

COMMITTEES OF VIGILANCE.—The undersigned, a committee appointed by a Democratic Convention of the 8th of September, 1846, have appointed the following persons in their respective townships, as a committee of vigilance, whose duty it is to call meetings of the Democratic Electors of each township on Saturday the 5th day of September next, to elect two delegates from each township to the Democratic County Convention, to be held on Tuesday evening, the 8th day of September, at the Court House in Towanda, for the purpose of placing in nomination a ticket to be supported at the general election.

The Stating Committee would respectfully urge upon the Committee of the Electors, the importance of the duties they are requested to perform. The success of the cause depends in a great measure, in a cordial and hearty support of the ticket formed at the County Convention, and to deserve and secure this support fair and timely notice should be given of the place and hour of holding the primary meetings, that every democrat who wishes may be present.

The meeting should be called at some convenient place, and kept open until every one has had an opportunity of voting.

- They would also urge upon Democrats the importance of a punctual attendance upon the primary meetings, and the selection of the electors will be made in their attendance upon the County Convention, and faithful in the discharge of the duty assigned them. It is to be hoped that every district will be fully represented, by duly elected delegates, as thereby much confusion and dissatisfaction will be avoided, which is ever likely to succeed when vacancies are supplied by substitution.
- E. O'NEARA, GOODRICH,
PETER G. WARD,
EDMON ASPENWALL,
FREDERICK ORWAN,
CHARLES STOCKWELL,
JOHN BALDWIN,
JOHN WATKINS.**

July 25, 1846. Stating Committee.

Athens tp.—Leri Westbrock, Don't Matthews; Athens bro.—C. H. Herrick, J. K. Wright; Asylum—Elnor Horton, John F. D.; Albany—Peter Sterner, Jos. Mcard; Armenia—John Kiff, Isaac Williams; Arrington—Benj. Ross, Morgan Deaton; Canton—Asa Pratt, O. P. Wilson; The Columbia—Myron Ballard, Jas. Sherwood; Durel—Joshua Kilmer, Benj. Lewis; Franklin—Eljah Blake, Samuel Smith; Granville—Stephen Vroman, D. B. Ross; Granville—Wm. C. Knapp, Richard Hillis; Leary—E. A. Bailey, Addison Hays; Litchfield—D. B. Gay, Engh Waleott; Moore—Chas. Holland, C. M. Knapp; Orrel—Julius Gorham, Sheldn Knapp; Pike—Geo. W. Northrop, Joshua S. Roberts; Rome—D. M. Waites, Hiram Mann; Ridgeberg—John Burt, Geo. Cooper; Standing Stone—Wm. Decker, Edward Patterson; Smithfield—P. P. Street, Laertes Smith; South Creek—John Reed, John Thompson; Springfield—Norman Conley, S. P. Mattocks; Sheshequin—F. G. Van Ostrand, John Horton; Springhill—Judson Stevens, D. B. Black; Towanda bro.—H. L. Shaw, Jeremiah Collins; Towanda tp.—Wm. Decker, Edward Patterson; Troy bro.—J. A. Paine Ballard, Delos Herrick; Troy tp.—John Porter, L. P. Williams; Ulster—John Bowman, James F. Gazy; Wyalusing—Sami. Gregory, E. Beeman; Wysox—D. E. Martin, Wm. D. Strobe; Wells—E. A. Ayres, S. B. Rowley; Windham—Wm. B. Dunham, D. M. Brainard; Warren—Rufus Burlington, David Hazelt.

The Mexican War.

It is mortifying and humiliating to witness the opposition manifested by a portion of the Federal press against the efforts made by the President and the citizens of this Republic, to defend the nation against the aggressions of Mexico. Some of the leading organs of federalism have denounced the present war, as "unholy, unrighteous and damnable;" and some of the less knowing ones, attribute it altogether to President Polk. It appears to be the settled policy of the leaders of that party, to assume, as they did in the late war with England, a hostile attitude towards their own government, and if possible, embarrass the President in his efforts to bring the war to a speedy termination. And when we hear the war with Mexico denounced as "the President's war," and the President charged with stealing from a neighboring nation a portion of her territory—we cannot but think that such American citizens (if they deserve the name) are but seeking a pretense on which to justify their recreancy to their country.

