

AMERICAN VOLUNTEER.

JOHN D. BRATTON, Editor & Proprietor. CARLEISLE, PA., MARCH 30, 1864.

Democratic State Ticket:

GOVERNOR: WILLIAM BIGLER, OF CLEARFIELD COUNTY.

JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT: JEREMIAH S. BLACK, OF SOMERSET COUNTY.

CANAL COMMISSIONER: HENRY S. MOTT, OF PIKE COUNTY.

We return thanks to His Excellency JOHN BIGLER, Governor of the State of California, for a neat pamphlet copy of his eloquent Inaugural Address, delivered 7th of January, 1864.

THE NEBRASKA BILL.—This important measure has been referred to the Committee of the Whole in the U. S. House of Representatives. This is regarded by its enemies as an indication that it will be lost in that body. The better opinion, however, is that the discussion will be prolonged, and that in the course of time it will become a law.

IRON WINDS.—We hear, as usual, of some damage from the high winds that have prevailed during the past two weeks. In some places fences were blown down, in others barns, while not a few ancient houses and stables were more or less dilapidated.

EMIGRATION TO NEBRASKA.—According to St. Louis papers, emigration from the northern and western States, has set in strong for the Nebraska territory. The fight in Congress about slavery, does not seem to deter the hardy pioneer from seeking a home there, while the prospect of government protection gives impulse to emigration.

THE HOME OF JOHN C. CALHOUN.—The Keizer (S. C.) Courier states that Fort Hill has been purchased by Col. A. P. Calhoun, from his mother, Mrs. Florida Calhoun, widow of the late Hon. J. C. Calhoun, and will be immediately occupied by him. He returns to his native State with an ample fortune, accumulated on the fruitful soil of Alabama, and hereafter the visitor to the sacred precincts of Fort Hill will be entertained by the son in a manner worthy of so distinguished a father.

THE PROHIBITORY STATE COMMITTEE, at a meeting in Harrisburg on Monday, adopted a resolution in favor of holding a Prohibitory State Convention in Harrisburg, on Wednesday, the 7th of June next, to nominate a Prohibitory State Ticket.

THE CURY DIFFICULTY.—It is said that no apprehension is entertained at Washington of a rupture with Spain in consequence of the Bark Warrior affair. It is thought that the difficulty will be settled honorably to both parties.

THE CLERICAL PROTEST.—The debate which occurred in the United States Senate, on the presentation of the great petition of 3050 clergymen and college professors, is to be published in full, embracing the speeches of Messrs. Hubston, Everett, Seward, Mason, Pett, Butler, Douglas, &c. It makes an interesting episode in Congressional annals.

THE DEATH OF MR. SOLTE.—The New York Herald says of a private source that Mr. Solte has instructed Mr. Solte, our Minister at Madrid, to make the demand for indemnity and apology in the most peremptory manner; and should the Spanish government hesitate, or put off its reply, and prefer the prospect of waiting for instructions from Havana, Mr. Solte is to leave no stone unturned in his efforts to Washington, when our government will proceed instantly to re-voke the treaty of Cuba, port.

DEATH OF MAJOR HOBBS.—Major S. R. HOBBS, First Assistant Post-Master General, died at his residence in Washington city, on Thursday last week, after a protracted illness. His disease was consumption. We sincerely regret the death of this estimable man and efficient public officer. It was our pleasure to be personally acquainted with him, and no one will accuse us of exaggeration when we say that as a public officer in the Post-office Department, the Government never had his superior if ever his equal. He was honest, prompt, energetic and obliging, and a gentleman in demeanor.

In his death the Government has lost a most valuable officer, and the community in which he lived a worthy and highly esteemed citizen. Peace to his ashes.

DISASTERS ON OUR WESTERN RIVERS.—The St. Louis Evening News says that during the two months, January and February, twenty-three steamers were sunk, burnt or blown up on the Mississippi river and its tributaries, and two destroyed by fire on the Savannah—involving the loss of near two hundred lives, and more than a million dollars worth of property. The records of the present month will greatly swell this fearful list of mortality. Within the last few days we have received accounts of the loss of the steamer Caroline and J. L. Avery upon the Mississippi, and the Reinder upon the Ohio river—hurling, in all, one hundred and fifteen souls, without warning or preparation into eternity.

Portraits of eminent Americans now living, including President Pierce and his cabinet; with Biographical and Historical Memoirs of their Lives and Actions. By John Livingston, of the New York Bar. Complete in one volume. This volume contains 650 pages, octavo, with 50 fine steel portraits made from daguerotypes, and expressly for the work. The engravings alone have cost over five thousand dollars.

