

# THE DEMOCRATIC WATCHMAN.

"BOTH LIBERTY AND PROPERTY ARE PRECARIOUS, UNLESS THE POSSESSOR HAS SENSE AND SPIRIT ENOUGH TO DEFEND THEM."

BELLEFONTE, PA., THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1857.

TERMS \$1.50 IN ADVANCE.  
VOLUME 3--NUMBER 53.

## Terms of Publication.

TERMS—\$1.50 per Annum in Advance. If not paid within three months, \$2.00. If not paid within six months, \$3.00. If not paid within a year, \$5.00. These terms will be applied to all subscribers. Advertisements and Business Notices inserted at the usual rates, and every notice of a **JOB PRINTING** EXECUTED in the most manner, at the lowest prices, and with the utmost dispatch. Having purchased a large collection of type, we are prepared to satisfy the orders of our friends.

## Business Directory.

**CHAUNCEY HUBBERT,**  
WITH SMITH, MURPHY & CO., DRUGGISTS,  
27 Market, and 25 Church Alley, Philadelphia.

**IRA C. MITCHELL,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
WELLS FARGO, PA.  
Office in the Arcade, one door from Southlog, a distance of 100 feet from the Court House, Centre, Clinton and Clearfield counties.

**MARTIN STONE & SON,**  
ATTORNEYS,  
Bellefonte, Pa., will attend to all business in higher law with punctuality.

**DR. J. H. BROWN, M. D.**  
**PAUL HARRIS & DOBBS,**  
PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office at Hotel on Hudson street, opposite the Temperance Hotel.

**J. L. CUTLER,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
CLEARFIELD, PA.  
Will practice in Clearfield and Centre counties.

**DR. JAMES H. HARTMAN,**  
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON,  
Successor to Dr. Wm. J. McKim, respectfully tenders his professional services to the citizens of Bellefonte, Pa., and vicinity. Office at the Ketchikan House.

**W. H. H. BLANK,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office with Hon. James V. Hale.

**SAMUEL J. NICHOLS,**  
HOUSE PAINTER AND GLAZIER,  
AND PAPER HANGER,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Will attend to all orders in his line with promptness and dispatch.

**D. G. BUSH,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office with Ira C. Mitchell.

**ABBOTT'S PERS,**  
CRYSTALLOGRAPHY & DAGUERROTYPES,  
Taken daily (except Sundays) from 8 A. M. to 5 P. M. by J. S. BARNHART.  
In the apartment in the Arcade Building, Bellefonte, Pa.

**JAMES H. HANSEN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office on High Street, opposite the residence of Judge Burnside.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

**W. W. BROWN,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Bellefonte, Pa.  
Office in Mayer's Building, opposite the Fulton House.

## Things Wise and Otherwise.

It has been witty said that Cupid's food is arrow root.

Woman—the morning star of infancy, the day star of manhood, the evening star of old age.

A man had better have all the afflictions of all the afflicted, than be given up to a recurring grumbling heart.

Keep your store of smiles and your kindest thoughts for home, give to the world only those which are to spare.

There's a "good time coming." We have not yet been informed as to the precise time, perhaps it will be in a "few days."

When Godard goes up next in his balloon, he intends to take a thermometer with him to see how high the mercury will rise.

Pete says, a woman's heart is the "most sweetest" thing in the world; in fact, a perfect, honey-comb—full of cells. Her wardrobe, *Other-day* a lady rushed into the garden in search of her daughter, on being told that the young lady had gone there with a "role."

Bridget, who broke those barrels that were in the world shed? "Misus told John to break them up, and save her the hoops."

The disquisitions that some persons resort to to drown care, are like the curtains that children in bed pull around them to keep out the dark.

Improbability and impossibility are two frightful words to weak minds but by diligent and wise men they are generally found to be only excess of idleness and ignorance.

Bachelors Please Take Notice.—Squiggles knows how to live in these hard times. He got married a short time ago because kissing saves him fifty per cent on his sugar tax.

