THE ERIE OBSERVER.

A. P. DURLIN & CO., Proprietors. ONWARD. $1 50 A YEAR, in Advance.

VOLUME 23. SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 21, 1852. NUMBER 15.

Erie Weekly Observer.

A. P. DURLIN & CO., PROPRIETORS.

B. F. SLOAN, Editor.

OFFICE, CORNER STATE ST. AND PUBLIC SQUARE, ERIE.

TERMS OF THE PAPER.

Delivered by the carrier, at $2,00
Sent to the office, in advance, 1,50
Paid in advance, or within three months from the time two dollars will be charged.
Communications must be post paid.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

For a square, exceeding 14 lines, one year,	$3,00
Do. do. six months,	10,00
Do. do. three months,	6,00
Do. do. one month,	3,00

Advertisements, 50 cents per square, of fifteen lines or less, for first month, 25 cents for each subsequent insertion. Advertisers have the privilege of changing at pleasure, and are allowed to occupy more than two squares, and to advertise immediate business.

Publications not having other directions, will be inserted till forbid, and charged accordingly.

BUSINESS DIRECTORY.

THOMAS M. AUSTIN, (Late of the firm of G. Loomis & Co.) Watches, Jewelry, Silver Spoons, Musical Instruments, Looking Glasses, Lamps and Fancy Goods, wholesale and retail. Cleveland Arcade, Public Square, Erie, Penna.

JOHN GOALDING, Manufacturer and Hat Maker—Shop on the east side of Peach street, two doors north of Eight, and adjoining J. H. Rhodes' Grocery Store—Remember Erie, Penna.

JOHN KEENAN, Forwarding Agent, office at R. J. Roger's Hat Store, Erie Pa.

CLARK & METCALF, Wholesale Dealers in Dry Goods, Carpets, and Dry Goods Jobbers.

WILLIAMS & WRIGHT, Wholesale Dealers in Gold and Silver coin, uncurrent Money, Drafts and Certificates of Deposite. Also collections made on the principal cities of the Union, and all parts of the Dominion. Office, Williams' Block, corner of Market and State Streets. P. B. WRIGHT.

J. G. & W. I. MILLS, Wholesale and Retail Dealers in Groceries, Wines, Liquors, Segars, Foreign Fruit, Nuts, Pickles and Pickled Oysters, Preserves, and Herbs, Sealed articles of all kinds constantly on hand. No. 3, William's Block, Opposite Brown's New Hotel, Erie, Pa. N. B. In the season, Oysters in shell, from J. G. Mills New York, which will be sold Wholesale at low prices. A. C. Jackson, Agent, Erie, Pa.

DURLIN & SLOAN, Commercial, School and Miscellaneous Books, Blank Stationery, and Printer's Cards, No. 9, Brown's new Row. B. F. SLOAN.

POYNTELL JOHNSTON M. D. Residence on 6th Street, two doors West of the Episcopal Church.

T. W. MOORE, Grocery, Provisions, Wines, Liquors, Candies, Fruit, Tobacco, Below Loomis & Co's State street, Erie.

JOHN B. COOK, Dealer in Fancy Dry Goods, and the Greatest variety in the City, Cheapside, Erie, Pa.

SPERRETT & GRAY, Wholesale and Retail Dealers in Wet and Dry Groceries, Produce, Foreign and Domestic Fruit, Woollen, Cotton, Stone Ware, Flour, Fish, Salt, Glass, Nails, Powder, Shot, Safety Fuse, &c., &c. French street, opposite Hilbert, Erie, Pa.

Steamboats and Boats, Vessels, Hotels, and Private Families with any of the above articles with prompt attention.

WM. S. LANE, Attorney and Counsellor at Law. Over Jackson's store, at North-East corner of the Public Square.

DR. JOHN BEEBE & STEWART, Physicians and Surgeons. Office and Residences—State Street. Office hours, 9 to 8, A. M. 1 to 2, and 6 to 7, P. M. J. L. STEWART, M. D.

JOHN HEARN & CO. General Commission Merchants, dealer in Coal, and Agent for a daily line of upper lake Steamers, Erie Pa.

LIDDELL & Co. Manufacturers of Iron Fence, Railing, Steamboat Work, &c., State, between 7 and 8th, Streets, Erie.

AMERICAN EXPRESS COMPANY. Removed to No 5 Reed Block, State Street. Express closes at 11 o'clock, A. M. " " 4 o'clock, P. M. O. S. STARBUCK, Agent.

GEORGE J. MORTON, (Late of the firm of J. Hearn & Co.) General and Commission Merchant, Public Dock, Erie, Pa. Dealer in Salt, Fish, Flour and Plaster.

WALKER & TIBBALS, Forwarding, produce and Commission Merchants, second Ware House from the Public Bridge, Erie Pa. Dealers in Coal, Salt, Plaster, Stucco, Fish, Lime and Limestone, Nails, Stoves, Castings, &c., &c., with unsurpassed facilities for shipping either by Steamboats, Propellers, or by Rail Road. L. N. TIBBALS.