The portraits are all engraved from daguerotypes, in the finest style of the art, and are undoubtedly correct. We can vouch for the remarkable fidelity of the likenesses of those persons with whose faces we are familiar. This truly national work is creditable to the ability, taste and enterprise of Mr. Livingston, and should adorn every public and private library in the country. His plan is "no creed or class confined," but embraces clergymen, lawyers, doctors, soldiers, statesmen, financiers, merchants, manufacturers, and farmers—in short, distinguished living representatives of every department of American society. To expatiate on the value of such a work would be superfluous, as it recommends itself to universal favor.

THE NEBRASKA BILL AND THE HARRISBURG TELEGRAPH.

The week previous to the assembling of the late Federal State Convention, to nominate candidates for Governor, Canal Commissioner, and Judge of the Supreme Court, the Harrisburg Telegraph, the organ of that party at the seat of Government, volunteered a few words of advice to the Delegates to whom had been entrusted the delicate duty of nominating the ticket.—On the subject of Senator Douglas's Nebraska Bill, the Telegraph advised that the Whigs should "keep hands off," and remain as neutral as possible. But we shall quote the Telegraph's own language. In that paper of March 15, (the day of the assembling of the Federal Convention,) we find the following:

"The Nebraska Bill, which has recently passed the Senate, and is now awaiting the action of the House, is creating an unusual excitement throughout the country, and bids fair to uproot all party lines. The late Locofoco convention was aware of the difficulty this question was liable to create, and therefore refused to take any action upon it. Now as every thing is 'fair in war,' we think we should not hastily commit ourselves upon a question which the masses of the people do not understand. We may nominate a candidate for Governor whose views upon this question may be obnoxious to the masses, and we cannot tell how a convention at this time, is able to tell what the views of the people are upon this question. Time has not been allowed them to examine it. There is one thing we hope, that the convention will not take hasty action upon this question, but will be governed by reason and the wish of the people."

Such were the Telegraph's views, such its advice to its party friends, before the meeting of the Federal Convention. Well, the convention met, and as a large majority of the delegates composing it were free soilers and abolitionists, of course the Nebraska bill had to be denounced in unmeasured terms—the advice of the Telegraph was disregarded by the Convention, and the following resolution was adopted as part of the "Whig platform":

"Resolved, That the provision in the Kansas and Nebraska Bill, now before Congress, which effects and repeals the Missouri Compromise, is a deliberate breach of pledged faith, and public compact, a high-handed attempt to force slavery into a vast territory now free from it by law, a reckless renewing of a quieted agitation, and therefore meets the stern, indignant and unanimous condemnation of the Whig party of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

We expected, as a matter of course, that the Telegraph, after having used the language we have quoted in its columns, would have independence enough to maintain its position—we expected to see it administer a mild but pointed rebuke to the Convention for having failed to adopt the plan and take the advice it had volunteered. But, the Telegraph, spaniel-like, "backed water," and instead of defending its own position, actually applauds the Convention for pursuing the very opposite course of that it suggested. If this is not synchopany double-distilled, we know not what is. Just see how that despised sheet speaks of the rebuke it received at the hands of its own party friends. We now quote from that paper of March 18, (its first issue after the adjournment of the Federal Convention.) Speaking of the "Whig Platform," adopted by the Convention, it remarks:

"Upon the Nebraska and Kansas Bill of Senator Douglas, the platform is clear and plain, and needs the least approval of the citizens of Pennsylvania, now so indignantly aroused at this base attempt to renew the agitation of a quieted question in violation of sacred compacts. Not like the contrary Locofoco Convention which struck down the important measure, it denounces it in proper and unmeasured terms. This dodge of the Locofoco Convention came too late to save the Party from its ignominious defeat. The Convention passed a resolution approving of the course of Senator Douglas, who voted for this Bill in the Senate on the 17th of February, and who, on the 17th of the same month, was elected Governor of Pennsylvania. By this act the Locofoco Party of Pennsylvania stands committed in favor of this measure, and every attempt to dodge it by Governor Bigler or his satellites will only expose their weakness, their hypocrisy and their villainy."