A thief broke out of jail on the Sabbath, but he might have escaped, but he had conscientious scruples about traveling on Sunday.

The last form of the spirit rapping delusion is said to be the attempt to summon back the spirit of the old Whig party. The "National Intelligencer" considers itself a medium.

A young man stepped into a bookseller's shop and asked for a Young Man's companion.

"Well, sir," said the bookseller, "there is my daughter."

There is but one passage in the Bible where the girls are commanded to kiss the men, that is the golden rule, "whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

"Do you know Mr. John Brown?"  
"Yes my dear."  
"Is he not a deserving man?"  
"Yes he deserves a flogging; and if he ever gallants you home again, I will give it to him."

Seeing upon his wife's shoulder a large third pin, Mr. D. said:  
"In the military, eh? got to be a captain."  
She indignantly remarked, pointing to a third baby in her lap:  
"No, recruiting sergeant in the third infantry."

**Political.**

**Address of the Democratic State Committee.**

To the CITIZENS OF PENNSYLVANIA.—It has been usual for the State Committee, representing the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, to address the people of the State pending important elections. In conformity with this usage, which may be regarded as settled and salutary, we submit the following address:

The Democratic State Convention, upon the second day of March last, and at its re-assembling in June, made nominations for the offices of Governor, Canal Commissioner and Judges of the Supreme Court.

For Governor, Gen. Paquet, of Lycoming, was named, after a spirited contest, and his nomination was then unanimously and rightfully confirmed. He has been long well known throughout the State; has filled a number of responsible and important positions in the State government, and has established a public character which strongly recommends him to the popular confidence. We conceive it to be a material qualification for this high office, that the incumbent shall be well acquainted with the practical workings of the government—the course and character of legislation—the details of business in the several executive departments—and with the public men of the Commonwealth, who have filled, or may fill, the various positions created by the Constitution and laws. The contrast, in this respect, between our candidate and the candidates of the opposition, is too strongly marked to escape general notice, and it is but necessary to allude to it to show the vantage ground

held by our party in the present canvass.—It may be asserted that the Convention have named "The right man for the right place," and that their nomination deserves popular endorsement if regard is had to qualifications and experience.

It is agreeable to add, that our candidate has a solid and reputable character in private life, and that his respectable qualities have endeared him to a large circle of friends who can enter upon his support with feelings of enthusiasm as well as with convictions of duty. We do not desire to draw strongly the contrast which it is possible to draw, between our candidate and his leading opponent. Judge Wilnot has had a career as a public man which has given him naturally without impairing confidence. Imperfectly acquainted with the practical action of the State government; without experience either in the legislative or executive departments, with but limited knowledge of public men and State affairs beyond his immediate locality, he is presented upon a comparatively remote national issue, and as the candidate of a better sectional party which received a merited defeat at the recent presidential election. It is not believed that his career in Congress exhibited any high capacity to promote the interests of the people of Pennsylvania, and it is certain that his recent course in the office he now holds, has been calculated to lower the judicial character by connecting it with extreme and violent partisan disputes.

Nimrod Strickland, of Chester county, was named by the Convention for Canal Commissioner. He needs no recommendation at our hands, for his integrity, honesty and capacity are not disputed and are widely recognized. It will be a pleasure for those who belong to our party and for all who desire to consult fitness and merit in bestowing their suffrages, to give him their cordial support.

By reason of the declination, by Chief Justice Lewis, of the re-nomination tendered him by the Convention, and the calling of Judge Black to the post of Attorney General in the National Administration, the Convention, upon its re-assembling in June, found the duty devolved upon it of naming two candidates for the Supreme Bench.—Wm. Strong of Berks county, a distinguished member of Congress, and James Thompson of Erie, also a former member of Congress, once a President Judge of the Common Pleas, an ex Member of the Legislature, and a profound and successful lawyer, were selected by the Convention. Their locations are suitable, lying both to the East and West representation upon the ticket, and their learning and responsible duties of the highest judicial position under our Constitution.

