

Bedford Gazette.



BY GEO. W. BOWMAN.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

TERMS, \$2 PER YEAR.

NEW SERIES.

FRIDAY MORNING, BEDFORD, PA. JULY 25, 1856.

VOL. XXIV, NO. 47.

Select Poetry.

Written for the Daily Pennsylvanian.

Ho! Rally Freemen.

—Yankee Doodle, or, 'The Girl I left behind Me.'

Ho! rally Freemen one and all
We'll give the foe no quarter,
We'll show no mercy, none at all,
Although they think we "oughter."

Our songs will make the workin' ring,
Then hurrah for James Buchanan,
Sure Buck and Breck are just the thing,
To give our foes a tanning.

For "Kansas" Massachusetts may
Take up her contributions,
But we'll stand and defend our play,
We'll fight and win the Constitution.

South Carolina may boast of Brooks,
And the Bay State of her Sumner,
But when they come to post their books,
They'll find the "Old Keystone" somewhere.

The men of the Keystone and Kentock,
Sure never can be beaten;
"Republicans" may curse their luck,
Dark lanterns, too, are cheapening.

Fremont may do for fanatics,
None other electioneer him;
An awful thing in politics,
This Buffalo engineering.

They fight the South and fight the Pope;
And fight the Constitution,
For such as you we have a rope
Of righteous retribution.

For Buck and Breck are on the track,
Just, fearless, and undaunted;
Who to their foes never turn their back,
They're just the men we wanted.

Our guns are charged BB's,
Take aim—now pull the triggers,
Oh! how they break and run, just see,
The men who worship niggers.

Then hurrah for Buck, hurrah for Breck,
And all that's Democratic;
Get out of the way with your foul truck
It looks quite too fanatic.

ATTENTION DEMOCRATS!!!

TOWNSHIP MEETINGS.

In accordance with the desire of many democrats, the County Committee have determined to hold a series of meetings throughout the County at the times and places set forth below. It is hoped that the Township Committees will give full notice in their respective Townships, and that all good citizens, of whatever party, who love the Union and desire an end to the Know Nothing Abolition agitation which now threatens it, will condescend to these meetings by their presence. We can promise to all, as well to our adversaries as our friends, and those who are "balancing between two opinions," a calm, temperate, and honest discussion of the great issues now before the County. In addition to the meetings to be held in the County, we expect the meetings to be addressed by Col. C. M. HANLEY, formerly of the Bedford Bar, and now of Galveston, Texas.

West Providence, Monday, August 11, at the village of Bloody Run.

East Providence, Tuesday, August 12, at D. A. T. Black's.

Monroeville, Wednesday, August 13, at Cloverville.

Harrison, Wednesday, August 13, at Keyser's School House.

Southampton, Thursday, August 14, at Buxton's Meeting House.

Junata, Thursday, August 14, at Boena Vista.

Colerain, Friday, August 15, at Rainburg.

Londonderry, Friday, August 15, at Bridgeport.

C. Valley, Saturday, August 16, at Centerville.

St. Clair, Monday, August 18, at St. Clairsville.

Union, Tuesday, August 19, at Ake's Mill.

Napier, Wednesday, August 20, at Schellsburg.

Hopewell, Broad Top and Liberty, Thursday, August 21, at Hopewell.

Middle Woodberry, Friday, August 22, at the village of Woodberry.

South Woodberry, Saturday, August 23, at Pattonville.

WM. P. SCHELL,
JOHN CESSNA,
JOSEPH W. TATE,
WM. M. HALL,
SAML. G. STATLER,
G. H. SPANG,
F. D. BEEGLE.

County Committee.

July 11, 1856.

THE "10 CENT" SLANDER! \$1,000 Reward

Will be paid immediately by the undersigned Democratic County Committee of Bedford County to any person or persons who will show, by clear and satisfactory proof, such as would be received in a Court of justice, that JAMES BUCHANAN, in any speech, letter, public or private paper, written or printed document or social conversation, ever advocated or favored the doctrine that the standard of American wages of labor should be fixed at ten cents per day.

This charge has been often and recklessly made by the enemies of the Democratic Party. It has been as often met and answered, but neither argument nor self respect have been sufficient to stop the mouth of vile slander.