Now, as the Telegraph is so fond of applying vulgar epithets to the Democratic party, for having, as it says, "stirred" this question, will that immaculate sheet inform its readers what side of the question it occupies? One week the editor says "the people do not understand the question," and therefore appeals to his party friends not to commit themselves for or against the measure. The week following he thinks the people do understand it, and the editor heartily approves of the resolution of the Convention in which the measure is condemned! This is, to say the least, a humiliating position for the Whig organ to occupy.

And yet, notwithstanding his own equivocal and awkward position, the editor of the Telegraph thunders forth indignant anathemas at the late Democratic State Convention for having pursued the very course he recommended the Whig Convention to pursue! What the editor thought to be the right course for his own party, he considers "dishonest and cowardly" in the Democrats. How characteristic of Federalism—a want of fairness, honesty and manliness, is now and always has been the principal features of that miserable pie-bald party. They adhere to no policy, and have trimmed their sails so often, for the purpose of satisfying abolitionism, freesoilism, native-Americanism, and a dozen other isms, that they have now no platform they can call their own. Every plank of the old whig platform, as recognized by Clay, Webster and Fillmore, have been abandoned, one by one, and the once great whig party is almost not entirely extinct. Requested in pace.

A word in conclusion in regard to the tactics of the Federal press because of the course of the late Democratic State Convention in "dodging" the Nebraska question. We say boldly and emphatically that the Democracy of Pennsylvania are in favor of the Nebraska Bill, and we feel authorized in saying also, that a very large majority of the Delegates to the Democratic State Convention were ready, had an opportunity been afforded them, to have endorsed the measure by their votes. It was the President of the Convention, and not the Convention itself, that refused to entertain the motion to endorse the Nebraska bill. We condemn the course of Judge Shannon (the President of the Convention,) because of his arbitrary course, and in doing so we feel that we spoke the sentiments of nineteen-twentieths of the Democrats of Pennsylvania. We desire no "dodging" in a Democratic Convention—we prefer boldness and decision on all great national subjects. We are ready and willing to join issue with the Whigs and their allies, the abolitionists, on this question, with the least fear as to the result.—There are a few "National Whigs" who despise the treacherous course of their party, and who are ready to join the democracy to "crush out" abolitionism wherever it may exhibit its hydra-head.

The New York Central Railroad Company, have prohibited the sale of spirituous liquors at the victualling stations.

CLERICAL PRESUMPTION.

It is a matter of history, that whenever the clergy have dabbled in politics, it has been, (with a few honorable exceptions,) in bad taste, with little knowledge, arrogant pretensions, dogmatical manners, and against the rights of the people and republican government. They have always been the stoutest defenders of despotism, and the last to yield to enlightened reform.—Such has been especially true wherever they had political power, by a meretricious union between Church and State. The most zealous opponents of all liberal movements in England at the present day, whereby the people of that country might be elevated to the standard of freedom, are the lords spiritual and the clerical influence of that country. In every advance to reform in the British Parliament, the clergy have been the most stubborn in opposition, and the last to yield to the necessities of the times and the rights of the people. They have always been clogs upon the wheels in all the advances towards free government. When France was struggling against feudal despotism and kingly tyranny, the priests of that country defended the powers of the Crown and justified the cruel despotism which ground to the dust an honest confiding peasantry, until by repeated indignities that peasantry rose in their might, and the bitter waters thus sent up swept away the mounds of priestly and kingly arrogance, and landed the nation in the broad plains of avowed and open infidelity.

The framers of our own admirable Constitution feared this danger and wisely prohibited all connection between Church and State, providing that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," well knowing from the history of the past, that the purity of religious doctrine could not be preserved by its defenders being set apart and excluded from all contamination with the turbid waters of political affairs. It was thus done, in the spirit of our Divine Master, who enjoined upon his followers "to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

The wisdom of the framers of our Constitution in this separating spiritual and temporal affairs in the administration of the government, has been abundantly verified in our own political history. Certain ambitious divines, at different critical periods in our own government, have endeavored to mould public sentiment in favor of arbitrary laws, and to breed discord, turbulence and disunion, and to speak in a tone of arrogance, ill suited to the precepts of our holy religion. They have shown a greedy grasping after political power and influence, detrimental alike to the principles of enlightened freedom and our republican institutions—anti-patriotic, and endangering the stability of the Government itself.