Such is the ticket formed by the delegates representing the Democratic party and support of it is confidently asked in view of the character of the nominations. But confidence and support are also invited upon the general grounds of policy and principle upon which our party stand. Ours is no new, untried, vindictive, sectional or suspicious organization. It has been tried, it is bold and open in conduct, it is magnanimous and patriotic and national. Founded more than a half a century ago by the author of the Declaration of Independence, it has had a distinguished history, has ordinarily given direction to the administration of public affairs and planting itself early, and throughout its whole career, upon a strict construction of the Constitution, and a sparing use of the powers of Government, has preserved our American system from degeneracy and failure.

The usefulness of organized parties is sometimes denied and often doubted. But in view of historical facts it cannot well be questioned that they are incident to free government, and arise of necessity under their operation. An inquiry, however, into the nature of political parties and the causes which produce them, can scarcely be expected to constitute the subject of a fugitive address. It will be sufficient for present purposes to assert the necessity of our party to check the evil and dangerous influences to which our political system is liable, and against which it is impossible that written constitutions can sufficiently guard.

Doubtless our constitutions exhibit the wisdom of those who framed them, and the amendments to which they have been subjected have rendered them more complete and perfect than they were at first. But a constitution can only be an outline for the action of Government, (besides providing for its establishment,) and by construction it may be made to mean almost anything the political authorities for the time being may choose. It is a chart given to direct the vessel of state, which can have little effect upon the voyage unless those in command choose to faithfully interpret and observe its counsel.

A party organization, therefore founded upon right principles of constitutional construction and powerfully and constantly influencing official action, may be regarded as necessary. It is, in short, absolutely required to give a just and consistent direction to government, both in cases dependent upon construction of the constitution and in cases where the constitution is silent. Besides the instability of political action in republics is a reproach to which they have been often subjected, and is the objection to them which has had greatest weight with profound and independent thinkers in the old world and the new. But this instability, which arises principally from individual ambition, the selfishness of classes, and the fluctuations of opinion, is to a great extent

checked and prevented by the predominance of a party founded upon clear and sound principles of public policy, and acting constantly with reference to them.

Now, the Democratic party is simply the representative of a school of opinion, and its creed is given it by those who founded and have subsequently supported it. The names will remain stamped prominently upon the history of the country, have been men of strong, clear and sound views of our system of government, and of the rules upon which its administration should proceed.—Our party is the product of their efforts; the instrument for accomplishing the ends they proposed, and it remains a monument of their sagacity, foresight and patriotism.

They held that overaction in government was a great evil—the most difficult to be guarded against, and therefore the most dangerous—and that both within and without the Constitution powerful guards against it were required. Proverbial language conveys the idea in declaring that "The world is governed too much;" and that "That government is best which governs least;" and philosophical reasoning attains the same result, in concluding, that government, being the creature of necessity, is limited, by the necessities which create it, and is not to be extended beyond them. The Democratic party has therefore held, and holds, that Constitutions shall receive a strict construction; that government shall exercise no powers not clearly delegated to it, and that in cases of doubt as to the policy of a particular measure, the conclusion shall be against it. In short, that public power shall not be exerted except where a clear warrant and manifest utility authorize and justify it.

The powerful and we think salutary operation of this doctrine appears throughout the history of the National and State governments, and the occasional departures from it stand as beacons to warn, and not as examples to follow.

To illustrate our remarks, we will refer briefly to a number of measures of public policy heretofore proposed to the general or State governments, and upon which divisions of opinion have existed among public men and parties. They will afford data for judging the value of the Democratic doctrine on the subject of Government powers and policy, of which we have spoken.

First—A Bank created by the General Government, owned, in part by it, and intended for the regulation of the currency, and to afford facilities to commerce and business. This measure was resisted, and all recent attempts to reestablish such an institution have been put down, upon the very grounds above stated.

Second—Internal Improvements to be constructed at the charge of the national treasury, to facilitate internal trade, and assist in developing the natural resources of particular sections. No clear authority for outlays of this description appearing, and the manifest dangers to which they lead being apparent, the action of the Federal Government on the subject of them has been rightfully and wisely arrested.

