and unequivocal terms, it is hereby declared as the sense of this National Council, that Congress possesses no power, under the Constitution, to legislate upon the subject of Slavery in the States, where it does or may exist, or to exclude any State from admission into the Union because its Constitution does or does not recognize the institution of Slavery as a part of its social system: and expressly pretermittting any expression of opinion upon the power of Congress to establish or prohibit Slavery in any Territory, it is the sense of the National Council that Congress ought not to legislate upon the subject of Slavery within the Territory of the United States, and that any interference by Congress with Slavery as it exists in the District of Columbia, would be a violation of the spirit and intention of the compact by which the State of Maryland ceded the District to the United States, and a breach of the National faith.

13. The policy of the Government of the United States, in its relations with foreign governments, is to exact justice from the strongest, and do justice to the weakest; restraining, by all the power of the government, all its citizens from interference with the internal concerns of nations with whom we are at peace.

14. This National Council declares that all the principles of the Order shall be henceforth everywhere openly avowed; and that each member shall be at liberty to make known the existence of the Order, and the fact that he himself is a member; and it recommends that there be no concealment of the places of meeting of subordinate councils.

E. B. BARTLETT, of Kentucky, President of National Council.

C. D. DESHLER, of New Jersey, Corresponding Secretary.

JAMES M. STEPHENS, of Maryland, Recording Secretary.

PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN PARTY, ADOPTED AT THE SESSION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 21st, 1856,

1st. An humble acknowledgment to the Supreme Being, for His protecting care vouchsafed to our fathers in their successful Revolutionary struggle, and hitherto manifested to us, their decendants in the preservation of the liberties, the independence, and the union of these States.

2d. The perpetuation of the Federal Union, as the palladium of our civil and religious liberties, and the only sure bulwark of American Independence.

3d. *Americans must rule America*, and to this end, *native-born* citizens should be selected for all State, Federal, and municipal offices, or government employment, in preference to all others: nevertheless.

4th. Persons born of American parents residing temporarily abroad, should be entitled to all the rights of native-born citizens ; but

5th. No person should be selected for political station, (whether of native or foreign birth,) who recognises any allegiance or obligation of any description to any foreign prince, potentate or power, or who refuses to recognise the Federal and State constitutions (each within its sphere) as paramount to all other laws as issues of political action.

6th. The unqualified recognition and maintenance of the reserved rights of the several States, and the cultivation of harmony and fraternal good will, between the citizens of the several States, and to this end, non-interference by Congress with questions appertaining solely to the individual States, and non-intervention by each State with the affairs of any other State.

7th. The recognition of the right of the native-born and naturalized citizens of the United States, permanently residing in any Territory thereof, to frame their constitution and laws, and to regulate their domestic and social affairs in their own mode, subject only to the provisions of the Federal Constitution. with the privilege of admission into the Union whenever they have the requisite population for one Representative in Congress. *Provided always*, that none but those who are citizens of the United States, under the constitution and laws thereof, and who have a fixed residence in any such Territory, ought to participate in the formation of the constitution, or in the enactment of laws for said Territory or States.

8th. An enforcement of the principle that no State or Territory ought to admit others than citizens of the United States to the right of suffrage, or of holding political office.

9th. A change in the laws of naturalization, making a continued residence of twenty-one years, of all not hereinbefore provided for, and indispensable requisite for citizenship hereafter, and excluding all paupers, and persons convicted of crime, from landing upon our shores ; but no interference with the vested rights of foreigners.

10th. Opposition to any union between Church and State ; no interference with religious faith, or worship, and no test oaths for office.

11th. Free and thorough investigation into any and all alleged abuses of public functionaries, and a strict economy in public expenditures.

12. The maintenance and enforcement of all laws constitutionally enacted, until said laws shall be repealed, or shall be declared null and void by competent judicial authority.

13. Opposition to the reckless and unwise policy of the present administration in the general management of our national affairs, and more especially as shown in removing "Americans" by designation and conservatives in principle, from office, and placing foreigners and ultraists in their places ; as shown in a truckling subserviency to the stronger, and an insolent and cowardly bravado towards the weaker powers ; as shown in re-opening sectional agitation, by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise ; as shown in granting to unnaturalized foreigners the right of suffrage in Kansas and Nebraska ; as shown in its vacillating course on the Kansas and Nebraska question ; as shown in the corruptions which pervade some of the departments of the government ; as shown in disgracing meritorious naval officers through prejudice or caprice ; and as shown in the blundering mismanagement of our foreign relations.

14th. Therefore to remedy existing evils, and prevent the disastrous consequences otherwise resulting therefrom, we would build up the "American party" upon the principles hereinbefore stated.

15th That each State Council shall have authority to amend their several constitutions, so as to abolish the several degrees, and institute a pledge of honor, instead of other obligations for fellowship and admission into the party.

16th. A free and open discussion of all political principles embraced in our platform.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

(Adopted March 12, 1856.)

Resolved, That we regard the Republican movement and organization as having been forced upon the country by the unconstitutional and despotic measures and aggressions of the national administration, and the want of any other party occupying a position suitable for combining public sentiment, and rendering it effective for resisting such aggressions, for defending the rights of the people, and vindicating the principles of freedom.

Resolved, That the recent convention at Pittsburg, which first inaugurated the Republican movement as a national organization, was demanded by the circumstances of the

country; that its proceedings were patriotic and judicious, and meet our hearty approval, believing that they have already exerted a powerful influence in inspiring confidence and awakening exertions in the cause which the convention so ably represented.

Resolved, That this convention, representing a portion of the people of the State, and believing that a majority of our citizens approve our principles and sympathise in our objects, deem the present an auspicious occasion to inaugurate the Republican party in this State, with anticipations that it will form a new political era, productive of results highly beneficial to the interests and honor of the State, and in its relations to the Union, conducive to the peace, the welfare, and freedom of the country.

Resolved, That we regard it a leading object of the Republican movement to vindicate and defend the Constitution against the perversions, interpolations, excisions, and assaults of a sectional monopoly interest; to restore the government to its original opinions, and to insure its administration, not in the interests of slavery, but in the interests of freedom, and in the same spirit in which it was founded, and its powers exercised by the fathers of the republic.

Resolved, That the aggressive acts originating in sectional monopoly interests which have agitated and alarmed the country, having been consummated in disregard of the plainest provisions of the Constitution, admonish us of the necessity and wisdom of an adherence to those republican doctrines that prevailed in the early days of the republic, which regarded our political system, not as a national or centralized government, but as a compact between sovereign States, each containing all its sovereignty except so far as it had voluntarily surrendered a part of its powers to the confederacy, and which regarded the federal system as having originated from the States, and as possessing only special and limited powers which had been granted to it by the States, and that this grant was the extent and measure of its authority, which cannot be enlarged by construction or implication, or by the exercise of assumed or doubtful powers, without an invasion of the reserved rights and sovereignty of the States. And in accordance with these sound doctrines, there being no grant of power to the federal government in respect to slavery, it cannot uphold or defend it in the Territories, or anywhere else under the flag and authority of the Union, without the exercise of unconstitutional powers.

Resolved, That recent events and disclosures respecting the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act, and the subsequent action of the administration on the subject, have stamped upon that measure a darker shade of corruption, fraud, injustice, despotism, and violation of public faith unparalleled in the records of modern legislation.

Resolved, That the conduct of the administration in relation to Kansas, both in what it has done and in what it has neglected to do, affords conclusive evidence that it has been its settled purpose to make Kansas a slave State, regardless of the wishes of the people, and in violation of the principles of "popular sovereignty," the establishment of which was alleged to be the object of the Kansas and Nebraska act.

Resolved, That as the federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over the Territories, it is the duty of the President to enforce the laws of Congress, and to protect the people of Kansas; and in the refusal of the President to do so, and in removing Gov. Reeder, who was upholding the authority of the law, the administration is justly responsible for the disorders, lawless acts, and crimes which have been perpetrated there, and all the calamities inflicted on the unoffending people of the Territory.

Resolved, That the recent proclamation of the President, and the instructions of the Secretary of War to the officer in command in Kansas, have placed the administration in the position of co-operating with the border ruffians to subjugate the people of Kansas, and to compel them, by military force, to submit to the usurpation and despotic laws which the Missourians have established over them. This illustrates his doctrine of popular sovereignty.

Resolved, That in view of the present distracted and alarming condition of the country, we see no safety, no way of deliverance, except in the success of the Republican movement; and that we earnestly appeal to the people to complete their organizations in every town in the States, and to sustain the Republican cause with an earnestness and zeal commensurate with its importance, and with the momentous issues depending upon it.

Resolved, That we sympathise with the people of Kansas, exposed to the outrages of the border ruffians, on the one hand, and the unjust acts of the administration on the other; and should the President attempt to execute his threats of compelling, by military force, their submission to usurpation and despotism for the evident purpose of forcing slavery upon them against their will, and against the principle of the organic law of the Territory, we trust that the friends of justice and freedom in the West and North will not quietly witness such wrong to the free people of the Territory, and to their own interests, but will promptly afford them such succor as circumstances may demand, let the consequences be what they may.

THE OBJECTS OF THE ANTI-WAR DISUNIONISTS IN 1812,
IDENTICAL WITH THOSE OF THE BLACK REPUBLICAN
LEADERS NOW.

More than forty years ago the patriotic Mathew Carey, of Philadelphia, startled the American people by publishing and proving in his invaluable book "The Olive Branch," "That there existed a conspiracy in New England to effect a dissolution of the Union at every hazard, and to form a separate Confederacy."

The object of that warning was to abjure the American people to forget their party names of Democrat and Federalist which separated them, and come up to save the country from a secret and malevolent enemy.

His proof consisted in the demonstration that this conspiracy was governed but by one principle, and that was the creation of a sectional hostility by which they could overthrow this Union. Read his description of the Anti-War and Disunion party of that day."

"They are possessed of inordinate wealth—of considerable talents—great energy and overgrown influence. A Northern Confederacy has been their grand object for a number of years. They have repeatedly advocated in the public prints a separation of the States."

* * * * *

"To sow discord, jealousy and hostility between the different sections of the Union, was the first and grand step in their career, in order to accomplish their favorite object of a separation of the States."

"In fact, without this efficient instrument, all their efforts would have been utterly unavailing. It would have been impossible had the honest yeomanry of the Eastern States continued to regard their Southern fellow citizens as friends and brethren, having one common interest in the promotion of the general welfare to make them instruments in the hands of those who intended to employ them to operate the unholy work of destroying the noble, the august, the splendid fabric of our Union."

"For eighteen years therefore the most unceasing endeavors have been made to poison the minds of the people of the Eastern States towards and to alienate them from their fellow citizens of the Southern. The people of the later section have been portrayed as demons incarnate, and destitute of all the good qualities that dignify or adorn human nature."

One of their writers says :

"The Northern States can subsist as a Nation or Republic without any connection with the Southern. * * * I shall endeavor to prove the impossibility of a Union for any long period in future, both from the moral and political habits of the citizens of the Southern States."