In the reign of the elder Adams, the pulpit flaminated in fiery indignation at those who were displeased at the alien and sedition laws, or expressed any disapprobation of the manifest monarchical tendencies which characterized his administration. As indicative of the clerical sentiment of that day, we need only refer to the remarks of Dr. Parrish in 1798, as being a type of the whole class of clerical agitators:

"Your public characters, as yet, are your own choice. Watch those ungrateful souls that murmur about taxation and oppression, the burdens of government and religion. They have fellowship with our enemies—they are traitors to God and Christianity. Be jealous of those who declaim against the sacred institutions of the Party of the Holy Scriptures. They have probably had a handkerchief about lying and rebellion, and honor."

Yet this political and clerical doctor and man of peace, cried aloud for war with France— "Cursed be that keepeth back the sword from blood," was his fanatical cry in 1799. Such clerical meddlers have an instinctive tendency to sustain Federalism when in power, and to aid the same element to obtain power, in opposition to Democratic and Democratic measures. Hence the cry for submission to the black codicil Federal tyranny of 1798. Hence the cry for war with revolutionized and republican France in 1799—and the cry for peace and bowing our necks to the yoke of haughty Britain in the war of 1812. The same Reverend Doctor Parrish who cried "blood" in 1799, declaimed against blood in 1814, and then denounced the Democratic Administration of Mr. Madison and those who sustained the war with Great Britain; in the most unmeasured terms.

"Let every man," said he, "who sanctioned his name by his signature or his influence, remember he was laboring to save himself and his country with blood; and in denouncing the Democratic party of that day, he said: 'I am here as a minister of God.'"

Mr. Butler says: "He had always entertained the highest respect for ministers of the gospel. His respect was so high that he would almost submit to their rebuke for an act performed in his official capacity. But that respect was for them in their appropriate and sacred calling, and when they abandoned their duty, descended from their high position, and engaged in the politics of the day, he would speak as viceregent of God on earth, and presume, in his name, solemnly to pronounce upon the Senate, the judgments of the Almighty."

Mr. Pettit said: "The Senator from South Carolina said he had great respect for clergymen, so long as their robes were unspotted, and they did not dabble in the polluted waters of the pool of political theology. He would agree with the Senator if he thought the pool of politics was any more polluted than the stagnant waters of the pool of contradictory theology, in which these clergymen lived. He loved the pool of politics far more pellucid, clean, healthy and beneficial than the stagnant waters which surrounded the contradictory creed and dogmas of those men who would contend upon any particular point of theology.—The Senate had an officer chosen for his ability and information, who was a brother clergyman, and with instructions to inquire and report to the Senate whether the Nebraska bill was in violation of the law of God, and whether the Senate had authority to pass it. The Senator from Louisiana, if Mr. Siler decided in the affirmative, he would be willing to revoke his action, and would have the bill sent to the House to send the bill back to the Senate."

Mr. Douglas again said: "What was this assumption of the name and power of the Almighty, but an attempt to establish in this country the right to determine the will of God on all subjects, and particularly in relation to the political and religious rights of the people? It was an attempt to put the legislation of the country in the hands and under the control of the church. No holder of a religious office was ever made a legislator, and no religious subject, but a subject of all political laws, they must receive, as the Divine Will, whatever they received from the church. If this pretension of the clergy be now sanctioned, all questions must be referred to the clergy for approval before Congress shall act. The nominal purports to speak in the name of the Almighty, and in that name to protect the rights of the people to settle for themselves. The clause relating to slavery, as it passed the Senate, is in these words:

"It being the true interest and meaning of this act to legislate slavery into any territory or State, not to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States."

Yet this true Democratic principle, this essence of the Democratic creed, is denounced by these New England clergymen, under their sign manual at Boston, Massachusetts, "in the name of Almighty God," and as "exposing us to the righteous judgments of the Almighty."

By what warrant do they thus speak? Do they find it in His Holy Word?—or have they a special revelation on this subject? Priestly tyranny has in all ages committed the most heinous crimes "in the name of Almighty God." It is easy to huddle together and cry, "We are the people of the Lord—we are the people of the Lord." But when comes this infidelity on the Nebraska question, and the right to speak in His name and to denounce His judgments? Is it secret, or traditional, or to be found in the open pages of His Holy Book? Whence comes their warrant? The intelligent people of America will not now be satisfied with mere assumptions. They are either speaking truly in His name or uttering the most horrid blasphemy. Whence, then, their authority? How comes their knowledge on this question so much above the range of the knowledge of other men, when in the common affairs of life, and especially in political matters, they are generally notoriously ignorant? Do they even agree upon the fundamentals of religious doctrine? On this subject an able contemporary, the Boston Post, remarks:

"Have not ecclesiastical councils been as notorious for their dogmatism as their turbulence? It was this feature as to them that prompted Dr. Hays, in deploring this disunion, there was a jubilee in hell every time the Presbyterian Assembly met together. 'Suppose an assembly of all the sects represented by these three thousand protestants in the name of Almighty God should be held; what sort of a jubilee would there be in heaven then? Would not the devils have a carnival? And are such to be allowed the claim of infallibility?'"