Third—Excessive duties upon imports, to the purpose of prohibiting upon their importation or to the production of revenue beyond the legitimate wants of government. The Federal power of imposing duties being for the express object of Government support and the liquidation of public indebtedness, its exercise for an entirely different object would seem unwarranted, and would be unjust to interests or individuals against whom a discrimination is thus produced.—Therefore it is, that against such misconstruction and the opposition of powerful interests, the doctrine of limited and reasonable duties has been sternly, and, upon the whole, successfully upheld.

Fourth—The distribution of moneys from the national treasury among the States, believed to be equally unwarranted with the preceding measures and inevitably tending to the production of speculation and extravagance in the States, has also been resisted, and except upon a single occasion, prevented.

Fifth—A bankrupt act, dissolving the relations of debtor and creditor in a manner and to an extent unauthorized by the Constitution, disastrous to private rights, injurious to morals, and to the encouragement, mainly, of one of the least meritorious classes of society—the speculator and spendthrift. With but haste and under the lash of public opinion, the very authors of such an act in 1842 were coerced into the repeal.

Sixth—Appropriations of public moneys or lands, to objects of doubtful constitutionality or utility, connected with which, may be mentioned the allowance of claims, unjustly established or unjust. The Democratic principle stands as decisively as all projects for assailing the treasury, for an individual, a class, or a section, in the absence of clear right to justify the demand, as it does at other unwarranted or doubtful measures.

Seventh—The exercise of jurisdiction by the General Government over slavery in the territories, to the exclusion of local decision thereon. Legislation by Congress upon slavery beyond the express requirement as to return of fugitives, is to be doubted, and if regard is had to high judicial decision, expressly denied, as a valid exercise of power, and its expediency is yet more plainly manifest, in view of the dangerous disputes which such action inevitably produces.—Most clearly, therefore, it is to be deprecated and opposed, upon the general doctrine of non-action by government in doubtful cases.

Eight—The establishment of corporations, either excessive as to number or vested with inordinate powers or privileges; and especially for purposes of business within the reach of individual means and skill. Under which head is to be particularly noted, the chartering of banks beyond points without adequate commerce or exchanges to afford legitimate occupation, and failing to impose upon them such guards against abuse and fraud as are demanded by experience. The recent resolution on this subject by our State Convention, but indicates the well considered position of our party and its policy for the future.

Ninth—The authorizing of municipal subscriptions to railroads and other corporate bodies to the acquisition of public lands, corruption and the accumulation of public debts. The proposition now before the people for the amendment of the Constitution to prevent this in future, is but the allusion of the principle we have been considering; for the decision of a divided Court in favor of legislative power to authorize such subscriptions has not returned all doubts, and has left the powerful objection to the system, upon grounds of expediency, untouched and irresistible.

Tenth—The sale or surrender by Government, in whole or in part, of any of its constitutional powers confided to it by the people, for the sale of the Main Line of the Public Works; an attempt which was denounced by the State Convention, and has since been pronounced unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, may be cited under this head and declared that reprobation which it has generally received.

Eleventh—Sumptuary laws, by which dress, food, drink, equipage, or other like concern of use, habit or fashion, is coerced. The interference of law in such cases would seem to be unuseful, and is of doubtful authority.

Twelfth—Finally, measures directed against a class or set, and intended to degrade them or limit their civil privileges. It is affirmed that neither religious belief nor birth-place will furnish grounds for ostracism of a denial of common rights.

Such are some of the leading measures upon which political divisions have taken place, and on their careful examination it will be seen that they can all be resolved into the general question whether the powers and action of government shall be extensive or limited. And if we should pursue the subject further, this view of the fundamental ground of difference between public men and parties would be but confirmed and strengthened.

We are left then to choose sides in the struggle between power and liberty—between a government that meddles and one that abstains—between political New England and the Virginia doctrines of 1798. Neutrality is not possible, for almost every political question that arises compels us to a choice between contending parties, and the schools of opinion which they respectively represent.