"It thus happens, that a people proverbially orderly, quiet, sober, and rational, were actually so highly excited as to be ripe for revolution, and ready to overturn the whole system of social order. A conspiracy was formed, which, as I have stated, and as cannot be too often repeated, promised fair to produce a convulsion—a dissolution of the Union—and a civil war."

In order to embarrass the government of Mr. Madison these disunionists opposed the war of 1812. Belonging chiefly to the commercial interests, they opposed a war made to protect those interests. They sympathized with the slave in bondage, and were as ready at that day as this to sever the Union rather than sit in council with the masters, whilst at the same time they traitorously opposed a war as the means of releasing their own sea-faring fellow citizens from worse than servile bondage, their being "eight hundred and seventy-three persons sailing under the American flag which ought to have insured their protection, imprisoned with every circumstance of outrage, oppression, injury injustice.

The patriotic Carey goes on to depict the slavery to which the American

scamen were reduced, from which the disunionists opposed the means of their release.

"We were ordered off the quarter deck, and the captain called for the master at arms, and ordered us to be put in irons. We were then kept in irons about twenty-four hours, when we were taken out, brought to the gangway, ~~WE~~ STRIPPED OF OUR CLOTHES, TIED AND ~~WE~~ WHIPPED, EACH ONE DOZEN AND A HALF LASHES, AND PUT TO DUTY."—*Deposition of Richard Thompson, of New York, page 211, Olive Branch.*

He goes on to recite innumerable affidavits of the same character.

One Hiram Thayer, a native of Greenwich, Mass., was told by Captain Stackpole a British officer, that "if they fell in with an American man of war, he did not do his duty, ~~HE~~ HE SHOULD BE TIED TO THE MAST AND SHOT LIKE A DOG."

But they wanted to dissolve the Union, and they resisted the efforts of a Southern President to set their *own fellow citizens free* from bondage.

They did not hate slavery. They hated the Union. It is the same case now.

HOW THEY OPPOSED THE WAR.

Some of the clergy at that day, as at this, denounced the government for passing an act (The Declaration of War,) of which they did not approve. Let us compare them with their successors.

The Rev. Mr. Gardiner, Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, on the 23d July 1812, said:

"The alternative then is, that if you do not wish to become the slaves of those who own slaves, and who are themselves the slaves of French slaves, you must either in the language of the day, ~~WE~~ CUT THE CONNEXION, or so far altar the national compact, as to insure yourselves a due share in the government."

"THE UNION HAS BEEN LONG SINCE VIRTUALLY DISSOLVED; AND IT IS FULL TIME THAT THIS PART OF THE DISUNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE CARE OF ITSELF." *Idem*, page 19.

Rev. David Osgood pastor of the Church at Medford, said:

"If at the command of weak or wicked rulers, they undertake an unjust war, each man who volunteers his services in such a cause, or loans his money for its support, or by his conversation, his writings, or any other mode of influence, encourage its prosecution that man is an accomplice in the wickedness, ~~WE~~ loads his conscience with the blackest crimes, ~~WE~~ brings the guilt of blood upon his soul, and ~~WE~~ IN THE SIGHT OF GOD AND HIS LAW IS A MURDERER." *Discourse delivered June 27, 1812, page 9.*

Rev. Elijah Parish, D. D., said:

"Here we must trample on the mandates of despotism!!! or here we must remain slaves forever." *Idem*, page 13.

"You may envy the privilege of Israel, and mourn that *no land of Canaan has been promised to your ancestors.* You cannot separate from that mass of corruption, which would poison the atmosphere of paradise. You must in obstinate despair bow down your necks to the yoke, and with your African brethren drag the chains of Virginia despotism, *unless you discover some other mode of escape.*" *Idem*, page 15.

"The legislators who yielded to this when assailed by the manifesto of their angry chief, *established iniquity and murder by law.*" *Idem*, page 9.

Compare the Disunion preached of that day with the Disunion preached at the present day. Look at the treasonable sentiments of the Beecher of 1855, contained in the pamphlet entitled "Fearful Issue, &c.," in this volume, and compare them with those of the Gardiners, Osgoods and Parishes of Mr. Madison's time. They assailed him and the Union then, as they assail the Kansas Act and the Union now.

But it happens that we can from the public records identify at least one individual who was the active advocate of dissolution then, and has avowed the

same sentiments now. He was then indifferent to the far worse than plantation bondage in which we have shown his own fellow-citizens were held by the British *then*, yet he affects to make his horror of slavery *now*, his excuse for avowing the same doctrines:

"Mr. Quincey repeated and justified a remark he had made: which, to save all misapprehensions, he committed to writing in the following words:

"If this bill passes, it is my deliberate opinion, that it is virtually A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION; that it will free the States from their moral obligation; and as it will be *the right of all*, so it will be *the duty of some*, TO PREPARE FOR A SEPARATION, amicably if they can—VIOLENTLY IF THEY MUST."

NOW HEAR THE SAME JOSIAH QUINCEY!

Josiah Quincey is the venerable head of a large class of men in Boston, who are constantly at work against the Union. During the late war with England he began his crusade against the Union, and surpassed its worst adverseries. He assailed Mr. Jefferson for his purchase of Louisiana, in 1803, because this was intended, in his opinion, to extend the area of Slavery. Though past eighty-five, he is still the enemy of the Democracy. *He is now in the field for Fremont*. What his views now are, may be seen from the following extract from his speech, at Boston, on the 18th of August, 1854.

"The Nebraska fraud is not that burden on which I intend now to speak. There is one nearer home, more immediately present and more insupportable. Of what that burden is, I shall speak plainly. The obligation incumbent upon the free States to deliver up fugitive slaves is that burden—and it must be obliterated from that Constitution, at every hazard."

"And such an obliteration can be demonstrated to be as much the interest of the South as it is of the North."

This man knows that we should have no Union or Constitution, but for this very provision!

Josiah Quincy is still in the land of the living; and though approaching his ninetieth year, is still as hostile to the Union as he was fifty-three years ago, while Jefferson was President, or at a later period, when Jackson was chief magistrate.—*Fearful Issue.*

For the sentiments in detail of the noted Black Republican disunionists of the present day, which afford the striking resemblance between them and those in Mr. Madison's time, we must refer our readers to the admirable document in this volume before referred to, from which the preceding pointed observations upon Mr. Quincey are taken.

PLANS OF THE DISUNIONISTS THEN—PLANS OF THE BLACK REPUBLICANS NOW.

They attempted to "stop the wheels of Government" by preventing the loan of money to carry on the war.

"Let no man who wishes to continue the war by active means, by vote or lending money, DARE TO PROSTRATE HIMSELF AT THE ALTAR ON THE FAST DAY; for they are actually as much partakers in the war, as the soldier who thrusts the bayonet; and THE JUDGMENT OF GOD WILL AWAIT THEM."

"By the magnanimous course pointed out by governor Strong, that is, by withholding all voluntary aid in prosecuting the war, and manfully expressing our opinion as to its injustice and ruinous tendency, we have arrested its progress; and driven back its authors to abandon their nefarious schemes, and to look anxiously for peace. What then if we now lend them money? They will not make peace; they will still hanker for Canada; they will still assemble forces, and shed blood on our western frontier. Mere pride, if nothing else, would make them do it. The motives which first brought on the war, will still continue it, if money can be had. But some say—will you let the country

become bankrupt? no, the country will never become bankrupt. BUT PRAY DO NOT PREVENT THE ABUSERS OF THEIR TRUST BECOMING BANKRUPT."

"It is very grateful to find that the universal sentiment is, that ~~NO~~ ANY MAN WHO LENDS HIS MONEY TO THE GOVERNMENT, AT THE PRESENT TIME, WILL FORFEIT ALL CLAIM TO COMMON HONESTY AND COMMON COURTESY AMONG ALL TRUE FRIENDS TO THE COUNTRY!!!!!"

"~~NO~~ My brother farmers, if you have money to let, let it lay. ~~NO~~ If the war continues, you will purchase your stock at four years old, cheaper than you can raise it; so unjust is this offensive war, in which our rulers have plunged us, in the sober consideration of millions, that ~~NO~~ they cannot conscientiously approach the God of armies for his blessing upon it."—[Boston Centinel, 13th January, 1813.

The Disunionists attempted to exhaust the means of the Middle and Southern States which supported the war, by draining their banks of specie.

"It may not be uninteresting to the reader to explain this process a little more in detail. New York purchased goods largely in Boston, partly for bank notes and partly on credit. For the latter portion promissory notes were given, which were transmitted from Boston to the New York banks for collection. Very large purchases were likewise made in Boston by citizens of Philadelphia, Baltimore, Richmond, Petersburg, &c. Payments were made in bank notes, of the middle and southern States, and in promissory notes. Both were sent on to New York, the first for transmission to the banks whence they were issued—and the second for collection.

"This state of things suggested the stupendous idea, at which the reader will stand aghast, of wielding the financial advantages then enjoyed by Boston, to produce the effect which the press and the pulpit had failed to accomplish—that is, *to stop the wheels of government by draining the banks in the middle and southern States of their specie, and thus producing an utter disability to fill the loans!!!* This scheme was projected in the winter of 1813-14—and immediate arrangements were made to carry it into execution."

"A fearful alarm spread through the community. The issue was looked for with terror. Wagons were loading with specie at the doors of our banks almost every week. There have been three at one time loading in Philadelphia. The banks throughout the middle and southern States were obliged to curtail their discounts. Bankruptcies took place to a considerable extent."

The result was that the Banks in Massachusetts soon had \$4,945,444 specie in their vaults to \$2,000,601 circulation.

"To render the stroke at public credit more unerring—and to place the result wholly out of the reach of contingency, there was an arrangement made by some persons at present unknown, with agents of the Lower Canada, whereby an immense amount of British government bills, drawn in Quebec, were transmitted for sale to New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and disposed of to monied men, on such advantageous terms as induced them to make large purchases. And thus was absorbed a very large portion of the capital of these three cities."

By such means they were determined then to repeal the declaration of war as their successors are now to repeal the Legislation of Kansas.

The further effect in the Middle and Southern States is shown by Mr. Carey.

"These drafts were carried to such a great extent, that on the 26th of August the banks in Baltimore—on the 29th those in Philadelphia—and on the 31st those in New York, were reduced to the painful necessity of suspending the payment of specie."

THE DISUNIONISTS DICTATED THE HIGHER LAW AS THE MEANS OF DEFEATING THE GOVERNMENT.

"Administration hirelings may revile the Northern states, and the merchants generally, for ~~this~~ *this monstrous depravation of morals, this execrable course of smuggling and fraud* But there is a just God who knows how to trace the causes of human events: and ~~he~~ *he will assuredly visit upon the authors of this war, all the iniquities of which it has been the occasion. If the guilty deserve our scorn or our pity, the tempters and seducers deserve our execration."*

Thus we have the Higher Law recommended by the Disunionists as justifying resistance to an "odious and unjust war," as it has been since in resisting what is called by them, an "unjust and odious" Fugitive Slave Law.