W. H. KNOWLTON, Watch and Repairer, Dealer in Watches, Clocks, Jewelry, Accordeons, Looking Glasses and other Fancy Goods. One door west of the Reed House. 17

ARBUCKLE & KEPLER, Dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, Crockery, &c. No 1, Reed Block, State Street, Erie, Pa.

A. M. JUDSON, Counsellor at Law.—Office on Park Row, between Browns' new Hotel and the Reed House, up stairs.

DR. C. BRANDES, Physician and Surgeon—Office corner of State and Seventh streets. Residence on Eighth Street, between French and State, Erie, Pa.

M. SANFORD & CO., Dealers in Gold, Silver, Bank Notes, Drafts, Certificates of Deposit, Sight Exchange on the principal cities constantly for sale. Office in Reed's Block, Public Square, Erie.

T. HERON STUART, Physician and Surgeon—Office, corner of French and Fifth streets, over Moses Koch's store. Residence on Fourth street, opposite the old Apothecary Hall.

RUFUS REED, Importer and Dealer in English, German and American Hardware and Cutlery, Saddles, Saddle Trees, Axes, Vices, Iron and Steel No. 3 Reed House.

C. SIEGEL, Wholesale and Retail dealer in Groceries, Provisions, Wines, Liquors, Fruit, &c., &c. Corner of French and Fifth Streets, opposite the Farmers' Hotel, Erie.

CADWELL & BENNETT, Merchant Tailors, and Retail Dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Queensware, Carpeting, Hardware, Iron, Steel, Nails, &c. Empire Stores, State Street, four doors, below the Hotel, Erie, Pa. Also, Axes, Bellows, Axle Arms, Springs, and a general assortment of Saddle and Carriage Trimmings.

S. MERVIN SMITH, Attorney at Law and Justice of the Peace, and Agent for the Mutual Life Insurance Company—Office 3 doors West of the Post Office, Erie, Pa.

GEORGE H. CUTLER, Attorney at Law, Girard, Erie County, Pa. Collections and business attended to with promptness and dispatch.

JOSIAH KELLOGG, A Commission Merchant, on the Public Dock, east of the Pier. Salt and White Fish, constantly for sale.

I. ROSENZWEIG & Co. Wholesale and Retail Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods, Ready Made Clothing, Boots and Shoes, &c., No. 1 Reed Block, State street, Erie.

MARSHALL & VINCENT, Attorneys at Law—Office up stairs in Tammany Hall building, next door to the Prothonotary's office, Erie.

MURRAY WHALLON, Counsellor at Law—Office over C. B. Wright's Store, one door west of State street, on the Diamond.

TIBBALS, & HAYES, Dealers in Dry Goods, Dry Groceries, Crockery, Hardware, &c. Brown's New Hotel.

SMITH JACKSON, Dealer in Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, Queens Ware, Lime, Salt, &c., &c., 121, Cheapside, Erie, Pa.

WILLIAM RIBLET, House Sign Painter, Glazier, and Undertaker, corner of State and Fifth streets, Erie.

CARTER & BROTHER, Wholesale and Retail dealers in Drugs, Medicines, Paints, Oils, Dye Stuffs, Glass, &c., No. 6, Reed House, Erie.

JAMES LYTLE, Merchant Tailor, on the public square, a few doors West of State street, Erie.

JOHN H. BURTON & CO. Wholesale and Retail dealers in Drugs, Medicines, Dye Stuffs, Paints, Oils, &c., No. 5, Reed House, Erie.

DR. O. L. ELLIOTT, Resident Dentist; Office and dwelling, in the Beebe Block, on the East side of the Public Square, Erie. Teeth inserted on Gold Plate, from one to an entire set. Carious teeth filled with Gold, and restored to health and usefulness. Teeth cleaned with instruments and Dentifrice so as to leave them of a pearl lustre. All work warranted.

M. CHAPIN, RESIDENT DENTIST—Office on the south side of the Diamond five doors east of the Erie Bank. Prices reasonable, and all work warranted. Erie June 19 1852. 6

SPEECH OF HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS.

Delivered in Richmond, Virginia, July 9, 1852.

Mr. President: I am not insensible to the compliment conferred upon me by your kind invitation to address the democracy of the "Old Dominion"—a State which, more than any other, has the honor of having embodied and proclaimed to the world that genuine creed of democracy which has been our text-book in all political contests. I am the more gratified at it, because I have the honor to reside in and represent a State which was once "THE COUNTY OF ILLINOIS, IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA." Since that county has become one of the sovereign States of the Union, like her illustrious mother, she has never departed from the faith, nor failed to sustain the democratic nominees an any Presidential election. (Applause.) Always true to the rights of the States and to the bond of the federal Union—never departing from those great landmarks laid down by Kentucky and Virginia in the resolution of '98-'99—I trust that, like the Old Dominion, Illinois will always be found faithful not only to the principles but to the candidates of the Democratic party. (Cheers.)