We were gratified to see the spirit with which this presumptuous memorial was received by Senators clothed with the authority of the people. It is a good omen, that many years removed from the bondage of priestcraft, which is equally as detestable as the bondage of kingcraft. They have tried both in the old world; it may be a long time before they shall obtain a foothold in the new. On the presentation and reading of the memorial, Mr. Douglas said:

"I hold it our duty to expose the conduct of men, who, either from ignorance, or willful blindness, will as it were, lead us into their sacred calling to arraign the conduct of Senators here in the discharge of their duties. I hold that this Senate is capable of judging whether or not the rights of the people are violated by the subversion of morals; whether it subjects us to the judgment of the Almighty, as are these political preachers, who do not understand the rights of the people; whether they are not, in their political conduct, exposing us to the judgment of the Almighty, and setting up a document here which is so full of contradictions, and so full of errors, as to violate all the rules of courtesy, propriety, and of honor."

domestic affairs, and which has received the sanction of two-thirds of the Senate of the U. S. States. The bill introduced by slavery nowhere, but throws the subject out of the hands of the people to settle for themselves. The clause relating to slavery, as it passed the Senate, is in these words:

"It being the true interest and meaning of this act to legislate slavery into any territory or State, not to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States."

Yet this true Democratic principle, this essence of the Democratic creed, is denounced by these New England clergymen, under their sign manual at Boston, Massachusetts, "in the name of Almighty God," and as "exposing us to the righteous judgments of the Almighty."

By what warrant do they thus speak? Do they find it in His Holy Word?—or have they a special revelation on this subject? Priestly tyranny has in all ages committed the most heinous crimes "in the name of Almighty God." It is easy to huddle together and cry, "We are the people of the Lord—we are the people of the Lord." But when comes this infidelity on the Nebraska question, and the right to speak in His name and to denounce His judgments? Is it secret, or traditional, or to be found in the open pages of His Holy Book? Whence comes their warrant? The intelligent people of America will not now be satisfied with mere assumptions. They are either speaking truly in His name or uttering the most horrid blasphemy. Whence, then, their authority? How comes their knowledge on this question so much above the range of the knowledge of other men, when in the common affairs of life, and especially in political matters, they are generally notoriously ignorant? Do they even agree upon the fundamentals of religious doctrine? On this subject an able contemporary, the Boston Post, remarks:

"Have not ecclesiastical councils been as notorious for their dogmatism as their turbulence? It was this feature as to them that prompted Dr. Hays, in deploring this disunion, there was a jubilee in hell every time the Presbyterian Assembly met together. 'Suppose an assembly of all the sects represented by these three thousand protestants in the name of Almighty God should be held; what sort of a jubilee would there be in heaven then? Would not the devils have a carnival? And are such to be allowed the claim of infallibility?'"

We were gratified to see the spirit with which this presumptuous memorial was received by Senators clothed with the authority of the people. It is a good omen, that many years removed from the bondage of priestcraft, which is equally as detestable as the bondage of kingcraft. They have tried both in the old world; it may be a long time before they shall obtain a foothold in the new. On the presentation and reading of the memorial, Mr. Douglas said:

"I hold it our duty to expose the conduct of men, who, either from ignorance, or willful blindness, will as it were, lead us into their sacred calling to arraign the conduct of Senators here in the discharge of their duties. I hold that this Senate is capable of judging whether or not the rights of the people are violated by the subversion of morals; whether it subjects us to the judgment of the Almighty, as are these political preachers, who do not understand the rights of the people; whether they are not, in their political conduct, exposing us to the judgment of the Almighty, and setting up a document here which is so full of contradictions, and so full of errors, as to violate all the rules of courtesy, propriety, and of honor."