We mentioned last week, that one of the principal objections raised by these pseudo patriots to the action of our government, is the possession and occupancy by our troops, of the territory between the Neches and Rio Grande rivers. We also, in that article, introduced some of the evidences which not only justify the occupancy, but establish most unquestionably our right and title to that portion of the Texas territory. We now propose to introduce still further proofs on this subject—not that we expect to convince those who have already raised their voices against their country; but that we believe the great mass of the people honest; and that it is only necessary to place the truth before them to induce them to embrace it. We believe the great mass of the Whig party are honest, and if not deceived by their leaders, that they would sustain their country and their country's rights, even though the government should be directed by a Democratic President and Congress.

But we proposed to say something of the boundary between Texas and Mexico. It is known that Mexico never acknowledged the independence of Texas; consequently, Mexico has not specifically agreed to any boundary for the western limits of Texas; and she has consented to none farther than she has been compelled to do.

Texas declared herself independent in 1836, and by the act of her Congress, which contains the declaration of her independence, the boundaries of her own territory are defined as follows:

"Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine river, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico three leagues from land to the mouth of Rio Grande, thence up the principal stream of said river to its source, thence due north to the 32nd degree of north latitude, thence along the boundary line as defined in the treaty between the treaty and the United States and Spain to the beginning."

Approved, Dec. 19th 1836.

This declaration of independence, was immediately ratified by England, France, and the United States, and Texas recognized as an independent State. Not any particular portion of Texas, but the whole of Texas as defined by the act of the first Congress of that nation, of which the foregoing is an extract. When the nation of the world recognized the independence of Texas, they recognized the boundaries as defined in their declaration of independence.

Although Mexico has never acknowledged the independence of Texas, and probably never will, yet she has admitted that the Rio Grande is the proper boundary between that country and her. If it is to be established.

In the Treaty made between Mexico and Texas, immediately after the battle of San Jacinto, is the following article:

"ARTICLE 3. The Mexican troops will vacate the Territory of Texas, passing to the other side of the Rio Grande."

The Secret Treaty reads:

"ARTICLE 4. A treaty of commerce, amity and limits will be established between Mexico and Texas, the territory of the latter not to extend beyond the Rio Grande."

In all this treaty, not a word is said on the part of Mexico as to the propriety of making the Rio Grande the boundary, or as to the Neches being the proper boundary; on the other hand they have uniformly acknowledged the right of Texas to the whole of their country as defined by their act of Congress, to be just as good as any part of it. She has acknowledged that the east bank of the Rio Grande is not Mexico any more than all Texas is Mexico. In any part of this, we have the following official document sanctioned and dictated by Mexican authority.

On the 20th June, 1846, Gen. Well—then Commander-in-chief of the Mexican army, on the northeastern frontier—is used, in pursuance of a decree of the Mexican government, bearing date the 17th June, 1843, the following general orders:

"HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY OF THE NORTH, Mier, June 20, 1846."

"1. Adrian Wall, general of brigade, &c., made known."

"2. The armistice with the department of Texas having expired, and the war being, in consequence, recommenced against the inhabitants of that department, all communication with it ceases."

"3. Every individual, of whatever condition, who may come from the provisions of the preceding article, shall be regarded as a traitor, and shall receive the punishment prescribed in article 45, title 10, treatise 8 of the article of war."

"4. Every individual who may be found at the distance of one league from the left bank of the Rio Grande, will be regarded as a traitor, and shall receive the punishment prescribed in article 45, title 10, treatise 8 of the article of war."

"5. Every individual who may be comprehended within the provisions of the preceding article, and may be rash enough to fly at the sight of any force belonging to the supreme government, shall be put to death."

"6. A consideration of the situation of the towns of Laredo and Santa Rita de Ampudia, as well as of all the farm-houses beyond the Rio Grande, in which remain all the interests of the inhabitants of the line committed to my charge, I have this day resolved, from the supreme government, orders to determine the manner by which those interests are to be protected; but, until the determination of the supreme government be received, I warn all those who are beyond the limits here prescribed, to bring them within the line, or to abandon them; as those who disobey this order will infallibly suffer the punishment here established."