Can there be any further doubt that the objects and plans of these two parties are the same?

We have only to recapitulate, to bring to the eyes and mind of the reader the identity of the two.

Both resorted to Anti-Slavery agitation, to divide the two sections.

The Disunionists of 1812 said that the South governed the North by its slave representation.

The Disunionists of 1856 say that the South commits an act of aggression upon the North, by leaving to the people of Kansas to choose whether they will own slaves or not.

Both employed a minority to effect their purposes.

The Disunionists of 1812, having no department of the Government, employed the wealth and corporate combination of an outside minority.

The Disunionists of 1856 employ the Legislative majority of two or three in one branch of the National Congress to compel the passage of an act which they want, and which the other Branch and Executive Departments of the Government do not want, as a condition to their consent to the passage of an act alike indispensable to the interests of all.

Both attempted to embarrass the Government into compliance with their purposes, by stopping the supplies necessary to national defence. The Disunionists of 1812, by defeating the War loan. The Disunionists of 1856, by withholding the pay of the officers, soldiers and artificers, and thus disbanding the army.

The object of the one was the repeal of the act declaring war against Great Britain.

The object of the other was the repeal of the act authorizing the admission of Kansas with a free or slave constitution.

Are not their purposes identical, and should you not fellow citizens sacrifice your party differences now, as your fathers did then, to the peace of the country and the duration of the Union?

HYPOCRISY OF ABOLITION ORATORS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

August 11, 1856.

SIR:—In compliance with your request, I forward to you a copy of the bill of sale from Dr. Joseph E. Snodgrass, the travelling Abolition orator, conveying to Daniel Burkhardt two slaves. I cannot comply with your farther request to have it certified under the seal of the Clerk of the County Court. It has never been recorded, as it is not usual in Virginia to record such instruments, nor does the law require it where the sale of a slave, or other personal chattel is accompanied by the transfer of possession from grantor to grantee, as was the case in the transfer of the slaves by Dr. Snodgrass

to Mr. Burkhart. The copy I send to you is in the handwriting of Mr. Burkhart, with which I am well acquainted, and who in person handed it to me. Mr. Burkhart is a gentleman of great intelligence and worth. He was for many years a magistrate of the county of Berkley, and is at this time the cashier of the Bank of Berkeley, Virginia. Dr. Snodgrass will not dare to deny the genuineness of this paper, nor will he dare to deny that he first made sale of all the slaves which he inherited from his father, and put the price of flesh and blood into his pocket, before he assumed the vocation of teaching his fellow men what an atrocious crime it is to hold a human being in bondage. Such hypocrites and impostors should be scouted from every stand from which they attempt to address the people.

Know all men by these presents, That I, Joseph E. Snodgrass, of the city of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, for and in consideration of the sum of eight hundred dollars to me in hand, paid by Daniel Buckhart, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have bargained and sold, and by these presents do bargain and sell into the said D. Buckhart, a negro man, named Charles, of about the age thirty-six years; also, a negro woman, wife of the said Charles, named Emily, aged about nineteen years, together with the natural increase of the said Emily. And I, the said Joseph E. Snodgrass, for myself and my heirs, executors, and administrators, do hereby warrant the said negroes and their increase to be slaves for life. In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 1st day of December, 1838.

(A copy.)

JOSEPH E. SNODGRASS.

[SEAL.]

A STUPENDOUS IMPOSTURE EXPOSED.

The Black Republicans are circulating for the purpose of poisoning the minds of our Irish fellow-citizens thousands of a fraudulent pamphlet purporting to be an address from their countrymen in Washington, imposing the acquittal of Mr. Herbert for killing Thomas Keating upon the Democratic party of the country. The following card from the alleged signers of the address exposes the fraud.

A CARD.

WASHINGTON CITY, August 28, 1856.

Finding our names appended to a printed document, published in this city for the benefit of the Republican party in the present political canvass, headed "THE KILLING OF THOMAS KEATING.—AN ADDRESS FROM IRISHMEN OF WASHINGTON CITY TO THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES," we desire to make known the fact that some of us have not signed it, and that all of us disapprove, disavow, and deny its political statements. Those of us who did sign it were induced so to do by misrepresentation of its purport and contents on the part of an individual who, in asking our signatures to it, assured us that it was only to be a history of the killing of Thomas Keating, and of the circumstances of the imprisonment, trials and final acquittal of Philemon T. Herbert, the perpetrator of that act, designed as a precursor of the publication of the speech of Mr. Preston delivered on the last trial of Herbert, printed in advance of the publication of that speech, so that the distant public might have a reliable key to his argument.

* * * * *

We pronounce false the statement of the aforesaid document intimating that the Secretary of State—Mr. Marcy—sought to screen the accused, by lending his influence to prevent Mr. Dubois, the Netherlands Minister from testifying in the case; that gentleman's Government having expressly forbid him from testifying under circumstances wherein he would be compelled to submit himself to the usual cross-examination, the only system of giving testimony known to our laws, and Mr. Dubois having asked permission of his Government to testify in that way at the suggestion and solicitation of Secretary Marcy.

* * * * *

We are humble men, but we respect ourselves and our rights which have been outraged by those unknown to us, who have undertaken for political effect to use our

names as we have explained above. We have to ask those conducting journals of all parties who respect the truth, to spread before their readers this brief card.

Patrick M. Keating,	Charles Quinn,
Rd. B. Gardiner,	James Quinn,
Daniel Shea,	Jere H. Riordan,
Peter Mansville,	John Green,
John Enright,	John Roach,
Wm. Roach,	John Keating,
Edmund Roach,	Edward Gorman,
Patrick Branagan,	David Roach,
Wm. Scherager.	

FREMONT THE DUELLIST.

The Black Republicans have been poisoning the northern mind with the idea that the Southern men are all bullies and fighting men, disposed rather to resort to the persuasion of the bludgeon than to the arguments of reason.

The case of the Hon. Preston S. Brooks, and other incidents resulting from an extraordinary existence of excitement, have been cited to sustain this assertion. We do not blame Col. Fremont for what he has done in that line, but we publish the following as antidotes to the poison which has been infected into the public mind by his friends.

These incidents show him to be the cool calculating, revenge-seeking duellist.

His first challenge was sent to Col. Mason, in 1847. It was as follows:

“CUIDAD DE LOS ANGELES, April 14, 1847.

“SIR:—An apology having been declined, Major Reading will arrange the preliminaries for a meeting requiring personal satisfaction.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

“J. C. FREMONT,

“Lieut. Col. Mounted Riflemen.

“Col. R. B. MASON,

“First dragoons, Cuidad de los Angeles.”

Col. Mason requested time to go to Monterey to arrange his *private* affairs previous to their meeting. Col. Fremont thus replied:

“CUIDAD DE LOS ANGELES, April 15, 1847.

“SIR:—I am in receipt of your letter of this date, and in reply have the honor to state that I will hold myself in readiness for a meeting at Monterey, at such time as you may designate.

“I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

“J. C. FREMONT,

“Lieut. Col. Mounted Riflemen.

“Col. R. B. MASON,

“First Dragoons, Cuidad de los Angeles.”

Col. Fremont repaired to Monterey, and presented himself at Col. Mason's headquarters, to let Mason see he was in Monterey, but would not sit down. Gen. Kearney and Com. Biddle, hearing of the proposed meeting, wrote the parties, forbidding the meeting.

Col. Fremont thus replied to Col. Mason's letter.

“MONTEREY, May 22, 1847.

“SIR:—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, on yesterday, of your note of the 19th inst., accompanied by a copy of a letter from Com. Biddle to yourself.

“The object of your note appears to be to induce me to consent to a further, and indefinite postponement of a meeting. If such be your desire I am willing to comply with

it, trusting that you will apprise me of the earliest moment at which the meeting can take place consistently with your convenience and sense of propriety.

"I am, most respectfully, your obedient servant,
"JOHN C. FREMONT.

"Col. R. B. MASON, Monterey."

THE FOOTE AND FREMONT DIFFICULTY.

The difficulty between Senators Foote and Fremont grew out of the circumstance that Foote charged Fremont, in the Senate, with seeking legislation in reference to the gold mines for the sake of his own private advantage, which Fremont pronounced false.

Afterwards they met in the ante-chamber, when Fremont struck Foote and brought blood. They were immediately separated by Senator Clarke. Subsequently, Fremont addressed a note to Foote, demanding a retraction of the language used by him in debate, to be signed in the presence of witnesses, and a challenge note was left if he refused.

Mr. Foote declined to sign the paper, but addressed a note in reply to Fremont, disclaiming any intention of giving any personal offence in the language used by him in debate.

The friends of both parties considered this satisfactory to Fremont. but, at his instance, the note of Mr. Foote was submitted to Col. Benton, who consented to an arrangement. The following card was the result :

WASHINGTON, September 28, 1850.

A. CARD.—The undersigned are authorized to state that the difficulty between the Hon. H. S. Foote and the Hon. J. C. Fremont, growing out of certain expressions used by the former in relation to the California bill in the Senate last evening, has been adjusted satisfactorily and honorably to both those gentlemen.

Signed,

A. C. DODGE,
W. M. GWIN,
HENRY W. SIBLEY,
RODMAN M. PRICE.

CHARGE OF BARGAIN AND INTRIGUE.

Referring to the document entitled "Short Answers, &c.," embraced in this volume, relative to the connection of Mr. Buchanan with the charge of bargain and intrigue against Mr. Clay, we cite some additional facts bearing thereon. See what Gov. Letcher, in a recent speech at Mayslick, Kentucky, said, "that Mr. Buchanan was his personal friend—that he was a gentleman and a patriot, for whom he entertained a high regard—and he could not say a word against his character as a man. He did not like his political sentiments, and opposed him on that account."

Gov. Letcher, be it remembered, is the witness upon whom the opposition editors have relied to prove Mr. Buchanan the calumniator of Mr. Clay!

GEORGE E. BADGER A PROMINENT SUPPORTER OF MR. FILLMORE IN NORTH CAROLINA CONNECTION WITH THE CHARGE. MR. BADGER IS ONE OF THOSE OLD LINE WHIGS WHO CAN'T SUPPORT MR. BUCHANAN.

Mr. Badger, in his address to his constituents in 1828, said:

"Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, was one of the four candidates for President; but having the lowest number of electoral votes, was excluded from the House. The State from which he came had instructed her members, in the event which had then happened; to support General Jackson; but, under the influence of Mr. Clay, a man of intrigue, and of eloquence, of unbounded ambition, and of talents above mediocrity, these members, with those of other western States, voted for Mr. Adams, and his election was the result. Immediately after his elevation, Mr. Adams appointed Mr. Clay Secretary of State, in

power and influence the second station of our government, and generally thought to be an introduction to the first.