Mr. Mason said: "In their character as ministers they have the tendency to threaten the Senate with the vengeance and judgments of the Almighty, whom they profess to serve. Such language was not respectful coming from any petitioners. But ministers of the gospel, and those who are called to the constitution or to our forms of government, and God forbid they ever should be known to it. It was the wise policy of our fathers, and it has been the policy of the United States, to keep ministers of the gospel, as such, and the government as wide apart as possible, and the wisdom of that policy was made manifest to-day by the conduct of the clergymen of the pool of political theology. The history of the world has shown the evils of recognizing ministers of the gospel as forming any part of the government. In all ages, and in all countries, those who have sought to mix religion with politics, and to give them power they proved the most arrogant of all others. On this occasion they come here, and in the name of the Almighty God, they invade the rights of the people, and presume, in His name, solemnly to pronounce upon the Senate, the judgments of the Almighty."

Mr. Butler says: "He had always entertained the highest respect for ministers of the gospel. His respect was so high that he would almost submit to their rebuke for an act performed in his official capacity. But that respect was for them in their appropriate and sacred calling, and when they abandoned their duty, descended from their high position, and engaged in the politics of the day, he would speak as viceregent of God on earth, and presume, in his name, solemnly to pronounce upon the Senate, the judgments of the Almighty."

Mr. Pettit said: "The Senator from South Carolina said he had great respect for clergymen, so long as their robes were unspotted, and they did not dabble in the polluted waters of the pool of political theology. He would agree with the Senator if he thought the pool of politics was any more polluted than the stagnant waters of the pool of contradictory theology, in which these clergymen lived. He loved the pool of politics far more pellucid, clean, healthy and beneficial than the stagnant waters which surrounded the contradictory creed and dogmas of those men who would contend upon any particular point of theology.—The Senate had an officer chosen for his ability and information, who was a brother clergyman, and with instructions to inquire and report to the Senate whether the Nebraska bill was in violation of the law of God, and whether the Senate had authority to pass it. The Senator from Louisiana, if Mr. Siler decided in the affirmative, he would be willing to revoke his action, and would have the bill sent to the House to send the bill back to the Senate."

Mr. Douglas again said: "What was this assumption of the name and power of the Almighty, but an attempt to establish in this country the right to determine the will of God on all subjects, and particularly in relation to the political and religious rights of the people? It was an attempt to put the legislation of the country in the hands and under the control of the church. No holder of a religious office was ever made a legislator, and no religious subject, but a subject of all political laws, they must receive, as the Divine Will, whatever they received from the church. If this pretension of the clergy be now sanctioned, all questions must be referred to the clergy for approval before Congress shall act. The nominal purports to speak in the name of the Almighty, and in that name to protect the rights of the people to settle for themselves. The clause relating to slavery, as it passed the Senate, is in these words:

"It being the true interest and meaning of this act to legislate slavery into any territory or State, not to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States."

Yet this true Democratic principle, this essence of the Democratic creed, is denounced by these New England clergymen, under their sign manual at Boston, Massachusetts, "in the name of Almighty God," and as "exposing us to the righteous judgments of the Almighty."

By what warrant do they thus speak? Do they find it in His Holy Word?—or have they a special revelation on this subject? Priestly tyranny has in all ages committed the most heinous crimes "in the name of Almighty God." It is easy to huddle together and cry, "We are the people of the Lord—we are the people of the Lord." But when comes this infidelity on the Nebraska question, and the right to speak in His name and to denounce His judgments? Is it secret, or traditional, or to be found in the open pages of His Holy Book? Whence comes their warrant? The intelligent people of America will not now be satisfied with mere assumptions. They are either speaking truly in His name or uttering the most horrid blasphemy. Whence, then, their authority? How comes their knowledge on this question so much above the range of the knowledge of other men, when in the common affairs of life, and especially in political matters, they are generally notoriously ignorant? Do they even agree upon the fundamentals of religious doctrine? On this subject an able contemporary, the Boston Post, remarks:

"Have not ecclesiastical councils been as notorious for their dogmatism as their turbulence? It was this feature as to them that prompted Dr. Hays, in deploring this disunion, there was a jubilee in hell every time the Presbyterian Assembly met together. 'Suppose an assembly of all the sects represented by these three thousand protestants in the name of Almighty God should be held; what sort of a jubilee would there be in heaven then? Would not the devils have a carnival? And are such to be allowed the claim of infallibility?'"