The foregoing document proves most conclusively that Mexico did consider all the territory east of the Rio Grande to be Texas. Had it been otherwise; had she considered it as not coming within the boundaries of Texas, and not included in the declaration of Texas independence, she would of course counted the inhabitants as Mexican citizens; and instead of proclaiming a war of extermination against them, she would have taken measures to defend and protect them. She evidently considered it a part of Texas, and resolved to make it the theatre of war against that revolted province, and to chastise her into submission. But in this she failed.—Texas maintained her independence until it was, according to the usage of nations, acknowledged by a great portion of the civilized world, and she took her position as a nation with the boundaries established by her own Congress—and admitted by all other nations who had recognized her independence.

Having become an independent nation, she proposes an alliance with the United States, which is accepted; and Texas is received into the Union as a member of the confederacy—by the almost unanimous consent of the people of both countries. By this act of annexation, Texas relinquishes her power as a nation, assumes the attitude of a State, and confides her interests to the care and protection of the general government. Shall she not be protected? We believe every American heart will respond YES; and that none will be found to denounce the defence of that portion of our territory as murder, and robbery, and aggression upon the soil of Mexico, but those whose hearts sympathize with the enemies of America, and whose patriotism is akin to the torquism of '76.

Polk and the Tariff.

We observe that in some sections of the State, great exertions are being made to bring into disrepute, the President, and those members of Congress who voted for the new tariff. It is more with feelings of contempt than pity, that we notice also, that several professing to be democrats, are joining the Whigs in this crusade.—Without exception, however, these democrats are such as have always been found, in all the great struggles between corporate wealth and power, and individual enterprise, to be arrayed on the side of the former. They turned their voices to those of the Whigs in denouncing General Jackson for his United States Bank veto—done more to defeat us in this state in 1844, than the whigs themselves. It is rule or ruin with them; the history of the State scarcely presents an instance of any great contest, involving a cardinal doctrine of Democracy with federalism, but they have failed. They failed with their Bank hobby—they hope to succeed with the tariff of 1842 hobby—or the one term hobby; and rely on the gullibility of the people to sustain them; if they get into power by it, all is right; if they fail, not one of them can be found but will deny that he was ever in favor of the tariff of 1842, or the one term principle. We were saying that such were the class of men who were assisting the whigs to denounce the President—and believe it—these men have the shame and hardihood to say that this state gave its vote for Polk in 1844, on the assurance that he was in favor of the tariff of 1842, and that without this assurance, he would have lost the state. A baser falsehood could not be uttered; and if these men gave any such assurances themselves in 1844, they gave them without authority. Let them, if they choose, desert the banner of Democracy, but leave it to wave unrent—undecorated; they may wish to flee again, as they have done before, to its broad folds. These men intimate that we have lost by the election of Polk, what would have been gained by the election of Clay? How do they know this? There is a majority in Congress opposed to the tariff of 1842, and in favor of the new bill; how could Mr. Clay have helped himself? He could not exercise the veto power; because both he and the whig party were pledged to a revision of the Constitution, to expunge this power; it was a measure out of which much capital was expected to be made. Henry Clay had said and written as many evils against the principles of the tariff of 1842, as he had ever said words in its favor. It was not until the very eve of the election, when he supposed his destiny was suspended on the single act, that he assumed himself in favor of the tariff of 1842; thereby giving the lie to all he had ever said—should constitute the principles of a tariff. This was a thing done more to defeat him, than any other thing; and yet we are to be found who have the hardihood to say that Polk was elected as the friend of the tariff of 1842.

The new tariff of 1846, differs in principle from the act of 1842 in that, it abolishes the specific and minimum duties, and substitutes the ad valorem; the former are instituted for protection merely, without regard to its

consequent effects on the consumer; the latter principle is the one which regulates the levying of taxes for the support of government, where each man is taxed in proportion to his property. Thus under the ad valorem principle, those who are able to dress in fine cloths pay more tax than those who can afford only the cheaper cloths; ad valorem duties meaning nothing more than a duty or tax in proportion to value. Whereas, specific duties are so much upon both, without regard to value; as for example, so much upon a ton of iron, coal, &c.—The new tariff, we say, abolishes the latter and adopts the former, or ad valorem principle—a principle which Mr. Clay has more strenuously advocated, than any man in the country. We insert here an extract from a speech made by him just before he left the Senate. Mr. Clay said:

"What are the other principles of the act? First, there is the principle, that a fixed ad valorem duty shall prevail and be in force at all times. For one I am to abide by that principle. There are certain vague notions about as to the utility and necessity of specified duties and discriminations, which I am persuaded, arise from a want of a right understanding of the subject. We have had the ad valorem principle practically in force ever since the compromise act was passed, and there has been no difficulty in administering the duties of the treasury on that principle."