In the present contest we have not only a "platform," but standard-bearers which unite and harmonize the sentiments of our entire party throughout this broad land.—I have heard of no democrat who repudiates the platform. (Applause.) I know of no section of the party which thinks that it ought to be "defied" or "spit upon." (Renewed applause.)

The platform is an embodiment of the principles of the party upon all questions to which it extends, and is in perfect harmony with the whole system of principles which it is our purpose to carry into effect.

We have not only been fortunate in our platform, but equally so in our candidates. (Great applause.) It is not said of the democratic convention that one section sold out their principles in order to get their man, (great applause;) for, democrats hold that it is not only essential to have sound principles, but to have honest and patriotic men to carry those principles into effect. No matter how pure your principles may be, if you have not men of intelligence, of honesty, of patriotism, and who understand your creed, your principles are not safe in their hands. Hence, as democrats, we invite the most rigid and strict scrutiny into the public and private character of Franklin Pierce and William R. King. (Great applause.) We lay their whole history, private and public before the world, and challenge investigation.

Take Franklin Pierce from his boyhood up. So far as his personal character is concerned, even the breath of slander has never dared to speak against them above a whisper, and then not without looking to see what honorable man might be present to repel the accusation. (Applause.) Take his public career in the Legislature of his own State, in the halls of Congress, or wherever else fortune may have taken him in the discharge of duty, and we defy our political opponents to point to one act of infidelity to his duty. He is not an obscure and unknown man. He has served several periods in the Congress of the United States, and voted upon all important questions which came before him He has served several years in the Senate of the United States in times that required the nerve and the patriotism of every man to be called into active requisition. There is his record, and we invite you to examine it. Try him by his votes, by his speeches, by his acts, and let any democrat find aught of which he can complain. Upon all of the party questions that were agitated during the administration of the immortal Jackson, or of Mr. Van Buren, covering the period in which he was a member either of one or the other House of Congress, Franklin Pierce was found to be true to the constitution, true to the rights of the States—a national man upon all occasions, and sectional upon no question. (Great applause.)

During his nine year's service in the two houses of Congress, he acquired an enviable reputation as a debater and a statesman. He retired from the Senate in 1842 in consequence of domestic afflictions and obligations, which a man of his sensibilities was not at liberty to disregard.

During the administration of President Polk he invited Mr. Pierce to accept a seat in his cabinet. They had been associated in the House of Representatives, and knew each other well. They had stood by Old Hickory during the war with the bank and moneyed power; and it was natural that Mr. Polk should desire to avail himself of the services of a man whose ability, fidelity, and patriotism he had witnessed and seen tested on so many and such trying occasions.

Mr. Pierce felt constrained to decline it from the same causes which constrained him to resign his seat in the Senate.

Soon after the United States found themselves engaged in a foreign war; and a call was made upon the citizen soldiery to repair to the scene of action an repel the insolent foe who had dared to invade their native land

Then it was that Mr. Pierce did not feel himself at liberty to decline the call. He volunteered as a private; but was not allowed to remain long in the ranks—being appointed colonel of his regiment, and subsequently a brigadier general in the army. The records of the department and the history of the war furnish satisfactory evidence that he displayed ability, skill and gallantry of a high order in the performance of his military duties.—I am aware that the whigs have been in the habit, lately, of assailing the military conduct of General Pierce. Instead of any direct charge, they deal in that cowardly mode of insinuation which is worse than direct and open calumny; because it does not take the responsibility of bold and specific accusation. They nickname him "the Fainting General;" and talk about his having fallen from his horse on the field of battle. While they do not dare openly to say that these acts are evidence of cowardice on his part, yet there is no other motive for the insinuation except to instil into the minds of the American people the impression that he was a coward. If that be true, why not have the manliness to come up openly and charge the fact? I do not know how it is in the Old Dominion, but I have reason to believe that the same rule applies here as in the great Northwest. There we hold that man comparatively honorable who utters a calumny openly, and boldly meets the responsibility, when contrasted with the slanderer who will sneakingly insinuate that which he dares not openly avow. (Great cheering.)

Now, fellow citizens, I have but one answer to make to all these insinuations in reference to General Pierce's military character: and that answer is simply this: General Windfield Scott, in his official reports, under the sanction of an oath, has given the lie direct to every base slanderer who dares intimate or insinuate such an imputation. (Applause.) I wish every whig to remember that, if he ever utters or repeats this charge, his candidate for the Presidency has pronounced and proven him a calumniator; and that by making the charge he also accuses General Scott of falsehood in his official reports to the government. Do our whig friends expect to commend their candidate to the favorable consideration of the American people by branding him with official falsehood, whilst at the head of that gallant army in which he gained all of his laurels? Either General Scott is unworthy of public confidence, or Franklin Pierce was a brave, gallant, and skilful general. (Great Applause.)