“Between these two gentlemen there had been previously neither confidence nor affection; and Mr. Clay had public expressed, in language not to be misunderstood, a disbelief of Mr. Adams’s political integrity and patriotism. How, then, are you to account for Mr. Clay’s support of Mr. Adams, in opposition to the declared wishes of Kentucky.

* * * * *

“Take the facts, and answer for yourselves whether it be harsh or uncharitable to conclude that he voted for Mr. Adams in the expectation of being Secretary of State, and that this expectation decided his vote. Let the friends of Mr. Clay protest against the conclusion with whatever of earnestness they can press into the service, and the common sense of mankind will still find in his conduct the grounds of serious suspicion. They may contend that there is not proof to convict him in a court of justice, and subject him to an ignominious punishment. If this were allowed, it will avail them nothing, for the inquiry is not about inflicting punishment on Messrs. Adams and Clay; it is about the propriety of continuing them in public stations of power and influence; and, with due submission, the difference is vastly important. We pity the miserably wretch dragged to the bar, for whom the scaffold or whipping-post is in waiting; and the humanity of the law coincides with our own compassion in pronouncing that doubt shall be followed by acquittal; but to him who claims our confidence, probable suspicion is just ground for refusal; and many are the men dismissed by an acquittal from a court of justice, who, upon grounds which the law cannot notice, stand condemned before the tribunal of public opinion. Aaron Burr was acquitted—and rightfully acquitted, too—for want of evidence; but think you he is a fit object to attract confidence?—is he entitled to support?

Andrew Jackson Donelson, the Know-Nothing candidate for the Vice-Presidency, connection with the Bargain and Intrigue slander.

Now, A. J. Donelson, in August, 1844, as chairman of a Democratic Mass Meeting, in announcing the circumstances which prevented the arrival of Hon. Lynn Boyd, of Kentucky—

“Called the attention of the meeting to the fact that Mr. Boyd was the distinguished Kentuckian who had charged and proved upon Mr. Clay, in his place in Congress, the charge of ‘Bargain, Intrigue and Corruption’ in the Presidential election of 1825, and who had been sustained by his constituents in his course, he therefore proposed nine cheers for Lynn Boyd and the Democracy of his district.”

There is consistency.

MR. BUCHANAN AND THE BANKRUPT BILL.

The enemies of Mr. Buchanan are charging him with having voted for the Bankrupt Bill. The Hon. David S. Reid, a Senator from North Carolina, has written a letter entirely disproving the charge. We extract from it the following record evidence:

“At the time this act was passed, Mr. Buchanan was in the United States Senate, and on July 24, 1841, he is recorded as voting against the passage of the bankrupt bill. See Senate Journal for that session, page 115. On the same day Mr. Buchanan made a speech against the bill. (See appendix to Congressional Globe for that session, p. 205.)

“On February 25, 1843, Mr. Buchanan is recorded as voting for the repeal of the bankrupt law. (See Senate Journal for that session, p. 229.)

“When the act passed Mr. Fillmore was a member of the House of Representatives, and on August 18, 1841, he is recorded as voting for the bankrupt bill. (See House Journal for that session, p. 879.) Mr. Fillmore made a speech in favor of the passage of the bill August 16, 1841. (See appendix to Congressional Globe for that session, p. 480.)

“On January 17, 1843, Millard Fillmore is recorded as voting against the repeal of the bankrupt act. (See House Journal for that session, page 215.)

“It will, therefore, be seen that Mr. Buchanan *did not* vote for the bankrupt law, but that Mr. Fillmore *did*; and moreover that Mr. Buchanan voted *for the repeal* of the law, while Mr. Fillmore voted *against the repeal*.”

MR. BUCHANAN VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGE OF HAVING VIOLATED THE SUB-TREASURY LAW BY DEPOSITING MONEY IN SIMON CAMERON'S BANK.

We wish to fix attention on the specific charge that "Mr. Buchanan, while Secretary of State, wrote to Mr. Polk recommending \$50,000 to be deposited in Simon Cameron's bank," &c. This letter, the Post is informed, contains sufficient evidence to send Mr. Buchanan to the state prison for a violation of the sub-treasury law. If this charge is true, Mr. Buchanan ought not to be elected president: and if true, the proof ought to be obtained from the proper department to establish it. To show how basely false the charge is, we ask attention to the following facts, which appear by the official records:

"Mr. Buchanan entered upon his duties as secretary of State, under Mr. Polk, on the 4th of March, 1845. The sub-treasury law was passed on the 6th of August, 1846.

"On the 4th of November, 1844, the books of the treasury department show that the deposits of \$50,000 was made in Mr. Cameron's bank at Middletown, Pennsylvania.

"The deposite, therefore, which the Post says was recommended by Mr. Buchanan's letter addressed to Mr. Polk, was made by Mr. Tyler, just four months before Mr. Buchanan was appointed secretary of State by Mr. Polk, and just twenty-one months before the sub-treasury law was passed."

TRIUMPHANT VINDICATION OF MR. BUCHANAN BY THE MECHANICS OF HARPER'S FERRY, VA.

MEETING OF THE MECHANICS OF HARPER'S FERRY, VIRGINIA.

A very large and enthusiastic meeting of the mechanics of Harper's Ferry was held in that place on the 12th of August, 1856, at which, on motion, JOHN PRICE, Esq., was called to the chair, and THOMAS W. SHRIVER, Esq., appointed secretary.

On motion, a committee, consisting of Captain William H. More, T. S. Duke, and Michael E. Price, Esqs., was appointed to draught resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting in regard to the base calumnies which have been circulated, charging Mr. Buchanan with being unfriendly to the interests of the working men of the country.

The committee, retiring for a short time, came into the meeting and made their

REPORT.

The mechanics of Harper's Ferry having seen, with much regret, the unprincipled effort of the enemies of the Hon. James Buchanan to revive and fasten upon him the charge of having advocated a reduction of the wages of mechanical labor to the rate of "ten cents a day," have deemed it a duty to one who has so long and so consistently represented the interests of the industrial classes, to examine and refute this infamous charge, as contrary to history and reason, and contradictory to the whole tenor of his private life and public record.

In proceeding with this refutation, we cannot suppress our honest indignation at the impudent imputation upon the intelligence of the American mechanics which the circulation of this calumny implies. Who are the mechanical classes of our country? Are they like the menial millions of Europe, oppressed by class combinations, kept in the most profound ignorance of everything except the manual skill necessary to execute some special article of social consumption, and living upon an allotted pittance of their own labor?

Are they so far debarred the privilege to read and reason as that they may be misled by the charge that one who has been through life their benefactor and advocate has deliberately tried to deprive them of a just compensation for their labor and the honest support of their families?

Is it supposed that they cannot discriminate between truth and falsehood? or distinguish an honest friend from a concealed enemy?

Enjoying, then, the same advantages of acquiring information with other citizens of the republic, accustomed to discuss and investigate for themselves public questions in which their rights are involved, they have appealed to the records of the country to testify upon the truth or falsity of the charge referred to.

Before, however, proceeding with the investigation of the subject, the mechanics of Harper's Ferry may be pardoned in taking a peculiar interest, when it is known that they stand under especial obligations to the statesman whose character they intend to vindicate.

It will be remembered that, in the year 1841, an effort was made to commit the direc-

tion of the mechanical labor employed in the manufacture of fire arms to officers of the army of the United States. The injustice of this measure occasioned an appeal to Congress, and amongst the most earnest and efficient advocates of continuing the mechanical construction of military weapons in the hands of a practical and mechanical civilian was the Hon. James Buchanan, as will be seen by reference to his whole congressional history, and the following letter addressed by him to a member of the committee sent from the Armory at this place to advocate the desired relief:

(Here the Mechanics publish Mr. Buchanan's letter of July 24, 1842, contained on page 25 of the document called Short Answers, in this volume.)

We proceed with a narrative of historical facts, necessary to the intelligent comprehension of this infamous charge.

During the currency war, which followed the delivery of the country from the monster monopoly of the United States Bank, Mr. Buchanan advocated the establishment of the independent treasury. One argument used by the enemies of this independent measure was that it was designed to prostrate the whole banking system, and introduce a metallic currency. Assuming that this was the purpose of its advocates, it was a natural inference that such a financial revolution must paralyze the monetary and industrial interests of the country. The wages of the mechanic and laborer must sympathize with this universal embarrassment, and great suffering would result to all who depended upon the sweat of their brows for an honest maintenance. Such were the consequences attributed by its enemies to the establishment of the independent treasury. The consequences then were denied and controverted by its friends. They disavowed any intention to overthrow the institution of credit. They demonstrated that such an effect treasury would reduce the wages of labor.

would not follow the measure. They denied that the establishment of the independent

It was a bold step on the part of the panic-makers that they should have ascribed to Mr. Buchanan an admission of the very imputation which himself and others so vehemently denied. Yet it seems that a senator of that day, whose *soubriquet* of *honest* John Davis was not certainly conferred upon him for the merit of fairness towards his political antagonists, charged Mr. Buchanan with having advocated the independent treasury for the express purpose of bringing down the wages of labor. Having assumed that this consequence was intended and desired by Mr. Buchanan, this honest John Davis added in the appendix of his speech the rates of daily labor allowed as the rule of mechanical compensation under the despotisms of Europe, as that to be established by the independent treasury in this country; another and an inferior set of calumniators reduced this fallacy to a simpler formula of falsehood, and asserted that Mr. Buchanan had declared himself in favor of fixing the wages of American laborers and mechanics "at ten cents a day!" Thus did this calumny originate.

Time has vindicated the wisdom of Mr. Buchanan and of those who aided him in separating the federal government from the monetary concerns of the country. It has shown that the predictions of the panic-makers have been falsified by the whole fiscal history of the country. The Bank of the United States has been discontinued; yet the currency is uniform and readily convertible. Domestic exchanges rule below the average rate during the bank regime. Commerce is prosperous. Manufactures flourish, and the wages of labor are steady and liberal. If the object of those who introduced the independent treasury had been to reduce the wages of labor, they should long since have set about its repeal. The preposterous consequences predicted by the panic-makers have not followed its establishment. The friends of the independent-treasury system point to the prosperity which prevails as a vindication of the wisdom that designed it.

Mr. Buchanan was never the representative of corporate or associated wealth. The Bank of the United States, with its whole affiliated influence, located in the metropolis of his own State, appealed to him in vain. He steadily represented the great agricultural, mechanical, and mineral interests. He still represents their interests, and it would be ridiculous to say that he had deserted them, and that they have nevertheless continued their unabated confidence in him for more than twenty years.

If any specific evidence of the interest taken by Mr. Buchanan in the misfortunes of the mechanic was wanting, it will be found in the following letter to the Secretary of the Navy, imploring him to afford temporary employment to five hundred mechanics thrown suddenly out of work at the Philadelphia navy-yard in 1837:

(Here the mechanics publish Mr. Buchanan's letter of December 26, 1837, contained on page 26, of the document called Short Answers, in this volume.)