"Compare the difference between the specific and the ad valorem system of duties, and I maintain that the latter is justly entitled to the preference."

"The one principle declares that the duty paid shall be upon the real value of the articles taxed; the specific principle imposes an unequal value."

"I say that, in theory, and according to every sound principle of justice, the ad valorem mode of taxation is entitled to the preference."

No man could more forcibly illustrate and vindicate the principles of the new tariff of 1846, than by using the language of Henry Clay in the foregoing extract.—What right then, have whigs to say, he would have approved another course, if elected? We ask for nothing more or better than the tariffs of Henry Clay, expressed above.

Pennsylvania and the Tariff.—Mr. Wilmot's Amendment.

What is to become of Pennsylvania? say the Whigs; how is her debt to be paid, or her manufacturers sustained, deceived and deserted as she is? say they. We will tell them how. Let the Whigs be honest and sincere in their pretensions; let them act in good faith toward the people, and forever repudiate the despotic means adopted by them, to get into power. Let them resolve to go for the best interests of their country, rather than the success of their party, and Pennsylvania will do well enough. What reason have the people to believe that they cherish more love for Pennsylvania, than they do for their party? We doubt whether any tariff bill, had its provisions been ever so favorable to the interests of this State, would have received the support of the Whigs, for the reason that it received the sanction of a democratic Congress and Administration. As proof of this, we refer to the attempt made by Mr. Wilmot to effect an amendment of the duties in the new tariff on Coal and Iron; by which these articles could have had all the advantages given by the tariff of 1842. What support did his amendment receive? EVERY WHIG MEMBER OF THIS STATE VOTED AGAINST IT.

Again. The delegation from this State had it in his power to secure almost any duties they could reasonably ask for by the new tariff; but they refused, and with the exception of Mr. Wilmot, voted against the bill; for the same reason we presume, that a similar delegation on a former occasion, except one, voted to re-charter the United States Bank; assuming it to be granted that the people were too gullible to understand their rights, or accept of any explanation. If Pennsylvania has not all the advantages under the tariff of 1842, that she had under that of 1846, it is her own fault. Mr. Wilmot endeavored to secure it for her; it was in her power to have it; but it was rejected. Why? Because it was not the tariff of 1842. This is the beginning, conclusion, and the whole argument.

This District and Mr. Wilmot.

We publish below, from the Democratic press of the other two Counties of this Congressional district, the opinion of the course of Mr. Wilmot. We are pleased to notice the frankness with which the *Toga Eagle* speaks on the subject. A labored effort has been made by some disaffected factious in this county, to place the *Eagle* in a false position. It has been caught up by the Whigs and bandied about the district and state, with the hope of injuring Mr. Wilmot. We cannot hope these men will be as ready to do justice, as they were to pervert it.

In addition, we also give an extract from the *Upland Union*, Delaware county, of the same subject. It speaks the truth fearlessly, and put to shame the sneaking policy of those who have not the courage to abide the issue.

[From the *Toga Eagle*.]

The speech of Hon. D. Wilmot on the Tariff question is highly spoken of by both whigs and democrats. It shall be given to our readers at the earliest moment. Mr. Wilmot may be blamed by some of his constituency for acting the part he has done on the tariff question, but we cannot see how he could have done otherwise and be consistent with his public declarations, and what he believed to be just and right. Of late years, looking one way and rowing another, has been the order of the day with prominent politicians of both parties. In fact, so much so, that little reliance is now placed in professed patriots, by their democrats or whigs.—Their assertions and promises are looked upon with distrust, and only where their broken promises and violated friendships are not known, can such men carry any way in public matters.—Mr. Wilmot has proved an exception to this rule. He has not to our knowledge broken his faith in a single instance, but has had the moral courage to act in accordance with his publicly declared opinions as regards the tariff. During the canvass of 1844 Mr. Wilmot was denounced as a "free trade" candidate and in consequence of such assertions, which his opponents knew were false, his public speeches during the campaign were more on the tariff subject than any other. He covered up nothing whatever, but candidly and readily answered all questions propounded. Mr. W.'s opponent was Col. Ball of Towanda, a gentleman for whom we have the highest respect. The Colonel took the field as the tariff candidate—pledged himself to sustain the act of 42, and the well known result, was Mr. Wilmot's triumphant election by some 3000 majority. We cannot see, therefore, how a constituency can attach any blame to a Representative doing in good faith what he professed before his election, and what they ought to have understood, as Mr. W. canvassed the district in person.