I have no charges to make against the military conduct, the gallantry and heroism of the illustrious general whom the whigs have presented to the people of the United States as their candidate for the Presidency. I will not depreciate his merits as a soldier, because truth and honor forbid it. (Applause.) I will refrain, because, as an American, I have too much pride of country to cast the slightest shade of dishonor upon those glorious deeds which form a part of American history. The laurels of Scott, achieved while fighting the battles of his country upon the Canadian frontier, or in the various Indian wars, or in the more recent Mexican campaigns, are common property; and I am as proud of them as any of our whig friends, who, after having opposed each of these wars, are now striving to elevate a military chieftain to the Presidency solely upon the ground that he was a gallant hero, in what they believed to be an unjust cause. (Cheers.)

But, fellow-citizens, we are to deal with Gen. Scott, during this campaign, not as the general-in-chief of the American army—not in the performance of his professional duties: but in a new character which he has lately assumed—that of a partizan candidate, seeking political honors. It is of the politician that I am now to speak, and not of the general. I propose to submit to you, and to the American people, the question, whether, when General Scott departs from the line of his profession, and from that course of duty in which he has acquired all his honors and his glory, it is wise and patriotic to convert A GOOD GENERAL INTO A BAD PRESIDENT. (Cheers.)

General Scott is presented to the American people by the Whig National Convention as a candidate for the Presidency. That convention, before proceeding to this nomination, formed and proclaimed to the world a platform. Of that platform I have but little to say; for in all things, except upon the slavery question, it is a genuine whig concern, to which every Democrat is presumed to be utterly and irreconcilably opposed. So far as it relates to the slavery question, it is a plank stolen from the Democratic platform for which they now attempt to claim credit before the American people. [Applause.] After the convention had thus proclaimed the platform, it proceeded to nominate a candidate for the presidency who had pertinaciously refused on any public occasion ever to endorse the platform, or to give any assurance of his approval of its principles. True, he wrote a letter to a member of the convention, in which he said substantially, "if you will nominate me I will write a letter in which I will express sentiments as strong in favor of the Compromise as I did to you in private." "I will not write a letter for publication now, because that would look like bidding for the presidency." [Laughter.] "But you are at liberty to show this to Jones, and Bolts, and other friends." [Great laughter.] Now, gentleman, what do you think of the frankness of the old soldier? He writes no letter for publication, lest he might be suspected of electioneering; but sends private notes to members of the convention pledging himself to make a publication in favor of certain principles in the event of his nomination. Is this manœuvre sanctioned by "Scott's Infantry Tactics" as adopted in the army, or has the old soldier been taking lessons in political tactics from Gen. Seward? [Renewed Laughter.]

Well, General Scott received the nomination "unanimously," according to the official proceedings of the convention. [Laughter.]

Fellow-citizens, did you ever hear of a unanimous nomination which was made in defiance of the fifty-times repeated protest and remonstrance of the delegations from one half of the States of the Union represented in the convention? Every southern delegation voted against him more than fifty-times, day after day, and night after night; and yet the nomination was "unanimous." [Great Laughter.] The nomination of General Scott, therefore, presents to the American people this extraordinary anomaly; for the first time in the history of our party contests has a sectional nomination ever been forced upon either of the two great parties. You may talk of the dangers to the American Union growing out of the partisan strife and political contests—you may tremble at the scenes through which we have all recently passed, connected with the slavery agitation; but yet there was nothing in all that so perilous to the safety of the Union as a sectional nomination for the presidency, where the North demanded the nomination of a particular man upon a sectional issue, and the delegations from every Southern State, without exception, resisting the nomination as dangerous to their rights and institutions A nomination forced upon the South by the abolition wing of the whig party north is now presented to the American people as a "unanimous nomination." It matters not whether the North forced the nomination upon the South, or the South upon the North, the danger consists in the fact that a territorial line divided men's opinions; that northern men were one way, and southern men the other. But, after the nomination is made, we are told that it was a fair compromise, because the South received the platform, and the North obtained the candidate, under the direction of men who "defy" and "spit upon" the platform. Thus we have Winfield Scott before us as a candidate for the presidency. After mature deliberation, he proceeds to accept the nomination, and to write the letter which he had promised Mr. Archer in the private note which was found in Butts' breeches-pocket. [Laughter.] Let us see whether that letter is as strong as the one which he promised to write? He says:

"Not having written a word to procure this distinction," [laughter,] "I lost not a moment, after it had been conferred, in addressing a letter to one of your members to signify what would be, at the proper time, the substance of my reply to the convention; and I now have the honor to repeat, in a more formal manner, as the occasion justly demands, that I ACCEPT THE NOMINATION, WITH THE RESOLUTIONS ANNEXED."