It has been fashionable for apostates from their party to claim that they retained their principles unchanged, and even opposing parties occasionally advance pretensions to the faith and doctrines of Jefferson. How unfounded such pretensions are, will appear advanced by apostate or party, will appear from considering the measures of public policy they propose and support. If we find them favoring new projects of doubtful right or expediency, contending for extensive jurisdiction for government, and scoffing at constitutional principles as "abstractions," we may be sure there are no disciples of the philanthropist, philosopher and statesman who founded our party, and who wrote to Edward Livingston late as 1824, to endorse the sentiment, "I have a doubt relative to any power, we ought not to exercise." Much more may we deny their discipleship, if we find their measures connected with intolerance in religion, proscription of adopted citizens, or aggressions upon territorial or state rights, which is manifestly a true description, at this moment, of the parties opposed to us.

The (so-called) Republican party makes high pretensions and challenges their examination; but there can be little difficulty in determining their character and value, and assigning the party which holds them its true position before the public. Especially will it be a work of ease, to expose its pretensions to sound opinions as held by former Republican Presidents, and to bring it within the condemnation which they directed against the heretical movements of the times in which they lived.

The resistance made about 1820, to the administration of Missouri into the Union, was similar to the recent conduct of those who misdescribe themselves as Republicans. In both cases the proposition was, that Congress should prohibit slavery in territories (or cause it to be prohibited) prior to their admission as States. The argument against was stated by Mr. Madison, in the Walsh letters, under all the high sanctions which his abilities and his position as the leading author of the Constitution, could confer upon slavery beyond the express requirement as to return of fugitives, is to be doubted, and if regard is had to high judicial decision, expressly denied, as a valid exercise of power, and its expediency is yet more plainly manifest, in view of the dangerous disputes which such action inevitably produces.—Most clearly, therefore, it is to be deprecated and opposed, upon the general doctrine of non-action by government in doubtful cases.

Eight—The establishment of corporations,

either excessive as to number or vested with inordinate powers or privileges; and especially for purposes of business within the reach of individual means and skill. Under which head is to be particularly noted, the chartering of banks beyond points without adequate commerce or exchanges to afford legitimate occupation, and failing to impose upon them such guards against abuse and fraud as are demanded by experience. The recent resolution on this subject by our State Convention, but indicates the well considered position of our party and its policy for the future.

Ninth—The authorizing of municipal subscriptions to railroads and other corporate bodies to the acquisition of public lands, corruption and the accumulation of public debts. The proposition now before the people for the amendment of the Constitution to prevent this in future, is but the allusion of the principle we have been considering; for the decision of a divided Court in favor of legislative power to authorize such subscriptions has not returned all doubts, and has left the powerful objection to the system, upon grounds of expediency, untouched and irresistible.

Tenth—The sale or surrender by Government, in whole or in part, of any of its constitutional powers confided to it by the people, for the sale of the Main Line of the Public Works; an attempt which was denounced by the State Convention, and has since been pronounced unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, may be cited under this head and declared that reprobation which it has generally received.

Eleventh—Sumptuary laws, by which dress, food, drink, equipage, or other like concern of use, habit or fashion, is coerced. The interference of law in such cases would seem to be unuseful, and is of doubtful authority.

Twelfth—Finally, measures directed against a class or set, and intended to degrade them or limit their civil privileges. It is affirmed that neither religious belief nor birth-place will furnish grounds for ostracism of a denial of common rights.

Such are some of the leading measures upon which political divisions have taken place, and on their careful examination it will be seen that they can all be resolved into the general question whether the powers and action of government shall be extensive or limited. And if we should pursue the subject further, this view of the fundamental ground of difference between public men and parties would be but confirmed and strengthened.

We are left then to choose sides in the struggle between power and liberty—between a government that meddles and one that abstains—between political New England and the Virginia doctrines of 1798. Neutrality is not possible, for almost every political question that arises compels us to a choice between contending parties, and the schools of opinion which they respectively represent.