The charge comes with an ill grace from a large portion of our opponents who are struggling to free men among us to compete with the working and laboring population of the country. It is made at an unfortunate time for our adversaries. Every person knows that the wages of labor never commanded a higher price nor a greater and surer reward than at this time, and every person knows that this result has been brought about by the doctrines and policy of the Democratic party under the lead of JAMES BUCHANAN and the other great statesmen who have, for years, assisted in guiding the "ship of State."

We trust that our adversaries will immediately claim the reward, or exhibit such a regard for truth in the future, as will prevent the repetition of this infamous and unfounded charge.

JOHN CESSNA,
WM. P. SCHELL,
JOS. W. TATE,
WM. M. HALL,
GEO. H. SPANG,
F. D. BEEGLE,
SAML. G. STATLER.

County Committee.

Bedford, July 18, 1856.

FREMONT A CATHOLIC.

The Proof.

From the New York Express.

KNOW-NOTHING MANIFESTO AGAINST COL. FREMONT.

COL. FREMONT'S MARRIAGE—HE MUST HAVE BEEN A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

There is a point now made one of great importance in the Presidential election—by the denial on the part of Col. Fremont's friends, and by authority, as we understand it, from him—that he is, or even has been, a Roman Catholic. The point is one of this importance, in a political view, first, because many Americans who support him in New England, especially support him upon the ground that he is anti-Roman Catholic—and second, because, if he ever has been a Roman Catholic, he denies the fact, and has ostensibly changed his religion. The Rev. Mr. Beecher says, in his *Independence*, apparently by authority:—

"Until he was fourteen, Col. Fremont was educated in the hope and expectation that he would become an Episcopal minister. At sixteen, he was confirmed in the Episcopal church, and has, ever since, when within reach of the church, been an attendant and communicant. And since his temporary sojourn in New York, he has been an attendant to Dr. Anthon's church until recently; and now he worships at Grace church. Mrs. Fremont was reared strictly in the Presbyterian Church, and united with the Episcopal Church upon her marriage with Col. Fremont. Their children have been baptized in the Episcopal Church, &c., &c."

These are strong statements—and it is prodigious wrong somewhere, and we propose to find out where.

There are two periods in a man's life when his religion, or the feeling for the religion he was educated in, first discloses itself—the first, when he marries for life; the second, when on his death-bed. It is admitted—and nowhere denied—that when Lieutenant Fremont married Miss Benton, Father Van Horneigh, of Washington, a Roman Catholic Priest, of character and high standing in the church there, married them. Nobody compelled Mr. Fremont to go to a Roman Catholic Priest. He went there of his own free will and choice. True, it is said, that in consequence of the social influence of Senator Benton, in Washington, no other than a Roman Catholic Priest could marry the runaway pair; but it is not proven, and it is not true, or if true, it does not vitiate the fact that a Roman Catholic Priest cannot under the ordinances and councils of his church, unite unless one of them, at least, professes to be of that church.

To understand the laws and the councils, and the customs of the Romish church, we must take our readers a little way into the theology of that church.

Marriage is with the Roman Catholics a sacrament. The Protestants have but two sacraments; the Roman Catholics have seven, and among them is matrimony. Hence, a Roman Catholic Priest would no more administer the sacrament of matrimony to a party not of his church, than he would the Lord's Supper, or confirmation, or baptism, for matrimony is, in the Romish church just as much a sacrament as the Lord's Supper. The highest written authority of the Romish church is the famous Council of Trent, and there it is decreed:—

DECREE.

33. Whosoever shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord or that they are more or less in number than seven; that is to say, baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be accursed.