Now, gentlemen, I desire to know what is the meaning of the words "with the resolutions annexed." Does he mean that he approves the resolutions? If so, why did he not say so, as the candidate for the vice presidency (Mr. Graham) did, in his letter of acceptance? Or, why did he not do as that gallant and honest man (Franklin Pierce) did, and say, "I accept the nomination upon the platform adopted by the convention, not because this is expected of me as a candidate, but because the principles it embraces command the approbation of my judgment?" There you have an honest man speaking from an honest heart, without any equivocation, dissimulation, or mental reservation. Here you find that Gen. Scott "accepts the nomination, with the resolutions annexed" —that is to say, using language susceptible of two constructions—one at the North, and another at the South. In the North, it will be said that he accepts the nomination, *notwithstanding* the platform; that he accepts it, although he "defies" the platform; that he accepts it, although he "*spits* upon" the platform. At the South, it will be said he accepts it, with an approval of the platform. I submit the question to you, whether that language was not *framed studiously* for the purpose of enabling men, north and south, to read it one way or the other, as the public pulse should beat in their particular localities. Again: I submit to you, was it the general-in-chief of the Army who fought the battles in Mexico that conceived this part of the letter, or was it his commander-in-chief, General Seward, who dictated it?—[Great applause.]

But I have heard it said that there is another part of this letter which helps the matter out. Here it is.—Towards the conclusion of the letter, he says: "Finally, for my strict adherence to the principles of the whig party, as expressed in the resolutions of the convention and herein suggested, with a sincere and earnest purpose to advance the greatness and happiness of the republic," and so on, "I can offer no other pledge or guarantee than the known incidents of a long public life, now undergoing the severest criticism." He can give no other pledge "than the known incidents of a long public life, now undergoing the severest criticism."—What "incidents" are there referred to as the "pledge" for his future conduct? Certainly not his military career for forty years; for that was not an incident of his life. It constitutes the principal, nay, his whole public career; and besides, that military life is not "now undergoing the severest criticism," or any criticism. It was not then, his military career to which he referred when he spoke of the known incidents of his life, which would afford a guarantee of his political principles and conduct. To what, then, did he refer? His series of political letters did constitute "incidents" in his long life—well-known incidents; and those incidents are now undergoing the severest critism. Hence to those letters he must have referred as the only pledge he was willing to give for his political fidelity. I repeat, what are those incidents as contained in the political letters to which allusion is so pointedly made? First, a pledge to support the annexation of Canada to the American Union; second, a pledge to the creed of the Native-American party; third, a pledge for the gradual emancipation of slavery; fourth, a pledge for the support of the bankrupt law; fifth, a pledge for a national bank; and so on through the whole series of federal measures, stretching out like Macbeth's procession of ghosts, some in existence, and others supposed to have become "obsolete ideas." To these incidents—to the pledges contained in these political letters—he must be understood as referring as the only guarantee he will give to carry out the principles and issues upon which this campaign is to be fought.—It is true there are yet one or two other planks to be added to the platform; for General Scott was not willing to "annex" the whig resolutions, and stop there. He wished to convey the idea distinctly that that was not the ground upon which he stood exclusively, if he stood upon it all. Hence we find him going further, and saying that "the political principles and measures laid down in those resolutions are so broad that but *little is left for me to* ADD." [Laughter] A modest man! He accepts the nomination, "with the resolutions annexed," and then adds a little. [Renewed laughter] Let us see what he adds. He says: "I therefore barely suggest, in this place, that should I, by the partiality of my countrymen, be elevated by the chief magistracy of the Union, I shall be ready, in my connexion with Congress, to recommend or to approve of measures in regard to the management of the public domain so as to secure an early settlement of the same favorable to actual settlers, but consistent, nevertheless, with a due regard to the equal rights of the whole American people in that vast national inheritance"

A GENTLEMAN in the meeting. "What does he mean?"

Mr. DOUGLAS: I hear a gentleman behind me asking what does General Scott mean by this? That is precisely what I was going to ask you, gentlemen.—What does he mean? I will tell you what I suppose he means. He means that, inasmuch as there are two bills now pending before Congress in relation to the public domain radically antagonastic to each other, to wit: the homestead bill and the bill to divide and distribute the public lands among the States, and inasmuch as the new States are for one of those bills and violently against the other, and inasmuch as the old States are for the other and opposed to the homestead bill, he says, "I am for the one favorable to actual settlers—that is, the homestead bill—*so as to secure the rights of the old States in this vast national inheritance.*" [Great Laughter] In other words, "I am for the homestead bill, so as to defeat it, and pass the distribution bill." That is the argument to be used in the old States. Or, "I am for the distribution bill, so as to defeat it, and pass the homestead bill;" and this will be the argument in the new States. Now, I defy any living man to tell what is the real meaning of the paragraph which I have just read or on which side of either of these two antagonistic questions is General Scott committed by this letter. Is he for the homestead bill, or for the distribution bill?—In my State, when I go home and visit the actual settlers upon the broad prairies, I expect to hear General Scott's friends claim that he is the best advocate in America of the homestead bill: and in Old Virginia, in New England, in New York, in all the old States, they will say "he is publicly committed against that 'vile and infamous' measure, and in favor of distributing the lands among the old States." They will attempt to prove each proposition in turn by the language used in his letter of acceptance. I again submit the question, was this part of the letter the production of the general-in-chief of the American army, or did it originate with the commander-in-chief of his political fortunes? Does it bear the marks of a frank, honest, straightforward old soldier, or of the tricky politician?