It will be seen from this report that we have examined this charge against Mr. Buch-

anan historically, logically, and by the test of those motives which usually influence the relation between representative and constituent. From this investigation we are satisfied that the charge is absurd, groundless, and malicious, and that it ought to be withdrawn by every antagonist who makes the least pretension to fairness or to justice.

Resolved, therefore, that the mechanics of Harper's Ferry have seen with regret that the malignant spirit of party has endeavored to impair the confidence of the laboring men of the country in the integrity of Hon. James Buchanan, by charging him with a wish to reduce the rates of compensation for their labor to a degrading scale of wages, established by the class-combinations of Europe.

Resolved, That the whole public history of Mr. Buchanan proves him to have been the representative of the laborious and intelligent class of American citizens upon which the power and prosperity of the republic must depend, of which he is a native, to which he owes every representative position which he has ever held, and to which he has dedicated the patriotic labors of a long and virtuous life.

Resolved, That with an impartial determination to examine every charge brought against the candidate of their choice, the mechanics of Harper's Ferry are satisfied that the charge that the Hon. James Buchanan has ever advocated a low rate of wages for the laboring man is contrary to the whole tenor of his private acts, to the charity and justice of his nature, and to the democratic theory by which his whole public actions have been regulated, and we pronounce these charges false, absurd, and malicious.

On motion, the above preamble and resolutions were adopted unanimously.

The meeting then adjourned.

JOHN PRICE, Chairman,

THOMAS W. SHRIVER, Secretary.

OLD LINE WHIGS OF THE COUNTRY IN FAVOR OF MR. BUCHANAN.

OLD LINE WHIGS IN MARYLAND FOR BUCHANAN.

Hon. Thomas G. Pratt, Hon James Alfred Pearce, present United States Senators.

Hon. William D. Merrick, former United States Senator.

Capt. Richard T. Merrick, son of the above.

Hon. Thomas F. Bowie, of Prince Georges, now in Congress.

Hon. Revedy Johnson, former United States Senator and Attorney General under General Taylor.

William K. Gaither, President of the State Senate.

Hon. John B. Eccleston, of Kent, one of the Judges of the Court of Appeals.

Hon. Ezekiel F. Chambers, former United States Senator and Judge of this Judicial District.

Hon. Isaac D. Jones, of Somerset.

Hon. John W. Crisfield, of Somerset.

Samuel Hambleton, Esq., of Talbot, former State Senator.

Henry H. Goldsborough, Esq., lawyer of Talbot.

Daniel F. Henry, Esq., of Dorchester, former Whig candidate for Congress.

George W. P. Smith, Esq., editor of the Snow Hill Shield.

Hon. William T. Goldsborough, former State Senator and Whig candidate for Governor.

R. W. Dirickson, of Worcester, former member of the Legislature.

Col. Joseph Wickes, of Charlestown, former Deputy Attorney General for Cecil and Kent.

Hon. Alexander Evans, of Cecil, former Representative in Congress.

George Earl, Esq., of Cecil.

John A. Croswell, of Cecil.

John C. Morgan, of St. Mary's.

John T. Dorsey, of Howard county, former member of the Legislature and member of the Reform Convention.

William H. Dorsey, of Baltimore, brother of the above.

S. Teakle Wallace, of Baltimore, a prominent lawyer and former Whig speaker.

Thomas Yoates Walsh, of Baltimore, former member of Congress.

William H. Gatchell, Esq., lawyer of Baltimore.

Robert M. Magraw, Esq., of Baltimore, President of Susquehannah Railroad.

Thomas Donaldson, Esq., of Howard county, former member of the Legislature and member of the Convention which formed the present constitution of the State.

John K. Longwell, of St. Mary's county, former member of the Legislature.
Benedict I. Heard, of St. Mary's county, a prominent Whig.

OLD LINE WHIG LAWYERS IN CINCINNATI FOR MR. BUCHANAN.

Judge James,
Judge M. R. Tilden,
Judge Saffin,
C. Anderson, Esq.,
Joshua Bates, Esq.,
N Longworth, Esq.,
T. Nesmith, Esq.,
D. Worthington, Esq.,
J. Worthington, Esq.,

Judge T. M. Key,
Judge W. Johnson,
Hon. E. H. Spencer,
Alex. Johnson, Esq.,
A. S. Sullivan, Esq.,
L. Anderson, Esq.,
Patrick Mallon, Esq.,
T. Jones, Esq.,

We add the following :

Hon. George Evans, Maine,
Hon. E. W. Farley, Maine,
Hon. Rufus Choate, Mass.,
Hon. James C. Jones, Tenn.
Hon. A. G. Talbott, Ky.,
Hon. William Preston, Ky.,

Hon. J. P. Benjamin, La.,
Hon. Josiah Randall, Penn.,
Hon. William B. Reed, Penn.,
Hon. I. E. Hiester, Penn.,
Hon. T. J. Michie, Va.,
And a host of others.

TO THE OLD LINE WHIGS.

The following address taken from the National Intelligencer of the 27th of October 1840, was issued by the State Whig Central Committee to the Whig Party in Maryland and shows the doctrine of the Whig party, both as to the naturalization and the Catholic question.

Many sincere Whigs, who in the present contest are heart and hand with the Democratic party, will rejoice to know that the Whig doctrine, years ago, was that a discussion of religious creeds should not be brought into political contests. They stand *now* where they stood in 1840, and extend the hand of fellowship to all who fight the same great battle :

TO THE WHIGS OF MARYLAND.

The undersigned, as members of the Whig Central Committee of the State, have deemed it their duty to present this statement of their views. The Whigs of Maryland will, we have no doubt, sustain this proceeding, and acquiesce in its propriety.

Gen. Duff Green, as editor of the Pilot, has discussed in his paper subjects which, in the opinion of the undersigned, have no proper connection with the Presidential election. Within a few days this gentleman has published a prospectus for a newspaper, in which he expresses his determination to continue, after the election, discussions on questions with which the Whig party has not been, and will not be identified. As an individual, Gen. Green has an undoubted right to take such a course as his own judgment may approve. As an editor of a party paper, he has thought proper to persevere in conduct which he knew was disapproved of by the Whig party of Maryland. He has repeatedly been requested to avoid all discussions in reference to religious sects, but such requests have always been disregarded. He has ever assumed the position that he alone is responsible for what may appear in his editorial columns. This is undoubtedly true ; and our object now is to make this manifest beyond all dispute to the people of Maryland. We now emphatically declare that the Whig party is not in any way, or to any extent, responsible for what has heretofore been published in the Pilot on the subject of Catholicism and naturalized voters, and will not be responsible for what Gen. Green may be pleased hereafter to do.

It is our decided conviction that the election contests in this country are already sufficiently exciting and absorbing in their character. If the differences of opinion between the religious denominations are to be appealed to, and to be used as incentives to party action, no man can foresee how terrible may be the result. Heretofore, after the elections have been settled by the ballot box, a calm has succeeded the political storm. With the close of the contest have subsided the excited and often angry feelings which prevailed during its continuance. Those who were alienated one from the other by political dis-

cussions have generally returned to their friendly relations after the settlement of the questions which divided them. But if, in addition to the causes of discussion which ordinarily exist, a religious controversy is to take place, who can allay the excitement which these combined causes may produce, and when will such a contest be finally settled.

In this country every man is permitted to worship his Maker in such way as his conscience may approve. Our laws and constitutions were framed to secure to all this glorious privilege. The native and naturalized citizens are equally entitled to the blessings of our government. All are equal; and when a stranger takes up his abode here, and has remained among us during the time prescribed by the naturalization laws, he has a right to become a citizen, and will be entitled to the privileges of citizenship.

Such being the views of the Committee, and, as they believe, of their constituents, the great Whig party of the State of Maryland, they hereby declare their disavowal of any concurrence in the present or prospective editorial course of General Green, and devolve upon him alone the entire responsibility of his course.

N. F. WILLIAMS, Chairman.

GEO. R. RICHARDSON,	WILLIAM CHESNUT,
WM. H. GATCHELL,	JOHN P. KENNEDY,
JAMES GRIEVES,	SAM'L McLELLAN,
SAMUEL HARDEN,	A. G. COLE,
GEO. W. KREBS,	HUGH BIRCKHEAD,
ASA NEEDHAM,	JAS. L. RIDGELY,
CHAS. H. PITTS,	GUSTAV W. LURMAN,
NEILSON POB,	JAS. FRAZIER,
GEO. M. GILL,	WM. R. JONES,
JAMES HARWOOD,	T. YATES WALSH.

THE NORTHERN SUPPORTERS OF MR. FILLMORE.

The first suggestion of the Revolutionary means of redressing what the Abolitionists call the wrongs of Kansas came from the Hon. George Grundy Dunn, of Indiana, a candidate for Elector on the Fillmore ticket in that State. In a speech in the House of Representatives on the 21st of July last he said:

“I would cut off the supplies and stop the wheels of government, rather than let it move an inch further in its present most ill-directed and perilous course. If those who control that course are refractory—if they will not heed the clear and distinct utterances of an overwhelming public sentiment, justly aroused to indignation against a great wrong—if the dangers that threaten us will not warn or check them, I would *cut off the sinews of power and thus compel submission* to an overwhelming public necessity. [Cries of ‘Good!’ ‘That is it!’ ‘That is the doctrine!’”

He was speaking in favor of a restoration of the Missouri Compromise at the time. The public sentiment to which he alluded was that which he supposed to be in favor of such restoration. In the same speech he said:

“I shall most cheerfully give my vote to that candidate who both hails from, and lives in, New York, and not to him who hails from, and lives in Pennsylvania, or to him who, living in New York, for the purpose of this canvass, hails from California—or to any other, who is amphibious, either in his home or his principles.” [Laughter.]

The following is from Mr. Bayard Clarke, a member of Congress from New-York, a prominent Know-Nothing and an ardent supporter of Mr. Fillmore:

“Some have wondered that a certain class of our naturalized citizens should be found sustaining the Cincinnati platform, and the Presidential candidate who has merged his individuality in that platform, while another class sustain the platform of freedom in opposition to the aggressions of slavery. But to me there is no mystery in all this. It only illustrates the natural affinity of Jesuitism with slavery. That part of our foreign born population who support Mr. Buchanan are, with rare exceptions, the subjects of the Roman hierarchy, and consequently friendly to the despotic *principle*, of which slavery is a logical necessity. On the contrary, the foreign born voters who oppose the extension of slavery, with the platform and candidate of the Cincinnati convention, are

generally a more intelligent class of citizens, owing no allegiance to Rome, and disdaining all alliance with the slave power, which degrades labor, and despises the laborer. The former are Catholics, the latter Protestants. Of course there are exceptions in both cases, but this classification will be found generally correct, and the explanation of the fact will also be found in the natural affinity of one despotic system with another. Said I not rightly that Protestantism is significant of all that contributes to the elevation, the progress, and freedom of our race? As a Protestant I can do no less, then, than oppose the aggressions of the slave-power; and when I find Jesuitism allying itself with that power, and striving to secure the success of its platform and its candidate, I cannot fail to remark, that consistency demands from all who love the Protestant principle, opposition to the usurpations of slavery, no less than relentless hostility to the aggressions of popery. They are TWIN DEMONS; and, God helping me, I am resolved, within the limits of constitutional action, to give no quarter to either."