Marriage among most Protestants—not all, however—is but a civil contract, but in the Romish Church it is an obligation, to be taken only before priests—it is a sacrament. The Romish Church is rigid, and stricter in its rule of marriage than any other religious denomination. Marriage in that church is an indissoluble tie, and never to be loosed even by the civil law of divorce. The marriage of heretics by the priest is a crime, except under some special Papal dispensation—just as much of a crime as it would be to administer the Lord's Supper to heretics. When Colonel Fremont, therefore, voluntarily went before Father Van Horneigh, and asked him, as a Priest of Rome, to marry him to a Protestant woman, he must have been, or pretended to be, a Roman Catholic, and must have promised to bring up the offspring, if any, in the Romish Church. That promise Col. Fremont fulfilled in an adopted daughter, now a grown woman, for he educated her in the convent on the heights of Georgetown, D. C., and he cannot deny, or authorize any one to deny the fact. The sacramental obligations of the marriage have been fulfilled till a late period; and if they are not fulfilled now, it is because of late, a change has taken place in Col. Fremont's profession of religion—it may be for the purpose of obtaining the Protestant vote for President.

The Roman Catholic celebration of the matrimonial sacrament (*Ritus celebrandi matrimonii Sacramentum*) is one of the august ceremonies of that church. The priest puts on his cassock and white stole, and he brings out his missal, and holy water to sprinkle the marrying parties, and he then unites the parties, according to the rules of the Holy Mother Church, and the priest sprinkles the marriage ring with holy water, in the sign of the cross.

THE PREPARATION FOR MARRIAGE.

From the Roman Catholic Catechism of the Christian Religion, chap. 9, sec. 5, page 378—Donnato's edition.

Question. How should we prepare ourselves for marriage?

Answer. By prayer, good works, and the reception of the sacrament.

Other authorities say by "confession," and through the confessional.

WHO CAN TAKE THE SACRAMENT.

From the Catechism of the Christian Religion. Patrick Donahoe. Boston edition, 1852. Page 375:—

Question. Who are the persons with whom the church forbids us to contract marriage?

Answer. Besides unbaptized infidels whose marriage with Catholics is null, the church forbids marriage with heretics and excommunicated persons, so long as the excommunication is in force. The church gives her sacraments only to those within her bosom.

CHILDREN MUST BE PLEDGED TO ROMANISM.

From the Golden Manual, published in London, with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster," and in New York (Sadtler & Co.) with the approval of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, New York:—

A Catholic, in marrying a person of another religion, cannot be allowed to enter into any agreement that any of the children shall be brought up to any but the Catholic faith.

THE RITUAL FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.

From the Golden Manual, published in London, with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster," and in New York (Sadtler & Co.) with the approval of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, New York:—

The priest, vested in a surplice and white stole, accompanied by at least one clerk, to carry the book and a vessel of holy water, and by two or three witnesses, asks the man and the woman, separately, as follows, in the vulgar tongue, concerning their consent.

And first he asks the bridegroom, who must stand at the right hand of the woman:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful wife, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the Priest asks the bride:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful husband, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the woman is given away by her father or friend; and if she has never been married before, she has her hand uncovered; but if she is a widow, she has it covered. The man receives her to keep in God's faith and his own; and holding her by the right hand in his own right hand, plights her his troth, saying after the priest as follows:—

I, N., take thee, N., to my wedded wife, to have and to hold, in health and in wealth, till death do us part, if holy church will permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth.

Then they loose their hands; and joining them again, the woman says, after the priest:—

I, N., take thee, N., to my wedded husband, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, &c., if holy church will permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth.

Their troth being thus pledged to each other on both sides, and their right hands joined, the priest says:—

Ego conjugo vos in matrimonium, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

I join you together in marriage, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then he sprinkles them with holy water.

This done, the bridegroom places upon the book gold and silver, (which are presently to be delivered into the hands of the bride,) and also a ring which the priest blesses.

Then the priest sprinkles the ring with holy water, in the form of a cross; and the bridegroom having received the ring from the hand of the priest, gives gold and silver to the bride, and says:—

"With this ring I wed thee," &c.

Then the bridegroom places the ring on the thumb of the left hand of the bride, saying:—"In the name of the Father;" then on the second finger, saying, "and of the Son;" then on the third finger, saying, "and of the Holy Ghost;" lastly, on the fourth finger, saying, "Amen," and there he leaves the ring.

[The service is continued in regular marriages with benediction, prayers, and sometimes the singing of mass.]

From these documents and facts, thus authenticated, the following conclusions follow:

1st. That the Council of Trent makes matrimony a sacrament in the Romish church.

2d. That a Romish priest cannot administer a sacrament but to a Roman Catholic.