Again, General Scott, in this letter of acceptance, incorporates another plank into the platform which was adopted at Baltimore and "annexed" at Washington—He proposes "also to recommend or to approve of a single alteration in our naturalization laws, suggested by my military experience, viz: Giving to all foreigner, the right of citizenship who shall faithfully serve in time of war one year on board of our public ships, or in our land forces, regular or volunteer, on their receiving an honorable discharge from the service."

This is the suggestion of his military experience. Recollect, that in 1841 General Scott was only hesitating between an alteration in our naturalization laws, requiring a residence of twenty-one years in this country as a necessary apprenticeship for naturalization, and a total repeal of all laws on the subject—in other words, for incapacitating foreigners from ever becoming citizens of this country at all—and that his "mind then inclined to the latter alternative." Recollect, that in 1841 he claimed to be the *originator* of the great native-American party—pledged himself to its support—was *fired with indignation* against those foreigners who claimed to be citizens, and to vote and enjoy the privileges of our laws. Since 1841 the only military experience of General Scott has been in Mexico, thousands of miles from the sight, hearing, and influence of American institutions. He means, therefore, that *this* military experience teaches him that a year's service in a foreign land, beyond the reach of our laws, beyond the hearing of our language, where an American newspaper never comes, where an election is an unknown and inconceivable event, where the name of the constitution is never heard, and under the martial rule which nullifies both law and constitution—he says that a twelve-month's service under these circumstances fits a man for citizenship as well as a whole life spent here in the pursuits of a citizen's life, and in the daily observation of the practical working of our institutions.—Such is the result of his experience in the Mexican war.

But as a subject of doubt whether General Scott proposes his "single alteration" as a substitute for our existing naturalization law, or whether he proposes it as an additional law, so that we shall have two distinct laws of naturalization. I am compelled to believe that he intends the former proposition; for I need not tell this audience that the constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to pass "a *uniform* rule of naturalization," and to pass no other. If, therefore, General Scott means that we shall have two modes of naturalization—one being the existing form, and the other a year's service in the army—his proposition is unconstitutional, and impossible, and an absolute absurdity. Is it possible that this candidate for the presidency never read the constitution? I am unwilling to assume the fact, and do not like to put upon his words such a construction. There is a difficulty indeed in construing them—they are equivocal, like all the rest of his letter. But there is this well known rule of construction—that when a document admits of two meanings, one impossible and absurd, the other consistent, intelligible, and significant, we are bound to take the latter. Now, if this clause in the letter means that general Scott desires an *addition* to our naturalization laws which would destroy their uniformity by giving unequal advantages, and offering different modes of naturalization to different persons, he proposes an "alteration" which is impossible under the constitution. But if he means that this single alteration shall be a substitute for all our laws—in other words, if he means that a year of military or naval service shall be the sole means of naturalization—then this proposition, however inexpedient, is a proposition for a uniform law; is consistent with the constitution; is consistent with his former declarations, and consistent with itself—Such, then, we are bound to believe his meaning to be—namely, that by an enlistment into our naval or land forces, and one year's service only shall an emigrant to this country become a citizen of the United States. What a plank for a platform! Is this a principle of the whig party? If it is the country ought to know it. Or is it only the utterance of a forked tongue—another gull-trap—constructed to catch Native votes under one construction, and the votes of our adopted citizens under a different construction. Charity even requires this construction, for should General Scott, by any strange accident, by any marvelous hallucination of this people, become the President of the United States—should he in good faith strive to make the alteration he proposes, and should he succeed in doing so—what results would come of that event! We have now an army of 10,000 men, all told. But 250,000 foreigners come every year to these shores. If an enlistment becomes necessary to make these people citizens, our standing army would soon contain a million of men. Are all these emigrants to be turned into the army and navy for naturalization? Or is it proposed that they shall remain in the land of freedom disfranchised, deprived of all political rights, of all participation in the civil affairs of the country, and reduced to a system of political bondage more intolerable than that from which they fled in their native land?

The democratic party has ever been just and liberal to all foreigners that come here. That party has made this country a home for the exile, an asylum for the oppressed of all the world. We make no distinctions among our fellow citizens. Uniform naturalization and equality under the law, has been our principle from the beginning, and will be through the coming time [Applause] It is this just, wise and honest policy that has attached the foreign vote to the democratic party. And we are willing to let them judge now between ourselves and a candidate who sets up this transparent blind between his present position and his real principles, as expressed in his memorable letter of '41. If General Scott has changed his opinions since that day—if all the indignation which "fired" him then has melted down into love and admiration under the operation of "his military experience"—why does he not say so like a man? I am unwilling to believe that a gallant soldier would have done this, had he written a letter himself; but I will not attempt to say what his political file-leader would not do while he held the pen.