[From the Northern (Susquehanna) Democrat.]

The attempts of some pretins to disparage our present worthy representative, while they excite our surprise for their effrontery, merit only the contempt of honest men of every party. It is well known, as we have before stated, that Mr. Wilmot's district is strongly in favor of a change in the present Tariff system, not approaching Free Trade, however, but affording both revenue for Government, and incalculable protection to all branches of American Industry, according to their importance. Mr. Wilmot carried out those views according to the express wishes and prayers of his constituents; and no reproach that corrupt and monied croakers can concoct, will in the least diminish their confidence in him, or impair their regard for the principles he has so ably vindicated. They know their wants—they know them, and in discharging a consequent duty, has won for himself imperishable honors, which will shine but the brighter as they hunt him with their virulence and obloquy.

[From the Upland Union.]

Hon. DAVID WILMOT.—The eloquent, talented, and we may add orthodox; democratic Representative stands a conspicuous target for the shafts of federalism and its truckling allies for voting with the democracy of the Union on a question of revenue to supply the public treasury, and liquidate the expenses of the government. In the memorable campaign of 1844, Mr. Wilmot, then a candidate for Congress, took the field in support of the now enemies of the Baltimore democratic convention, not as a *timeserving, trimming* politician, but as an honest advocate of the principles avowed by that convention, and in his public address and contrasted exposition of democracy and federalism, openly adverted to the injustice of the tariff of 1842, and the unequal bearing of its provisions on the agricultural and commercial interests of the country, which constitute eleven-twelfths of its productive industry, and urged what the intelligent and honest of all parties had declared from the day of its passage, that modification must and under these circumstances he was elected by a majority of 3000, and in strict conformity to his expressed sentiments, and the known will of his constituents, he voted with the phalanx of democracy for such modifications of the *old tariff* bill of 1842 as local and conflicting sectional interests enabled the majority to obtain. It is alleged that he has violated the instructions of the

legislature of the State—his constituents had the right to instruct him. Our political experience has taught us to distrust both the propriety and validity of legislative instructions. We remember when men professing democracy offered at democratic meetings, resolutions in favor of the United States Bank, and we also remember that a democratic legislature passed resolutions in favor of the re-charter of that bank, and that every federal paper and bank vassal predicted eternal ruin to the country, if that, then insolvent and swindling institution was not re-chartered.—We never believed that the resolutions above alluded to spoke the sentiments of the people of Pennsylvania, neither do we now believe that the democracy of Pennsylvania will make the tariff of 1842, or any other tariff ever yet passed, or hereafter to be passed, the test of their political faith. A tariff is a question of expediency as well as principle, depending on existing circumstances at the time of its passage, and has under the increased momentum of the protecting principle, which Clay's Compromise Bill had for a while stifled, become with many a mere scramble for dollars and cents. The great and fundamental principle of democracy so far as we are informed, is, first, to levy on the people the least possible amount of revenue or taxes, and in its assessment to discriminate in favor of protection to all the great interests of the country, and to distribute the burdens of taxation with greatest possible equality. Such are the views of Mr. Wilmot, and we shall take great pleasure in laying his speech before the public, which is said to be one of the ablest made on the subject during the late debate.

[From the Westfield Standard.]

It will afford great pleasure to the democrats of this Congressional district, to notice the just estimation of the talent and ability of its member, and of his course in Congress. There are some here envious of his fame and reputation, and who would crush him, if they could. But it is of no use. There is a too deep settled and fixed attachment for him, for such shafts to reach. He is winning the laurels which it was ever believed were in store for him. May they cluster more and more, by the devotion of his talents to the cause of the people.

[From the *Westfield Standard*.]