3d. That Col. Fremont, therefore, at the time of his marriage, must, at least, have professed to be a Roman Catholic; and was, therefore, sprinkled with holy water, and accepted other forms and rites of the Roman Catholic church as such a Catholic.

4th. That then he must have taken all the obligations of that sacrament, with the pledge to educate his offspring in Romanism.

5th. That in educating an adopted daughter in the convent at Georgetown he carried out the obligations of the sacrament.

But, says the "Independence"—

"It is said that a daughter has been sent to a Catholic institution for education. So far for it, she has never been sent away from her father, but has been educated by her own mother."

This is a quibble. The statement was that his adopted daughter was educated at the convent on the heights of Georgetown, and dare a denial from Col. Fremont.

If Col. Fremont, in view of the President, has recently changed his religion, and is with a view to that office, so much the worse, but the fact is undeniable, overwhelming and crushing, that to be married by the Romish priest, Father Van Horneigh, Mr. Fremont

must have professed the Roman Catholic religion, and hence accepted all the rules and rituals of the Roman Catholic Church! He may have broken the sacrament of his marriage within a few weeks past; and he may have become a convert to Protestantism in good faith, in order to win the American vote, but there is a record of Romanism, in the most solemn act of his life, and it cannot be got over or got under; it cannot be tied down or covered up, and we, as journalists, but do our duty in publishing truths, no matter how much abuse may follow."

AN OVERWHELMING ARGUMENT.

We have rarely read anywhere so powerful an analysis of the dilemma in which the conjuncted fanaticisms of know-nothingism and abolitionism have been placed, now that they have formally come together in support of Fremont, than the following. It is a portion of the masterly speech of Hon. Wm. Bigler, senator from Pennsylvania, delivered in Independence Square on the 4th of July, 1856. He certainly has presented, in a condensed and striking form, a truthful and convincing picture of the contradictory and suicidal position of the allied army. We call upon the adopted citizen particularly to mark the point made by Governor Bigler:—

"But I wish you to look at the joint or combined enemy for a moment. No one has failed to notice the efforts which are being made to bring about a fusion between the republicans and know-nothings in the North. The first coincidence is, that the New York know-nothing convention and the Philadelphia Black-republican convention both nominated Mr. Fremont for President. Then, again, they have united at different points on State and local officers. In Pennsylvania, for instance, they have but one ticket; and here they have acted together before, and may do so again. They did so in 1854 and in 1855, and have determined to do so at the coming October election. This was the easier for the reason that, with a few honorable exceptions, the know-nothings are black-republicans. Dissimilar as are their purposes, they will unite, if it be necessary, to secure office and spoils. The examples we have in this State should satisfy us on this point. Now let us bring them in juxtaposition, and study the whole picture. The abolitionists and black-republicans are agitated to distraction about the hardships of the African slave; they are devoted to his interests—are determined to sever his chains, and to elevate him in the scale of moral and political being. This is their faith and their duty. They are equally determined to proscribe all foreign-born and Catholic citizens from civil office, and thus degrade a large class of white citizens. They are not for the African, but they are against the Irishman and the German, the Frenchman and the Welshman, &c. It is perceived, then, that the success of republicanism is the triumph of the colored race, whilst the triumph of know-nothingism is the signal for the prostration of a large class of white citizens. Now, I can hardly see how this business can be managed on joint account. Its practical workings present sad difficulties. The negroes and the foreigners can never stand on the same platform. Fremont, if elected, will be half-republican and half-know-nothing, for he will be the embodiment of the views of all his friends. Then, how would he meet his obligations? Would he put the negroes up and the foreigners down, or vice versa? Either horn of the dilemma would be distressing. The most reasonable solution is, that as the republicans and know-nothings had triumphed on joint account, he would divide his favors. He would redeem his obligations to the republicans by going in for the colored race, and, in like manner, he would redeem his faith to the know-nothings by proscribing all foreign-born and Catholic citizens from office. I see no other reasonable version. But there are other phases of this fusion which I find it difficult to solve. For instance, I cannot understand how those abolitionists whose sympathies have been so excited for the African, and for his promotion on grounds of humanity and liberality, can so readily fraternize with a party whose avowed purpose is to proscribe white citizens, and degrade them to a condition but little above that of blacks. I had supposed that when the benignant feeling of benevolence got possession of the human heart, it would be good enough to cover the white as well as the black race.—And then, again, how can the republicans, with any show of sincerity, denounce the repeal of the Missouri line because of their reverence for compact and good faith, and then make common cause with a midnight dynasty, whose avowed purpose is to break compacts, to disregard the constitution and laws, and to violate the faith of our fathers, for the purpose of subverting rights and privileges conferred upon the foreign-born and Catholic citizens? These are things which I do not understand; nor do I believe that when Solomon said 'there is nothing new under the sun' he had any reference to a fusion like this."