Gentlemen, this letter of General Scott, accepting the nomination, is a fertile theme for a speech. It has many points, and I have but a few moments to get through with it; but it contains so many novel and rare features, that you will bear with me for calling your attention other portions of it.

It will be remembered that the whig party, from time immemorial, have been in the habit, in every election, of charging the democracy with proscription—with proscribing honest men for opinion's sake—turning them out of office merely for a difference of political sentiment, and putting democratic partizans in their places. "Proscribe proscription," has been the whig motto. It was so when Henry Clay was the gallant standard-bearer of the whig party. Every whig in America was horror-stricken at the odious doctrine, that "to the victors belong the spoils." Every whig then denounced the idea of removing a man from office merely because of a difference of opinion on the subject of partisan politics.—When General Taylor was the whig candidate four years ago, you were told upon every stump, in the public press and through every vehicle of communicating intelligence to the people, that no man was to be removed in consequence of his polit cal sentiments; that it made no difference whether he was a whig or a democrat; if he was honest and capable, he was to be protected in the station he held: What do we find now? General Scott in his letter of acceptance, in cunning and adroit language, solemnly pledges himself that no democrat shall ever hold office under his administration, but that abolition whigs may do so without the slightest hindrance; this is my translation of that part of his letter. Now let us recur to his own words. He says: "In regard to the general policy of the administration, if elected, I should, of course look among those who may approve that policy for the agents to carry it into execution; and I should seek to cultivate harmony and fraternal sentiments throughout the whig party, without attempting to reduce its members by prescription to exact conformity to my own views." He would employ agents from among those who approved the policy of his administration. As democrats do not approve, and cannot approve, of the policy of such an administration as his would be, they are excluded from ever holding an office under an administration at the head of which General Scott may be placed. Can language be more clear and explicit, that a man differing from him in politics cannot participate in the honor, and emoluments which his country may have to award to merit and patriotism? Proscription of all political opponents is boldly proclaimed in advance. He says, in substance, "Democrats, take notice: you do not approve of my policy; you cannot be selected as my agents; you cannot enjoy any of the patronage of the government; it is to be distributed only to those who do approve the policy of the administration." But then, looking around and seeing Mr. Seward and his abolition followers, he adds: "but I will cultivate harmony and fraternal sentiments throughout the whig party, without attempting to reduce its members by proscription to exact conformity to my own views." No fraternal feeling is to be cultivated between him and the democracy; no friendly sentiments are to prevail between him and us This brotherhood and fraternal feeling are only to be among the members of the whig party, and they are not required to conform to his views, if they belong to any branch of the universal whig party, and are numbered among his supporters.

This language is broad enough to let in Mr. Seward and the whole of his abolition followers, at the same time that their appetite for the spoils is whetted by the assurance that no honest democrat should ever hold office under his administration, and therefore they may enjoy a monopoly of all the honors and patronage of the government.

Gentlemen, I ask you to bear in mind that this is the first time that any candidate for the presidency, from the days of Washington to this moment, of any political party or creed, has avowed that the entire patronage of the government should be confined exclusively to the men who sustained and supported the policy of an administration.

This humiliating declaration is now made for the first time. There never has been a democratic administration in this Union that did not return at least one-third of his political opponents in office. This was emphatically the case under the administrations of General Jackson, Mr. Van Buren, and Mr. Polk, and yet the whigs have been in the habit of pointing to those as the most proscriptive of all the administrations during the history of our republic.

True the most important and responsible of the offices were held by the friends of the administration, yet a large portion, from one-third to one-half, of all the offices were invariably enjoyed by our political opponents. But Gen. Scott, as the candidate of this anti-proscriptive party, pledges himself that no office, high or low, shall ever be held by a democrat, no matter how honest, capable, and useful he may have been in the public service.—Whatever his services and character, he must walk the plank. Can you believe that the man of the last war, the hero of Lundy's Lane, the victor at Chepultepec, could entertain such sentiments if he had not become the tame instrument of a heartless demagogue? Proscription such as he avows has never yet been heard of in this country. An old companion in arms—one, perhaps, who had stood by him in those very battles to which I have referred, where he may have left an eye, a leg, an arm; who may have a family dependant for bread upon his continuance in office—must make room for a sleek whig or some selfish abolitionist. Such is the doctrine of this letter. I cannot believe that it is the sentiment of a soldier's heart. I had rather believe that he wrote it as a king writes, *through the premier who is to manage his administration.* [Great applause.] But if such is to be the morality, the theory and the practice of his administration, why not elect its real chief to bear the responsibility? [Cheers] Why blot out the refulgent glory that now encircles the name of Scott, and wither the laurels which his profession has won him? Why repeat the story of Taylor? *His* honor, too, knew not a stain, until you made him a President, with Clayton for his premier.