We were gratified to see the spirit with which this presumptuous memorial was received by Senators clothed with the authority of the people. It is a good omen, that many years removed from the bondage of priestcraft, which is equally as detestable as the bondage of kingcraft. They have tried both in the old world; it may be a long time before they shall obtain a foothold in the new. On the presentation and reading of the memorial, Mr. Douglas said:

"I hold it our duty to expose the conduct of men, who, either from ignorance, or willful blindness, will as it were, lead us into their sacred calling to arraign the conduct of Senators here in the discharge of their duties. I hold that this Senate is capable of judging whether or not the rights of the people are violated by the subversion of morals; whether it subjects us to the judgment of the Almighty, as are these political preachers, who do not understand the rights of the people; whether they are not, in their political conduct, exposing us to the judgment of the Almighty, and setting up a document here which is so full of contradictions, and so full of errors, as to violate all the rules of courtesy, propriety, and of honor."

they received from the church. If this pretension of the clergy be now sanctioned, all questions must be referred to the clergy for approval before Congress shall act. The nominal purports to speak in the name of the Almighty, and in that name to protect the rights of the people to settle for themselves. The clause relating to slavery, as it passed the Senate, is in these words:

"It being the true interest and meaning of this act to legislate slavery into any territory or State, not to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States."

Yet this true Democratic principle, this essence of the Democratic creed, is denounced by these New England clergymen, under their sign manual at Boston, Massachusetts, "in the name of Almighty God," and as "exposing us to the righteous judgments of the Almighty."

By what warrant do they thus speak? Do they find it in His Holy Word?—or have they a special revelation on this subject? Priestly tyranny has in all ages committed the most heinous crimes "in the name of Almighty God." It is easy to huddle together and cry, "We are the people of the Lord—we are the people of the Lord." But when comes this infidelity on the Nebraska question, and the right to speak in His name and to denounce His judgments? Is it secret, or traditional, or to be found in the open pages of His Holy Book? Whence comes their warrant? The intelligent people of America will not now be satisfied with mere assumptions. They are either speaking truly in His name or uttering the most horrid blasphemy. Whence, then, their authority? How comes their knowledge on this question so much above the range of the knowledge of other men, when in the common affairs of life, and especially in political matters, they are generally notoriously ignorant? Do they even agree upon the fundamentals of religious doctrine? On this subject an able contemporary, the Boston Post, remarks:

"Have not ecclesiastical councils been as notorious for their dogmatism as their turbulence? It was this feature as to them that prompted Dr. Hays, in deploring this disunion, there was a jubilee in hell every time the Presbyterian Assembly met together. 'Suppose an assembly of all the sects represented by these three thousand protestants in the name of Almighty God should be held; what sort of a jubilee would there be in heaven then? Would not the devils have a carnival? And are such to be allowed the claim of infallibility?'"

We were gratified to see the spirit with which this presumptuous memorial was received by Senators clothed with the authority of the people. It is a good omen, that many years removed from the bondage of priestcraft, which is equally as detestable as the bondage of kingcraft. They have tried both in the old world; it may be a long time before they shall obtain a foothold in the new. On the presentation and reading of the memorial, Mr. Douglas said:

"I hold it our duty to expose the conduct of men, who, either from ignorance, or willful blindness, will as it were, lead us into their sacred calling to arraign the conduct of Senators here in the discharge of their duties. I hold that this Senate is capable of judging whether or not the rights of the people are violated by the subversion of morals; whether it subjects us to the judgment of the Almighty, as are these political preachers, who do not understand the rights of the people; whether they are not, in their political conduct, exposing us to the judgment of the Almighty, and setting up a document here which is so full of contradictions, and so full of errors, as to violate all the rules of courtesy, propriety, and of honor."

Mr. Mason said: "In their character as ministers they have the tendency to threaten the Senate with the vengeance and judgments of the Almighty, whom they profess to serve. Such language was not respectful coming from any petitioners. But ministers of the gospel, and those who are called to the constitution or to our forms of government, and God forbid they ever should be known to it. It was the wise policy of our fathers, and it has been the policy of the United States, to keep ministers of the gospel, as such, and the government as wide apart as possible, and the wisdom of that policy was made manifest to-day by the conduct of the clergymen of the pool of political theology. The history of the world has shown the evils of recognizing ministers of the gospel as forming any part of the government. In all ages, and in all countries, those who have sought to mix religion with politics, and to give them power they proved the most arrogant of all others. On this occasion they come here, and in the name of the Almighty God, they invade the rights of the people, and presume, in His name, solemnly to pronounce upon the Senate, the judgments of the Almighty."

Mr. Butler says: "He had always entertained the highest respect for ministers of the gospel. His respect was so high that he would almost submit to their rebuke for an act performed in his official capacity. But that respect was for them in their appropriate and sacred calling, and when they abandoned their duty, descended from their high position, and engaged in the politics of the day, he would speak as viceregent of God on earth, and presume, in his name, solemnly to pronounce upon the Senate, the judgments of the Almighty."