The New Albany Tribune, the leading Fillmore paper in Indiana, has the following ticket at the head of its columns:

FOR PRESIDENT, MILLARD FILLMORE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT, A. J. DONELSON.

Electors for the State at large.

George G. Dunn, of Lawrence county,

Andrew L. Osborne, of Laporte.

District Electors.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. James G. Jones, of Vanderburg. | 7. William K. Edwards, of Vigo. |
| 2. David T. Laird, of Ferry. | 8. James Prather, of Montgomery. |
| 3. John Baker, of Lawrence. | 9. Thomas S. Stanfield, of St. Joseph. |
| 4. William E. White, of Dearborne. | 10. John B. Howe, of Langrange. |
| 5. Fred. Johnsonbough, of Wayne. | 11. William R. Hale, of Wabash. |
| 6. Henry H. Bradley, of Johnson. | |

The same paper contains the following:

COALITION BETWEEN FILLMORE AND FREMONT.

The Fillmore State Convention of Indiana have just united with the Fremont or Black Republican party, by nominating the same Electoral ticket for the State. If any of our Democratic friends have been feeding themselves up with the hope of a division among the American and Republican parties, upon the State ticket, they would do well to give that hope up as utterly futile.

The fusion of the parties for the Presidency is now complete, which seals the fate of Buchanan Democracy in Indiana.

The friends of Mr. Fillmore should now go to work to secure a majority of the popular vote of the State of Indiana for him; if they succeed, of which we have no doubt, the Electoral vote will be cast for him. *Let there be no crashing between the friends of Fillmore and Fremont, because their cause is one cause.* Let the energies of the friends of each be directed against Buchanan, and we will have *no more slave soil to curse our government.*

The Huntington (Indiana) Gazette, a Fremont paper, has the same Electoral ticket in its columns, headed as follows:

FOR PRESIDENT, JOHN C. FREMONT, of New York.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT, W. L. DAYTON, of New Jersey.

MORE FUSION.

The Gazette published at Mauch Chunk, Pennsylvania, has the following ticket at its head:

WHIG, AMERICAN AND REPUBLICAN UNION TICKET.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER, THOMAS E. COCHRAN, of York County.

FOR AUDITOR GENERAL, DARWIN PHELPS, of Armstrong county.

FOR SURVEYOR GENERAL, BARTHOLOMEW LAPORTE, of Bradford county.

IS NOT THE FUSION COMPLETE?

The Eagle, a Fillmore paper published at Newark, New Jersey, has the following caption to the American platform adopted at Philadelphia, February 21, 1856:

THE PLATFORM MR. FILLMORE ENDORSES AND STANDS ON!

AMERICA FOR AMERICANS, AND OPPOSITION TO THE REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

AMERICANISM AT THE NORTH.

THE KNOW-NOTHING PLATFORM OF THE STATE OF MAINE.

BANGOR, February 1st, 1855.

Resolved, That the Declaration of Independence, the tone and tenor of the constitution, the ordinance of 1787, the words and deeds of the founders of this republic, all indicate that our forefathers intended that slavery be sectional, not national—temporary, not permanent.

Resolved, That *native-Americanism, anti-slavery, and temperance* are the foundation stones of our order, equally deserving our consideration; and that before giving our political support to any man, for any office, we will imperatively demand his entire committal in favor of these great and cardinal principles.

Resolved, That we solemnly protest against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the passage of the Nebraska-Kansas bill, and the fugitive slave law, as violations of the rights of the free States, and tending to the destruction of the free institutions of our country."

KNOW-NOTHING PARTY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE ON SLAVERY.

Resolved, That the Declaration of Independence, the tones and deeds of the founders of this republic, all indicate that our forefathers intended that slavery should be sectional, not national—temporary, not permanent.

Resolved, That as a political party pledged to regard and watch over the best interests of the whole Union, and to labor for its integrity and perpetuity we solemnly protest against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the Kansas and Nebraska bill, and the fugitive slave law, as violating the spirit of the Constitution, and tending to the destruction of the free institutions of the country.

Resolved, That we never will, under any circumstances, consent to the admission of slavery into any portion of the territory embraced in the compact of 1820, and from which it was then excluded by the mutual agreement of both the northern and southern States."

MR. FILLMORE IN FAVOR OF ALIEN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. Fillmore signed the Washington Territorial bill in 1853. That bill gives aliens the right of suffrage.

WASHINGTON TERRITORY.

"Every white male inhabitant above the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of said Territory at the time of the passage of this act, and shall possess the qualifications hereinafter prescribed, shall be entitled to vote at the first election, and shall be eligible to any office within the said Territory; but the qualifications of voters, and of holding office at all subsequent elections, shall be such as shall be pre-

scribed by the Legislative Assembly : *Provided*, That the right of suffrage, and of holding office, shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States above the age of twenty-one years, and those above that age who shall have declared on oath their intention to become such, and shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act.

THE STATES, AND NOT CONGRESS, HAVE ALONE THE RIGHT TO REGULATE SUFFRAGE WITHIN THEIR RESPECTIVE LIMITS.

The Know-Nothing orators clamor about aliens voting in some of the states. They promised the people if they were elevated to power that they would stop it. Have any of them attempted to do it in Congress? No! Why? Because they know Congress has no power over the subject. Congress can make a man a citizen of the United States, but not a voter in the states, nor can it take from him the right of voting therein. The states have the controlling power in that respect. Thus Virginia years since prescribed in her constitution that a man without a property qualification could not vote. The man thus prescribed was a citizen of the United States. Such citizenship it will thus be seen did not give him the right to vote. Virginia controlled that matter and decided that he should not vote. This fact is merely cited as an illustration.

FOREIGN PAUPERS AND CONVICTS.

Alabama, California, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont and Virginia, the only states, through the seaports of which foreign paupers and convicts can find access to our shores, have already on their statute books, ample law to prevent the immigration of convicts, and to reimburse those States the damages arising from the support of paupers.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL ENGLAND SATISFIED THAT NO TEMPORAL ALLEGIANCE IS DUE, BY CATHOLICS, TO THE POPE.

The odious Catholic disabilities which existed in Protestant Episcopal England for so many years, were, no doubt, established on account of the idea that Catholics owed a Temporal Allegiance to the Pope. Mr. Pitt, on the part of the British Government, instituted the following inquiries, and received the subjoined answers. The result was that nearly, if not all, of the disabilities were removed by England :

“ 1. Has the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England ?

“ 2. Can the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects, from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever ?

“ 3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature ?”

These questions were sent for answer to the Catholic universities of Paris, of Douay, of Alcala, of Valladolid, and of Salamanca. These several universities are conducted by the most learned men of Europe, and they all responded with frankness and promptness to the questions. We have space only

for the answer of one, though we have them all before us, and state that the answers of all are strictly the same. To show what they all answered, we select the response of the University of Paris, as follows:

Abstract from the answers of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris to the above queries.

After an introduction, according to the usual form of the university, they answer the first query by declaring—

Neither the Pope, nor the cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil pre-eminence whatsoever, in *any* kingdom, and, consequently, none in the kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope, or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the sacred faculty of divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rigidly proscribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

Answer to second query. Neither the Pope, nor the cardinals, nor any body of men, or any person of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, absolve or release the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

This and the first query are so intimately connected, that the answer of the first immediately and naturally applies to the second, &c.

Answer to the third query. There is no tenet in the Catholic church by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet that it is lawful to break faith with heretics is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants have complained more heavily than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them; &c., &c., &c.

Given at Paris, in the general assembly of the Sorborne, held on Thursday, the 11th day before the calends of March, 1789. [Signed in due form.]

IDENTITY OF PRINCIPLE BETWEEN HARTFORD CONVENTIONISM AND KNOW NOTHINGISM.

Every one recollects the odious Hartford Convention, held during the War of 1812—a Convention, representing constituencies in the New England States, who opposed their country in that war and hung blue lights out on the coast to enable the ships of the enemy to know the movements of our own gallant navy and conspire the more easily to defeat it. It had its secrecy, like the Know Nothings.

The first resolution read:

Resolved, That the most inviolate secrecy shall be observed by each member of this Convention, including the Secretary, as to all propositions, debate, and proceedings thereof, until this injunction shall be suspended or altered.

A part of its platform, like that of the Know Nothings, proscribed naturalized citizens.

ONE OF THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE HARTFORD CONVENTION.

Resolved, That no person who shall hereafter be naturalized shall be eligible as a member of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States, nor capable of holding any civil office under authority of the United States.

THIRD ARTICLE OF THE KNOW NOTHING PLATFORM OF 1856.

3. *Americans must rule America*; and, to this end, *native-born* citizens should be selected for all State, Federal, and municipal offices, or government employment, in preference to naturalized citizens.

THE BIBLE VS. KNOW NOTHINGISM.

“If a *stranger* sojourn with thee in your land, *ye shall not vex him*; but the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as *one born among you*, and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God.—*Book of Leviticus, 19th chapter, 33d and 34th verses.*”

GEORGE III, A KNOW-NOTHING.

Amongst the counts in that grand indictment framed by our Revolutionary fathers -- the Declaration of Independence, is one charging his Royal highness with the infliction upon the American Colonies of one of the very abuses now sought to be engrafted upon the policy of the country by the Know-Nothing party. Read from that Declaration of Independence with what emphasis they rebuked the Know-Nothingism of that Royal tyrant.

“He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of land.”

PRINCIPLE OF THE NATURALIZATION LAWS VINDICATED BY THE WAR OF 1812.

In a paragraph preceding this we show the identity of principle between Know-Nothingism and Hartford Conventionism. The Hartford Conventionists opposed the war of 1812. The war of 1812 was fought by this country for the reason that England denied the right of a man born under her flag to swear away his allegiance to her Government and become a citizen of the United States. Denying this right she attempted to search our vessels, take from them those in the service of the United States who were born under English dominion. War was the result. Victory for our arms ended the contest. The basis principle of the naturalization laws was vindicated. The Know-Nothings are endeavoring to destroy these laws, with the halo of the glory of the revolution and the war of 1812 thrown around them. Think of this and read the following paragraph :

FOREIGN INFLUENCE.

It was against this kind of foreign influence that Washington advised his countrymen when he said :

“Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake.”