But what is almost as incredible is, that, in the face of this startling picture, some of the republican press have the boldness to claim the German vote for Mr. Fremont; and if it be true that 'coming events cast their shadows before,' we may look out for another edition of the farce of 1852, with the foreign-born citizens on the stage. But the attempt cannot rise above a farce. Surely our naturalized citizens are not to be deceived again, as they most surely will be if they rely upon any protection but that furnished by the constitution and the laws and a democratic administration."

SHOCKING MURDER OF A YOUNG LADY.—A letter in the New York Tribune, dated Erie county, Pennsylvania, July 8, relates the following tragedy growing out of a love affair:—"A man by the name of Hoyt had for some time been paying his attentions to a Miss Allen. He was over 40 years old, while she was in her 15th year. The girl's father had asked Hoyt for the loan of a revolver, which he was known to have, to shoot rats with. He had, accordingly, loaded every barrel, and after dinner proceeded to the house of Allen, for the double purpose of seeing his daughter, and delivering the pistol; but after spending some time with the girl, she told him that she would not marry him, and that if he was out of the way she could get other beaux, or another beau, when, without a moment's hesitation, he drew from his pocket the pistol, and placing it to her head, deliberately fired, when she screamed and fell. He then picked her up and laid her on the lounge or settee, when he fired a second barrel, the ball passing through her head forward of her ears. The mother of the girl, who was in an adjoining room, on hearing her scream, started to go to her assistance, but Hoyt commenced firing at her also, but without effect. He then immediately left the house and ran into the woods, as was supposed for the purpose of secreting himself, but, instead of so doing, went as quietly as possible and gave himself up to the proper authorities. In his examination he said that he had no intention of shooting or hurting his victim a minute before the deed was done. He confessed everything, saying that he was perfectly sane, but does not know why he fired at the girl's mother, as he did not want to harm her. He was committed."

contrary, Mr. Seward and other Fremont leaders declared that the Fugitive Slave law should be repealed. The agitation began at that time; and was continued as we know wherever an attempt was made to enforce the law based upon that provision of the Constitution, without which no Constitution would have been adopted, and consequently no Union could have existed. Then it was 'down with the Constitution!' then Josiah Quincy, of Boston, declared that the fugitive slave law should be repealed at the hazard of overwhelming the Constitution, then it was that Seward rallied his cohorts; then it was that Gerrit Smith attended the celebrations of the Jerry rescue in New York, and went to Massachusetts to defy the law and to involve and organize opposition to it, and then the whole nation saw infuriated mobs composed of indiscriminate gatherings of blacks and whites resisting a statute which had passed in the spirit of compromise and peace!

After the compromise measures had been agreed upon, the principles which prevailed in the Missouri compromise act was regarded by all sensible Statesmen as the end of the geographical line, and as a logical sequence that the people were henceforth to assume control over their own domestic affairs, and not a majority of the Federal Legislatures. In accordance with this understanding, which no one saw more plainly than Mr. Buchanan; when in his letter of 1851, after the compromise measures had been enacted, he declared that the Missouri line had 'passed away,' Mr. Dixon, a Whig Senator from Kentucky, rose in his place, in 1854, and proposed the repeal of the Missouri line. The question was met, and how met, the country knows. The Democratic party espoused the sacred principles of popular sovereignty, and as they had done in many a hard fought fight before, they suffered for adhering to the truth in the midst of the clamor and confusion of these demagogues who have always assailed the policy of the great progressive party. The principle upon which they now stand is, that the majority of the people in the Territories shall rule, or, in other words, the actual residents of the Territory shall control their own affairs, in their own way, restrained only by the Constitution of the United States. This just and equitable doctrine prevails in all assemblies of the people in this free country. It is that under which they prosper in primary organizations. It is the whole basis upon which our free institutions repose. It is the solution of every great national difficulty, and it will as certainly triumph in the struggle as it has always triumphed before.