Why has the whig party forgotten with an oblivion so complete all that it once said about military politicians? Time was when they preferred "war, pestilence, and famine," to the election of a military chieftain, referring to General Jackson, who did not at the time of his nomination hold any commission in the army, who *never* was a soldier by profession, and who had entered the army early in the hour of danger, as Pierce did—and, like him, sheathed his sword when the war was over. [Great applause.]

We have yet to see a professional soldier succeed as a statesman. Washington was no military man by profession, following the army for a living. He was a civilian in the fullest sense of the word He was reared for civil pursuits He held civil offices both before and after the Revolution. He was a member of the Continental Congress that founded the Union, and a member of that convention which framed our constitution. He knew whether naturalization laws ought to be uniform or not. The period during which Washington held a commission in the army constituted indeed but a very few years of his long life. He was the first of our citizen-soldiers. [Cheers and applause.] Andrew Jackson, too—

[Here Mr. Douglas was interrupted by long and hearty cheers. He continued—]

Gentlemen, it does my heart good to hear democrats applaud the name of Andrew Jackson. [Renewed applause] Andrew Jackson started in life as a poor attorney; was United States Attorney under Washington, a senator of the United States from Tennessee, and a judge of the supreme court of his State, before he ever drew a sword. When his country was involved in war, only did the duties of a soldier; and like Washington, when he was at an end, he threw up his commission and went to a farm. Like Washington, also, he left that farm again only to become the President of the United States. He was not a member of the military profession; like Washington, he was never more than a citizen soldier. Of forty years of public service not more than five or six were spent in the army, and the rest in civil life. [cheers] So with Harrison. He commenced his career as a young physician—he held many civil offices before he went into the army; he went to the army at last only as Mr. Pierce did, because there was war in the land; and when he was nominated for the Presidency, he had long since ceased to hold the commission of a military officer.

But next we come to the name of Taylor. He was the first, the very first professional soldier who ever became the Chief Magistrate of this country. My friends, *was there anything in the result of that experiment which invites you to repeat it?* If he had lived for one year more than he did with that Cabinet about him, would this Union be extant at the present time? I believe Gen. Taylor to have been an honest and sincere man; but at the time of his death he was simply *taking a military view of a civil question;* and neither whig nor democrat, who is at all informed upon the history of that period, will be disposed to deny that he had already committed himself to steps which would have led inevitably to a civil war between the federal government and several sovereign States of our Union, and thereby have rent in fragments the entire confederation.

Why is it that the South American republics do not thrive—why do they have no peace—why do they live in a perpetual revolution? They have adopted our laws; they have copied our constitutions; yet they do not succeed, while we do. Why do not like causes produce like effects? Because, while between their institutions and ours there is a good parallel, in their *administration* of them they make a grand difference. In those republics the commanders of their armies are invariably candidates for the presidency, while with us, such has never been the case until the present time. In those republics, when a civilian is the candidate of one side and the commander-in-chief is set up by the opposite party, the civilian is generally elected by the people; *but the soldier invariably takes possession of the office by the sword.* Hence their civil wars, resulting in anarchy and despotism, and destroying every vestige of liberty. Now, we are importing this unhappy policy, this *Mexican* policy, into the United States. We are copying misfortune—borrowing a fatal fault. This practice of setting up the commanders of the army for the highest civil offices, I repeat, is an innovation on our theory and our practice, and the history of those miserable sister States ought to settle the question of its expediency.

It was the hand of Providence that saved us from our first and only *military administration.* Taylor was gathered to his fathers; Fillmore reigned in his stead—a man who, previous to that time, had never furnished such proofs of superiority of statesmanship as to cause him to be looked to as a candidate for the first office—a man of respectable talents, respectable character, and of gentlemanly deportment, who has performed no great and striking act to signalize his administration in history. Yet, regarding his official term in contrast with the military administration that preceded him, we feel—ay, all of us feel—that Fillmore was a real *godsend!* It was the calming of the waters when the ship was sinking in the tempest. All, therefore, look kindly on Mr. Fillmore, and we like to give him all the consolation we can after the bad treatment he received at Baltimore, *because he was a whig, and yet did no harm to the country!*

Yet, for the simple reason that he did no harm to his country—ay, because he has been a national President, and because he has kept within the bounds of his official oath—Mr. Fillmore has been repudiated by his party.—Is not this so? Was not Mr. Fillmore defeated by the abolition sentiment and abolition party of the North, and by that alone? Did not every southern State stick to him to the death? Could all the whigs in the Union, except Seward and the abolition whigs, have defeated him at Baltimore? And would Seward or any abolitionist have raised a cry upon Millard Fillmore if he had acted in office upon the principles of his Buffalo letter,