It has been fashionable for apostates from their party to claim that they retained their principles unchanged, and even opposing parties occasionally advance pretensions to the faith and doctrines of Jefferson. How unfounded such pretensions are, will appear advanced by apostate or party, will appear from considering the measures of public policy they propose and support. If we find them favoring new projects of doubtful right or expediency, contending for extensive jurisdiction for government, and scoffing at constitutional principles as "abstractions," we may be sure there are no disciples of the philanthropist, philosopher and statesman who founded our party, and who wrote to Edward Livingston late as 1824, to endorse the sentiment, "I have a doubt relative to any power, we ought not to exercise." Much more may we deny their discipleship, if we find their measures connected with intolerance in religion, proscription of adopted citizens, or aggressions upon territorial or state rights, which is manifestly a true description, at this moment, of the parties opposed to us.

The (so-called) Republican party makes high pretensions and challenges their examination; but there can be little difficulty in determining their character and value, and assigning the party which holds them its true position before the public. Especially will it be a work of ease, to expose its pretensions to sound opinions as held by former Republican Presidents, and to bring it within the condemnation which they directed against the heretical movements of the times in which they lived.

The resistance made about 1820, to the administration of Missouri into the Union, was similar to the recent conduct of those who misdescribe themselves as Republicans. In both cases the proposition was, that Congress should prohibit slavery in territories (or cause it to be prohibited) prior to their admission as States. The argument against was stated by Mr. Madison, in the Walsh letters, under all the high sanctions which his abilities and his position as the leading author of the Constitution, could confer upon slavery beyond the express requirement as to return of fugitives, is to be doubted, and if regard is had to high judicial decision, expressly denied, as a valid exercise of power, and its expediency is yet more plainly manifest, in view of the dangerous disputes which such action inevitably produces.—Most clearly, therefore, it is to be deprecated and opposed, upon the general doctrine of non-action by government in doubtful cases.

Eight—The establishment of corporations,

the battle of Bunker Hill to the treaty of 1763, we never had so ominous a question: "Even damps the joy with which I hear of your high health and welcomes me to the want of it. I thank God I shall not live to witness its issue." In a letter to the same; April 23d, 1821, he says—"what does the Holy Alliance in and out of Congress intend to do with us on the Missouri question? And this, by the way, is but the name of the case; it is only the John Dog or Richard Roe of the objection. The real question, as seen in the States allied with this unfortunate population, is, are our slaves to be prevented with freedom and a possession by them, and it will become necessary to the Missouri question is the most important one which ever yet threatened our Union. In the gloom of a moment of the Revolutionary war, I never had any apprehension equal to that which I felt from this source." To Mr. Short, April 12, 1820, he writes—"Although I had laid down as law to myself never to write, talk, or even think of politics; to know nothing of public affairs; and had therefore 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 existed in every State, and united them together by the fatalism