Washington was not thinking of the poor emigrant, but of influence like the following, which appeared in the London Chronicle, one of Victoria's organs, in reference to our Presidential contest :

“We should be sorry to see Mr. Buchanan elected, because he is in favor of preserving the obnoxious institutions, as they exist, AND THE UNITY OF THE STATES. There is no safety for European monarchical governments, if the progressive spirit of the Democracy of the United States is allowed to succeed. **ELECT FREMONT AND THE FIRST BLOW TO THE SEPARATION OF THE UNITED STATES IS EFFECTED!**”

ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE OATH OF THE KNOW NOTHINGS AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

Art. VI.—“No *religious test* shall ever be required as a qualification to *any* office of public trust under this government.”

KNOW NOTHING CONSTITUTION.

Art. III.—“The object of this organization shall be to resist the insidious policy of the Church of Rome, and other foreign influence against the institutions of the country, *by placing in all offices in the gift of the people, or by appointment, none but native born* **PROTESTANT citizens.**”

Compare it also with the act of religious toleration in the Constitution of Virginia, penned by Thomas Jefferson, the authorship of which is his epitaph on his tombstone :

16. That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction—not by force or violence; and therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practise christian forbearance, love, and charity towards each other.

KNOW NOTHING OATH.

“ You futhermore promise and declare that you will not vote nor give your influence for any man for any office in the gift of the people, unless he be an American born citizen, in favor of Americans ruling America, *nor if he be a Roman Catholic.*”

Again: “ You solemnly and sincerely swear that, if it may be done legally, you will, when elected to any office, remove all foreigners *and Roman Catholics from office,* and that *you will in no case appoint such to office.*”

PROSCRIPTION OF ONE RELIGIOUS SECT WILL LEAD EVENTUALLY TO THE PROSCRIPTION IN TURN OF ALL.

The following, says the Trenton True American, is taken from a pamphlet written by a member of one of the American orders to prove that the Methodist Church ought not to be tolerated in a free country.

Recollect Methodists that this is from one of a faction that is endeavoring to get your aid to proscribe your Catholic fellow citizens.

“ But again—the very organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church is dangerous to the liberties of a free people. Suppose a crisis to arrive in political action, in which the hierarchy of the Methodist Church is interested. From the dependence of all the parts on one great central power, it is easy to perceive how the suffrages of most of the members may be controlled by the bishops. Let the bishop suggest to the presiding elders that the interests of their ecclesiastical despotism will be subserved by the election of a certain set of men to office; the presiding elders use their influence over the preachers, the preachers over the class leaders, and the class leaders over their class members, and thus the balance of power in a political contest may rest in the hands of SEVEN EPISCOPAL METHODIST BISHOPS. There is as much danger of this, as there is of Romanism accomplishing a similar result; provided the occasion requires it. It may be said that the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church are too independent to be thus influenced; but, while they submit to the degradation to which I have shown they are subjected in Church matters, let them not speak of independence in political matters. Let them become ecclesiastically free, and then it may be hoped that they would *dare* to become *politically* free if the bishops undertook to prevent it.

“ I have thus briefly shown that Episcopal Methodism is anti-American in its spirit and tendency, and that it is a dangerous foe to republicanism. I have shown that it had its origin in *usurpation*—that its very organization provides for the support and extension of *assumed power*, and that this power may be *oppressively exercised without restriction*. I have shown that Methodist Episcopacy contains in itself the very elements of an *absolute despotism*, and therefore must ultimately, unless checked, subvert and ~~destroy~~ our republican institutions.

A KNOW-NOTHING MAYOR vs. THE CONSTITUTION.

The Constitution says:

“ SEC. II—ARTICLE III.—No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation

therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

Here is what a Know-Nothing Mayor, whose election was hailed in every section, even in the South, as a great American triumph, said:

"MAYOR'S OFFICE, PHILA., MARCH 6, 1835.

"MR. SAMUEL JOHNSON—DEAR SIR: *With the kindest feelings for you personally, and with great respect for your character as an officer, it is proper that I should inform you that if you act as the agent of Louisiana to return Warwick, charged with encouraging the escape of a fugitive slave to that State, I will consider it my duty to discharge you immediately from the police force of this city.*

"Yours, respectfully,

R. T. CONRAD, MAYOR."

KENNETH RAYNER.

No man in the country pretends to be more afraid of the Pope, at this time than Kenneth Rayner. He is his terror by day as well as by night. A Catholic, to his eyes, is a monstrum horrendum. He wants legislation against Catholics, although he knows that it is neither practicable or constitutional to do it. But let us exhibit the humbuggery of Know-Nothingism, by showing when Rayner had it in his hands to move to oppress them, what he then said. In the Constitutional Convention of North Carolina, in 1835, he, the said Rayner, thus spoke:

"I do not conceive that we have anything to do with the tenets of any particular creed. We have not to decide between the merits of contending sects. We have not to inquire whether the Pope of Rome is the legal custodian of the Keys of Christ's Kingdom, or whether, (according to the opinion of some,) he is the many-headed monster mentioned in the Apocalypse.

"But it is said, if the Catholic is excluded from office, that will not deprive him of the right of worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Sir, the right of worshipping God free from all personal pains and penalties, is a right which can now be enjoyed in any country in Christendom. An exclusion from the honors, the profits, and the emoluments of the State, is the highest persecution which public opinion will tolerate in any Christian country in this enlightened age. So that if you sanction the principle recognized in the 32d Article, you use the rod of persecution with as unsparing a hand as it is used in Spain, or the States of the Church. And if you exclude one sect, why not another and another, and finally all, except one?

"Retain that Article, and I assert it, the Catholic and Jew will be placed under the ban of proscription, no matter how great may be his merit; although he may love his country with a patriotism as pure as the first love of woman; although he may pour out his blood like water in her defence; yet, for daring to 'worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience,' you cut him off from all hope of political preferment and from all stimulus to ambition. Like the Israelites in Egypt, he will be oppressed by the land in which he lives, the soil on which he treads, and like them, he will have left no other resource but to turn back upon the graves of his fathers, and take up his march to a more tolerant clime. Sir, the exclusion from office for opinion's sake, in this enlightened age, proceeds from the same spirit of bigotry and superstition which has preyed upon mankind from the building of Babel to the present time."

Mr. Rayner concludes his defence of the Catholics in the following manner:

"Sir, is this convention ready to incorporate into our fundamental law the doctrine, that 'honesty, capability, and faithfulness to the Constitution,' is not a sufficient qualification for office, but that he who obtains it must abjure a certain particular faith? Sir, who constituted us judges of the hearts and consciences of men? What right have we to impugn the motives of our fellow men? It is asserting one of the attributes of the Deity himself, for it is the Lord alone that pondereth the heart. Sir, you may carry on this system of persecution, but there is one point beyond which you cannot go. You may subject the body to privation and torture, but you cannot fetter the mind—fettters cannot bind it—tyrants cannot enchain it—dungeons cannot confine it—it will rise superior to the powers of fate, and aspire to Him who gave it."

For the correctness of the quotation (says the Fayetteville Carolinian) we refer the reader to the Debates of the Convention of 1835, pages 262-3-4.

Mr. Alex. H. H. Stuart, one of the Know-Nothing Electors in the State of Virginia, who was Secretary of the Interior under the administration of Mr. Fillmore, thus endeavored to blarney our Irish Fellow Citizens, when he was in hopes that his Master my Lord Fillmore would be the Whig nominee and would like to have their votes.

WASHINGTON, March 13, 1852.

Gentlemen:—I have been favored with the receipt of your invitation to attend a public dinner to be given in the city of Philadelphia on the 17th inst., in celebration of the anniversary of St. Patrick's day."

The occasion is an interesting one, and there is no portion of our citizens whom it would give me greater pleasure to meet around the social board. I have always regarded it as a happy omen of the perpetuity of our Government, that so large a portion of the emigration to our shores is of the Irish race—kindred to ourselves—and who so readily become incorporated with us. I have been struck with the facility with which they adapt themselves to our institutions, rightly entering into their scope and spirit—becoming, in a word, thoroughly Americanized. And I feel assured that, while the approaching festival will naturally call up hallowed recollections of old Erin, it will be with hearts full of attachments and devotion to the home of their adoption, and with sentiments that will do honor to the character of American citizens.

Regretting that official engagements will forbid my acceptance of your kind invitation, and wishing you all joy on this festive occasion. I am, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,
ALEX. H. H. STUART.

EXTRACT FROM THE WILL OF GENERAL JACKSON.

"I bequeath to my well-beloved nephew, Andrew J. Donelson, son of Samuel Donelson, deceased, the elegant sword presented to me by the State of Tennessee with this injunction, that he fail not to use it when necessary in support and protection of our glorious Union, and for the protection of the Constitutional rights of our beloved country, should they be assailed by foreign or domestic traitors."

Where was this sword and its owner during the Mexican War ?

HUMPHREY MARSHALL AND FREMONT.

The Loudoun, Va., Democratic Mirror, speaking of a speech made by Humphrey Marshall, at Leesburg, recently, says:

"He was also very severe upon Mr. Buchanan, charged him with being the squatter sovereignty candidate of the North, and declared that he would as leave see John C. Fremont, or the Devil himself made President as James Buchanan."

PRENTICE AN ABOLITIONIST.

In 1829, Prentice was the editor of a paper called the Weekly Review, printed at Hartford, Connecticut, and on the 27th of July, of that year, he published the following editorial in that paper. Read it slaveholders :

"The purchase of Texas must be opposed. Every man who does not wish to see the power of the Northern and Western States depart forever: every man who does not wish to see a dozen new slave States added to the Union, and to hear the cries of additional millions of wretched negroes going up to meet the Lord in the air and imprecate vengeance upon our land, will oppose the purchase of Texas with a deep and irresistible determination.

LAST BALLOT FOR SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 34TH CONGRESS.

On the 2d day of February, 1856, the House adopted a resolution, that on the third ballot, who ever received the highest plurality should be the Speaker. The third ballot resulted in the choice of Mr. Banks. It was as follows :

Nathaniel P. Banks received.....	108
William Aiken.....	100
Henry M. Fuller.....	6
Lewis D. Campbell.....	4
Daniel Wells.....	1

The following is the vote in detail :

For Mr. Banks—Messrs. Albright, Allison, Ball, Barbour, Henry Bennett, Benson, Billingham, Bingham, Bishop, Bliss, Bradshaw, Brenton, Buffington, Burlingame, Jas. H. Campbell, Lewis D. Campbell, Chaffee, Ezra Clark, Clawson, Colfax, Comins, Covode, Cragin, Cumback, Damrell, Timothy Davis, Day, Dean, De Witt, Dick, Dickson, Dodd, Durfee, Edie, Flagler, Galloway, Giddings, Gilbert, Granger, Grow, Robert B. Hall, Harlan, Holloway, Thomas R. Horton, Howard, Kelsey, King, Knapp, Knight, Knowlton, Knox, Kunkel, Leiter, Mace, Matteson, McCarty, Meacham, Killian Miller, Morgan, Morrill, Mott, Murray, Nichols, Norton, Andrew Oliver, Parker, Pearce, Pelton, Pennington, Perry, Pettit, Pike, Pringle, Purviance, Ritchie, Robbins, Roberts, Robison, Sabin, Sage, Sapp, Sherman, Simmons, Spinner, Stanton, Stranahan, Tappan, Thorington, Thurston, Todd, Trafton, Tyson, Wade, Walbridge, Waldron, Calwalader C. Washburne, Elihu B. Washburne, Israel Washburn, Watson, Welch, Wood, Woodruff, and Woodworth.