Who Can Give Peace to Kansas?

Kansas is now the whole stock in trade of the opposition to the Democratic party. Everything is forgotten by them in order to keep up the agitation about Kansas. It is amazing how much they have written, and how much they have printed on this prolific subject. Their documents may be estimated, not by the thousands but by the ton. They have engaged in this discussion of Kansas, the Free-love ladies and gentlemen, the negroes and whites, infidels and philosophers, Senators and Representatives, GARRISON and GREELEY, and all the odds and ends that go to constitute the great Abolition disunion party. One would suppose that after all this noise and confusion, some practical common sense remedy would be suggested for the settlement of the Kansas troubles, but no such thing has been proposed. On the contrary, the greatest calamity that could now befall the enemies of the Democratic party and of the Union, would be the adjustment of the exaggerated difficulties in Kansas. The Senate of the United States has passed the judicial bill of Mr. Senator Toombs; it will go to the House of Representatives, and will be passed, and peace to Kansas; and yet, that peace will come, and that soon, in spite of their factious opposition, we have no manner of doubt. It will not come, however, through the efforts of the Black Republican leaders. Mr. Greeley will not be able to help in this good work, even if he were willing; Mr. Seward will not help; Mr. Hale will not help. Suppose, indeed, their plan were adopted; suppose a bill were to become a law, forcing the admission of a half formed State under circumstances such as those which controlled at the Top-ka Convention. Would this give peace to the country? Nobody believes it. For even if this were followed by the election of Col. Fremont the waves of public opinion would be lashed into an excitement without parallel in our history. Agitation would be the order of the day; the South would feel that they had been outraged by the North, and the conservative men in the North would rise en masse against the gamblers who had precipitated these difficulties upon the country. The Democratic party is the only party which can bring peace to Kansas. Its policy is the only policy which can forever settle the dispute which convulses that territory.

We shall be told by some fanatical Abolitionists that this excitement, as far as Kansas is concerned, would never have taken place but for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. In answer to this we direct attention to the fact that no party is half as much responsible for the existing state of things as the very disunionists who now clamor against the Senate Kansas Bill. These men had over and over again offered to them the Missouri Compromise line as the final settlement of the Slavery question. Had they permitted it to be run, as was proposed by Mr. BUCHANAN in 1847, to the Pacific, not only Kansas would have been a free State, but a large addition would have been made to the strength of the free States in Congress in course of time. In those days, however, the Missouri Compromise was the bugarth of abolitionism, as it had been from the time it became the law of the land. Those who are now in the habit of talking of irrevocable contracts were the first and foremost to repeal the binding force of the Missouri Compromise even when it was applied to Arkansas, in 1846, and subsequently when all other remedies seemed to have failed. In 1846, '47, when every other proposition was rejected, and when the country was waiting anxiously for the adjustment of the questions growing out of the acquisition of the territory under the Treaty of Gaudalup Hidalgo, the Missouri Compromise was offered as the olive branch of peace to the eager and infatuated fanatics of the North and was refused by them amidst a tempest of denunciation and fury. The compromise measures followed. How did these denunciations receive those glorious measures originated in the wise councils of Clay, of Cass, of Webster, and all those pure men who have shed lustre upon the national character, and whose names are constantly recalled as wholesome recollections in those days of peril? Did they submit when the whole country was anxious that they should submit? Did Greeley submit? Did Seward, or Hale, or any of those men who now clamor in the forefront of the opposition ranks in favor of John C. Fremont, did these men yield? On the

contrary, Mr. Seward and other Fremont leaders declared that the Fugitive Slave law should be repealed.