Mr. Pettit said: "The Senator from South Carolina said he had great respect for clergymen, so long as their robes were unspotted, and they did not dabble in the polluted waters of the pool of political theology. He would agree with the Senator if he thought the pool of politics was any more polluted than the stagnant waters of the pool of contradictory theology, in which these clergymen lived. He loved the pool of politics far more pellucid, clean, healthy and beneficial than the stagnant waters which surrounded the contradictory creed and dogmas of those men who would contend upon any particular point of theology.—The Senate had an officer chosen for his ability and information, who was a brother clergyman, and with instructions to inquire and report to the Senate whether the Nebraska bill was in violation of the law of God, and whether the Senate had authority to pass it. The Senator from Louisiana, if Mr. Siler decided in the affirmative, he would be willing to revoke his action, and would have the bill sent to the House to send the bill back to the Senate."

Mr. Douglas again said: "What was this assumption of the name and power of the Almighty, but an attempt to establish in this country the right to determine the will of God on all subjects, and particularly in relation to the political and religious rights of the people? It was an attempt to put the legislation of the country in the hands and under the control of the church. No holder of a religious office was ever made a legislator, and no religious subject, but a subject of all political laws, they must receive, as the Divine Will, whatever they received from the church. If this pretension of the clergy be now sanctioned, all questions must be referred to the clergy for approval before Congress shall act. The nominal purports to speak in the name of the Almighty, and in that name to protect the rights of the people to settle for themselves. The clause relating to slavery, as it passed the Senate, is in these words:

"It being the true interest and meaning of this act to legislate slavery into any territory or State, not to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States."

Yet this true Democratic principle, this essence of the Democratic creed, is denounced by these New England clergymen, under their sign manual at Boston, Massachusetts, "in the name of Almighty God," and as "exposing us to the righteous judgments of the Almighty."

By what warrant do they thus speak? Do they find it in His Holy Word?—or have they a special revelation on this subject? Priestly tyranny has in all ages committed the most heinous crimes "in the name of Almighty God." It is easy to huddle together and cry, "We are the people of the Lord—we are the people of the Lord." But when comes this infidelity on the Nebraska question, and the right to speak in His name and to denounce His judgments? Is it secret, or traditional, or to be found in the open pages of His Holy Book? Whence comes their warrant? The intelligent people of America will not now be satisfied with mere assumptions. They are either speaking truly in His name or uttering the most horrid blasphemy. Whence, then, their authority? How comes their knowledge on this question so much above the range of the knowledge of other men, when in the common affairs of life, and especially in political matters, they are generally notoriously ignorant? Do they even agree upon the fundamentals of religious doctrine? On this subject an able contemporary, the Boston Post, remarks:

"Have not ecclesiastical councils been as notorious for their dogmatism as their turbulence? It was this feature as to them that prompted Dr. Hays, in deploring this disunion, there was a jubilee in hell every time the Presbyterian Assembly met together. 'Suppose an assembly of all the sects represented by these three thousand protestants in the name of Almighty God should be held; what sort of a jubilee would there be in heaven then? Would not the devils have a carnival? And are such to be allowed the claim of infallibility?'"

We were gratified to see the spirit with which this presumptuous memorial was received by Senators clothed with the authority of the people. It is a good omen, that many years removed from the bondage of priestcraft, which is equally as detestable as the bondage of kingcraft. They have tried both in the old world; it may be a long time before they shall obtain a foothold in the new. On the presentation and reading of the memorial, Mr. Douglas said:

"I hold it our duty to expose the conduct of men, who, either from ignorance, or willful blindness, will as it were, lead us into their sacred calling to arraign the conduct of Senators here in the discharge of their duties. I hold that this Senate is capable of judging whether or not the rights of the people are violated by the subversion of morals; whether it subjects us to the judgment of the Almighty, as are these political preachers, who do not understand the rights of the people; whether they are not, in their political conduct, exposing us to the judgment of the Almighty, and setting up a document here which is so full of contradictions, and so full of errors, as to violate all the rules of courtesy, propriety, and of honor."

James Pollock's Vote.

James Pollock, the whig candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania, whilst in Congress, in 1846, voted against a proposition to pay the infantry ten dollars a month; and the dragoons twenty dollars, under the bill to employ a volunteer force of fifty thousand men during the continuance of the Mexican war. We have looked at