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 receiving irritations, until it would kill to render separations preferable to eternal discord." He says to Joseph C. Cabell January 31st, 1821—"How many of our youths, (the Harvard College) now has been the lessons of the Anti-Missouriism, I know not; but a gentleman lately from Princeton told me he saw a list of students at that place, and that more than half were Virginians. These will return home no doubt deeply impressed with the principles of the Holy Alliance of Restrictionists." And to Gen. Breckinridge he writes, February 11th, 1821, "The line of division lately marked out between different portions of our confederacy is such as will not soon be obliterated; and we are now trying to those who are against us in point of principle, to fashion to their own form the minds and affections of our youth. If, as has been estimated, we send three hundred thousand dollars a year to the northern seminaries for the instruction of our own sons, then we must have five hundred of our own sons imbibing opinions and principles in discord with those of their own country. This is eating on the vitals of our existence, and, if not arrested at once, will be beyond remedy." In a letter to Mr. Madison, in reference to the Missouri question, he declared that Rufus King (a distinguished federalist) was "ready to risk the Union for any chance of restoring his party to power, and resigning himself to the head of it." On another occasion, he declared the question to be a mere party trick, "that the leaders of federalism defeated in their schemes of obtaining power, \* \* \* have changed their fact and thrown out another barrel to the whale. They are taking advantage of the virtuous feeling of the people to effect a division of parties by a geographical line, \* \* \* perceiving that this will insure them, upon local principles, the majority they could never obtain on principles of federalism." And finally, his letter to Gen. La Fayette, dated November 4th, 1823, contains his judgment of the whole movement, expressed with his usual directness and vigor. He says—"The Hartford Convention, the victory of this, and the peace of Ghent, prostrated the name of federalism. Its votaries abandoned it through shame and mortification, and now call themselves REPUBLICANS. But the name alone is changed, the principles are the same, \* \* \* On the eclipse of federalism, its leaders got up the Missouri question, under the false front of lessening the measure of slavery, BUT WITH THE REAL VIEW OF PRODUCING A GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISION OF PARTIES, WHICH MIGHT ENSURE THEM THE NEXT PRESIDENT." "The people of the North went blindfold into the snare, following their leaders for a while, with a zeal truly moral and laudable until they became sensible that they were injuring instead of aiding the real interest of the slaves; THAT THEY HAD BEEN USED MERELY AS TOOLS FOR ELECTORING PURPOSES; AND THAT TRICK OF HYPOCRISY THEN fell as quickly as it had been got up."

This is an admirable description of the Republican party of the present day—of the causes which led to it, and the objects of its founders. The picture is drawn by the hand of a master, and represents the features of the subjects with fidelity and exactness. Republicanism, being but a reproduction of Missouri agitation, bears precisely the same description, and is obnoxious to precisely the same censure. And it is to be remarked, that like its predecessor—it invokes the legislation of Congress in a case of rank expediency and doubtful power, and hence falls within the condemnation of the general principle as to "limited action" by Government, which has been a topic of this address.

But a view of modern Republicanism would be incomplete without some particular notice of the features of its career.—Without tracing its early movements in the organization of Abolition societies through the circulation of incendiary matter through the mails, agitation by petition to Congress, cla-

mate opposition to the annexation of Texas, and to the prosecution of the Mexican war, and the acquisition of territory to which it felt it will be sufficient to notice somewhat the Wilmot Proviso which preceded, and the Kansas dispute which accompanied, the organization of the Republican party in its present form.

The Wilmot Proviso was offered in Congress in 1846, as an amendment to a war bill, and was (briefly described) a proposition to prohibit slavery in Mexican territory to be acquired. It evoked a contention which continued some four years. The national harmony was disturbed and the public business impeded by it, until it became necessary to terminate their utmost efforts to restore peace and secure such legislation as was absolutely necessary for the territory in question. The Compromise Measures were the result presented in 1850, and essentially received the general approval of the people.

In fact, in 1852, both the great parties of the country endorsed them in their platforms, and their wisdom and propriety are not now a subject of general dispute.

The Territory we acquired from Mexico by the treaty of peace—the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo—was comprised of nearly the whole now included in the state of California; and the Proviso, if it had been adopted, would therefore have had application solely to them. But the Proviso was never adopted or applied by Congress to either California or State was admitted into the Union as a State with the Constitution as she formed for herself without any decision by Congress on the subject of slavery within her limits. That was adjusted by her in her Constitution, and by her own act she therefore entered the Union as a free State. In the acts for the organization of Utah and New Mexico as Territories, there were no provisions prohibiting or authorizing slavery, but it was expressly provided that they should eventually come into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each should decide, in forming Constitutions preparatory to admission. Seven years have elapsed since these Territorial acts were passed, and no complaint is heard against them, nor has slavery been established in either Territory. It is, therefore, proved that the Wilmot Proviso was wholly unnecessary to the exclusion of slavery, and that the agitation from 1846 to 1850 to secure its enactment was a thing of a rant folly as well as of real evil.

There stand the facts; no longer to be perverted or denied; and they exhibit the Proviso agitation in its true character. Not adopted, it is seen to have been unnecessary. Product