The agitation began at that time; and was continued as we know wherever an attempt was made to enforce the law based upon that provision of the Constitution, without which no Constitution would have been adopted, and consequently no Union could have existed. Then it was 'down with the Constitution!' then Josiah Quincy, of Boston, declared that the fugitive slave law should be repealed at the hazard of overwhelming the Constitution, then it was that Seward rallied his cohorts; then it was that Gerrit Smith attended the celebrations of the Jerry rescue in New York, and went to Massachusetts to defy the law and to involve and organize opposition to it, and then the whole nation saw infuriated mobs composed of indiscriminate gatherings of blacks and whites resisting a statute which had passed in the spirit of compromise and peace!

After the compromise measures had been agreed upon, the principles which prevailed in the Missouri compromise act was regarded by all sensible Statesmen as the end of the geographical line, and as a logical sequence that the people were henceforth to assume control over their own domestic affairs, and not a majority of the Federal Legislatures.

In accordance with this understanding, which no one saw more plainly than Mr. Buchanan; when in his letter of 1851, after the compromise measures had been enacted, he declared that the Missouri line had 'passed away,' Mr. Dixon, a Whig Senator from Kentucky, rose in his place, in 1854, and proposed the repeal of the Missouri line. The question was met, and how met, the country knows. The Democratic party espoused the sacred principles of popular sovereignty, and as they had done in many a hard fought fight before, they suffered for adhering to the truth in the midst of the clamor and confusion of these demagogues who have always assailed the policy of the great progressive party. The principle upon which they now stand is, that the majority of the people in the Territories shall rule, or, in other words, the actual residents of the Territory shall control their own affairs, in their own way, restrained only by the Constitution of the United States. This just and equitable doctrine prevails in all assemblies of the people in this free country. It is that under which they prosper in primary organizations. It is the whole basis upon which our free institutions repose. It is the solution of every great national difficulty, and it will as certainly triumph in the struggle as it has always triumphed before.

That errors have been committed on both sides in Kansas, it would be madness to deny; that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the Territory of Kansas is absurd, the Territorial Legislature fair-minded men must admit. All these results, have, however, chiefly flown from the persistent opposition in the first place, of Abolitionism to the extension of the Missouri line to the Pacific, and from the violent antagonism raised against the compromise measures of 1850 as a part of the legislation of the country.—*Pennsylvania.*

Republicanism.

Hon. James K. Paulding in a recent letter says, speaking of "Republicanism":

In the words of one of the lecturers, of this new school of ranting philosophy, now a member of Congress, "We must have an Anti-Slavery Constitution, an Anti-Slavery Bible, and an Anti-Slavery God."

Whatever may be the names which parties choose to adopt for purposes of deception, it must be obvious to all observers that the Republic party is pervaded by the heaven of Abolition, without which it would be inert and comparatively lifeless. To conciliate that dangerous faction it is absolutely necessary to adopt its principles, and they are sufficiently notorious, having been repeatedly avowed at conventions and lectures and anniversary meetings. They denounce the Bible because it is not an anti-slavery Bible; they denounce Christianity because it tolerates a state of society which existed at the time, and has ever since been recognized; they denounce all laws inconsistent with the great dogma which constitutes their entire religious, moral and political creed; and, finally, they denounce the Constitution as a gross violation of the law of God and the rights of nature."

It must be evident to every mind that can follow out principles to their inevitable consequences, that were a party holding such doctrines to wield the powers of this Government, it must necessarily lead to a revolution, not only political, but religious, moral and social. It would not be merely reform but complete subversion. It would uproot the very foundation of the great system under whose beneficent operation the people of the United States have hitherto enjoyed a degree of prosperity and happiness without parallel in the history of the world. We shall be cut adrift from all our safe moorings to float on the wide ocean of untried experiment, without rudder or compass, without any pilots but mad-brained fanatics and visionary reformers, who can neither comprehend their own vagaries or make them comprehensible to others.

STATE ELECTIONS.—On the first Monday in August, elections will be held in the States of Kentucky, Arkansas, Texas, Missouri, and Iowa; and on the first Thursday of August, in North Carolina. On the first Monday of October, in Georgia and Florida; and on the second Tuesday of October, in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana.

Mr. VAN BUREN has written a strong letter in which he emphatically declares himself in favor of Mr. Buchanan. The union between the Hards and the