For Mr. Aiken—Messrs. Allen, Barksdale, Bell, Hendley S. Bennett, Bocoek, Bowie, Boyce, Branch, Brooks, Burnett, Cadwalader, John P. Campbell, Carlisle, Caruthers, Caskie, Clingman, Howell Cobb, Williamson R. W. Cobb, Cox, Crawford, Davidson, Denver, Dowdell, Edmundson, Elliott, English, Etheridge, Eustis, Evans, Faulkner, Florence, Foster, Thomas J. D. Fuller, Goode, Greenwood, Augustus Hall, J. Morrison Harris, Sampson W. Harris, Thomas L. Harris, Herbert, Hoffman, Houston, Jewett, George W. Jones, J. Glancy Jones, Keitt, Kelly, Kennett, Kidwell, Lake, Letcher, Lindley, Lumpkin, Alexander K. Marshall, Humphrey Marshall, Samuel S. Marshall, Maxwell, McMullin, McQueen, Smith Miller, Millson, Mordecai, Oliver, Orr, Paine, Peck, Phelps, Porter, Powell, Puryear, Quitman, Reade, Ready, Ricaud, Rivers, Ruffin, Rust, Sandidge, Savage, Shorter, Samuel A. Smith, William Smith, William R. Smith, Sneed, Stephens, Stewart, Swope, Talbott, Trippe, Underwood, Vail, Walker, Warner, Watkins, Wells, Wheeler, Williams, Winslow, Daniel B. Wright, John V. Wright, and Zollicoffer.

For Mr. Fuller—Messrs. Broom, Bayard Clark, Cullen, Henry Winter Davis, Millward, and Whitney.

For Mr. Campbell—Messrs. Dunn, Harrison, Moore, and Scott.

For Mr. Wells—Mr. Hickman.

Messrs. Broom, Clarke, Fuller, Whitney, and Richardson who voted for Mr. Aiken the day before, did not vote for him on the last ballot. Messrs. Broome, Clarke, and Whitney voted for Mr. Fuller. Mr. Fuller was in the Hall and did not vote. It was stated that he had paired off with Mr. Barclay, who was also in the Hall. This Mr. Barclay denies. Messrs. Faulkner, Alexander K. Marshall, and Keitt, who were not present the day before voted for Mr. Aiken then. Mr. Richardson had to resume a pair with Mr. Emrie, of Ohio, which Mr. Faulkner had temporarily taken off his hands.

LAST DAY OF THE CALLED SESSION.

(From the Daily Globe.)

SATURDAY, AUGUST 30, 1856.

In the *House of Representatives* Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, by leave, reported from the Ways and Means Committee another Army appropriation bill, with the proviso, that no part of the military of the United States, for the support of which appropriations are made by this act, shall be employed in aid of the enforcement of any enactment of the body claiming to be the Territorial Legislature of Kansas.

The previous question was seconded, and under the operation thereof, the bill was read a third time and passed, by the following vote :

YEAS.—Messrs. Albright, Allison, Barbour, Barclay, Henry Bennett, Benson, Billinghurst, Bingham, Bliss, Bradshaw, Brenton, Buffington, James H. Campbell, Lewis D. Campbell, Chaffee, Ezra Clark, Clawson, Colfax, Comins, Covode, Cragin, Cumback, Damrell, Henry Winter Davis, Timothy Davis, Dean, De Witt, Dick, Dickson, Dodd, Durfee, Edie, Edwards, Emrie, Flagler, Galloway, Giddings, Gilbert, Granger, Grow, Harlan, Haven, Holloway, Thomas R. Horton, Howard, Hughston, Kelsey, King, Knapp, Knight, Knowlton, Knox, Kunkel, Leiter, Matteson, McCarty, Morgan, Morrill, Mott, Murray, Norton, Andrew Oliver, Parker, Pelton, Pettit, Pike, Pringle, Purviance, Ritchie, Robbins, Roberts, Robison, Sabin, Sage, Sapp, Scott, Sherman, Simmons, Spinner, Stranahan, Tappan, Thorington, Thruston, Todd, Trafton, Tyson, Wade, Wakeman, Walbridge, Waldron, Cadwalader C. Washburne, Elihu B. Washburne, Israel Washburne, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wood, Woodruff, and Woodworth—99.

NAYS.—Messrs. Aiken, Akers, Barksdale, Bell, Hendley S. Bennett, Bocock, Bowie, Boyce, Branch, Burnett, Cadwalader, John P. Campbell, Carlile, Caskie, Clingman, Howell Cobb, Williamson R. W. Cobb, Cox, Craige, Crawford, Cullen, Dowlall, Dunn, Edmundson, Elliott, Etheridge, Florence, Thomas J. D. Fuller, Goode, Greenwood, Augustus Hall, J. Morrison Harris, Sampson W. Harris, Thomas L. Harris, Harrison, Hickman, Hoffman, Houston, Jewett, George W. Jones, J. Glancy Jones, Kennett, Kidwell, Lake, Letcher, Lumpkin, Mace, Alexander K. Marshall, Humphrey Marshall, Maxwell, McMullin, McQueen, Smith Miller, Millson, Mordecai Oliver, Orr, Pennington, Phelps, Powell, Puryear, Quitman, Ricaud, Rivers, Ruffin, Rust, Shorter, William Smith, William R. Smith, Stanton, Stewart, Talbott, Vail, Walker, Warner, Wheeler, Daniel B. Wright, and John V. Wright—77.

In the *Senate*, the bill having been taken up for consideration, Mr. HUNTER moved that the Kansas proviso be stricken out of the bill, which was agreed to by the following vote :

YEAS.—Messrs. Adams, Allen, Bayard, Bell of Tennessee, Bright, Brodhead, Brown, Butler, Cass, Clay, Crittenden, Douglas, Geyer, Houston, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson, Jones of Tennessee, Mason, Pratt, Pugh, Reid, Thompson of Kentucky, Toucey, Weller, and Wright—26.

NAYS —Messrs. Durkee, Foot, Foster, Harlan, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson—7.

The vote in the Senate on the passage of the bill as amended, was the same as the last except one less in the affirmative, Mr. Bell of Tennessee, who voted on the previous vote being absent.

IN THE HOUSE.

A message having been received from the Senate, announcing that that body had passed the Army appropriation bill with an amendment striking out the Kansas proviso, the House proceeded to consider the amendment ; when it was agreed to by the following vote :

YEAS.—Messrs. Aiken, Akers, Barksdale, Bell, Bennett of Mississippi, Bocock, Bowie, Boyce, Branch, Burnett, Cadwalader, Campbell of Kentucky, Carlile, Caskie, Clingman, Cobb of Georgia, Cobb of Alabama, Cox, Craige, Crawford, Cullen, Davidson, Davis of Maryland, Denver, Dowlall, Edmundson, Elliot, Etheridge, Eustis, Evans, Faulkner, Florence, Fuller of Maine, Goode, Greenwood, Hall of Iowa, Harris of Maryland, Harris

of Alabama, Harris of Illinois, Harrison, Haven, Hickman, Hoffman, Houston, Jewett, Jones of Tennessee, Jones of Pennsylvania, Keitt, Kelly, Kennett, Kidwell, Lake, Letcher, Lumpkin, A. K. Marshall of Kentucky, H. Marshall of Kentucky, Marshall of Illinois, Maxwell, McMullin, McQueen, Miller of Indiana, Milson, Oliver of Missouri, Orr, Packer, Peck, Phelps, Porter, Powell, Puryear, Quitman, Ricaud, Rivers, Ruffin, Rust, Sandidge, Savage, Seward, Shorter, Smith of Tennessee, Smith of Virginia, Smith of Alabama, Sneed, Stephens, Stewart, Swope, Talbott, Taylor, Tyson, Underwood, Vail, Walker, Warner, Wells, Wheeler, Whitney, Williams, Winslow, Wright of Mississippi, Wright of Tennessee, and Zolicofer—101.

NAYS —Messrs. Albright, Allison, Barbour, Barclay, Bennett of New York, Benson, Billingham, Bingham, Bliss, Bradshaw, Brenton, Buffington, Campbell of Pennsylvania, Campbell of Ohio, Chaffee, Clark of Connecticut, Clawson, Colfax, Comins, Covode, Cragin, Cumback, Damrell, Davis of Massachusetts, Dean, DeWitt, Dick, Dickson, Dodd, Dunn, Durfee, Edie, Edwards, Emrie, Flagler, Galloway, Giddings, Gilbert, Granger, Grow, Harlan, Holloway, Horton of New York, Howard, Hughston, Kelsey, King, Knapp, Knight, Knowlton, Knox, Kunkel, Leiter, Mace, Matteson, McCarty, Morgan, Morrill, Mott, Murray, Norton, Oliver of New York, Parker, Pelton, Pennington, Pettit, Pike, Pringle, Purviance, Ritchie, Robbins, Roberts, Robinson, Sabin, Sage, Sapp, Scott, Sherman, Simmons, Spinner, Stanton, Stranahan, Tappan, Thorington, Thurston, Todd, Trafton, Wade, Wakeman, Walbridge, Waldron, Washburne of Wisconsin, Washburne of Illinois, Washburne of Maine, Welch, Wood, Woodruff, and Woodworth—98.

Mr. Whitney, of New-York, now that the Army bill had passed, asked leave to bring in a bill repealing the obnoxious laws in Kansas. Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, and other Republicans objected, so leave was not granted.

ELECTORAL VOTE OF STATES.

Maine - - - - -	8	Alabama - - - - -	9
New Hampshire - - - - -	5	Mississippi - - - - -	7
Vermont - - - - -	5	Louisiana - - - - -	6
Massachusetts - - - - -	13	Arkansas - - - - -	4
Rhode Island - - - - -	4	Texas - - - - -	4
Connecticut - - - - -	6	Missouri - - - - -	9
New York - - - - -	35	Kentucky - - - - -	12
Pennsylvania - - - - -	27	Tennessee - - - - -	12
New Jersey - - - - -	7	Iowa - - - - -	4
Delaware - - - - -	3	Illinoise - - - - -	11
Maryland - - - - -	8	Indiana - - - - -	13
Virginia - - - - -	15	Ohio - - - - -	23
North Carolina - - - - -	10	Michigan - - - - -	6
South Carolina - - - - -	8	Wisconsin - - - - -	5
Georgia - - - - -	10	California - - - - -	4
Florida - - - - -	3		