Hon. DAVID WILMOT, of the Bradford County district, was the only member from Pennsylvania, who had the moral courage to vote for a reduction of the Tariff to a revenue standard. He deserves the thanks of Democrats, every where, for his firmness of purpose in thus adhering to the principles of democracy, so shamefully deserted by his colleagues.—That he will be sustained by his own constituents we have not a doubt, for he is remembered that it is the interest of democracy, and the weak and cowardly party leader, and not the hardy yeomanry of Pennsylvania, that are disposed to make common cause with whiggery upon the tariff question.

[From the Chester County Democrat.]

Every member from this State voted in the negative, except Mr. Wilmot from Bradford and Susquehanna counties, an agricultural district. Mr. Wilmot is a high-minded and honorable man, and we doubt not truly represents the views of his constituents on this subject. When he was a candidate for the seat he now so ably fills, he took open and decided ground against the Tariff of '42, and was elected by a majority exceeding 3000.

[From the Washington Union.]

From Pennsylvania, so distinguished in support of the war of '76, and 1812, and so ever ready to pour out the life-blood of her sons in defence of the country—so devoted to the Union—so true to the democratic faith on all other questions but the tariff, there was but a single vote for this great measure—and that came from the bold and fearless, the truly able and eloquent Wilmot. Let him wait but a year to see the operation of this bill defeat all the predictions of his opponents, and his vote, though now alone, will be the vote of Pennsylvania.

[From the Carbonate Democrat.]

As our readers will perceive, we are able this week to lay before them the important intelligence of the triumphant passage of the *Reform Tariff Bill* through the House. It has been only from the peculiar urgency of our Foreign Relations, that the measure has been so long delayed. It has been anxiously waited for by the friends of the Administration, and its success will be hailed with joy by every true Democrat. To Mr. WILMOT, belongs the honor of correctly representing not only his own constituency, but a large portion of the Pennsylvania Democracy. An integrity, an honesty, rendered so conspicuous by the surrounding defection is worthy of all praise. All eyes are now turned anxiously to the Senate. We predict its success, though it will not be without a fierce struggle.

[From the Clinton Democrat.]

In the discussion of the bill in the House several of the Pennsylvania delegation gave their views at large, and among others Mr. Wilmot of Bradford. I deeply regret that I did not hear him, for it is universally conceded that he made a most brilliant effort. I was told by a prominent whig, that he made the best speech upon the subject. Mr. W. is quite a young man—amiable in manners, and modest in deportment; and tho' the architect of his own fortune, already stands prominent among the most prominent men of Congress. Talents of so high an order, controlled, as they are, in his case, by unwavering integrity, and genuine democratic principle, cannot fail to become the property of the great and glorious old Keystone.

[From the Elmira Gazette.]

Hon. DAVID WILMOT, of Bradford County is the only member of Congress from Pennsylvania, that voted for the new tariff bill. He not only voted for it but made one of the ablest speeches in the House for it. It is really gratifying to find one pure democrat among the members from that state. One that has not been influenced by the iron-masters and owners of our lands, but who feels it his duty to legislate for the interest of the masses instead of the aggrandizing few. That vote of his elevated him far above his colleagues with the democrats of that state, who hold principles as paramount to interest. His star is in the ascendant and the time will come when the democracy of the state will point with pride to that vote, and exult that they had such a man in the councils of the nation. Thousands of them now speak his name in praise. We pretend to know something of the views of its democracy, and can assure the friends of the protective system that the people are not so unanimous in favor of a protective tariff as the vote of its members of congress indicate.

The vote of Pennsylvania on this question is similar to the one given on the re-chartering of the U. S. Bank by congress, previous to its being vetoed by Gen. Jackson. Every mem-

ber but one voted for its re-charter. The reason of their doing so was, because it was believed in that spirit, and they conceived it to be in their interest to have it re-chartered. But never were men more mistaken, unless it is those who voted against remodeling the tariff. As those as the people get their eyes open a change came over their dreams, they saw that they and soon were found arrayed against it. They will be with the tariff. The people will soon discover that a protective tariff is not democratic and ruinous to the laborer, and therefore set their faces against it. It cannot be possible that the democrats of that state will cling to a measure that even Great Britain feels is too illiberal a policy for her, and about to repeal their restrictive laws. Will they contend for a restriction upon commerce, and thus attempt to place our government, which should keep in advance of the monarchial governments, in all that constitutes the true principles of equality and liberty?

The vote of Mr. Wilmot in the dawn of a day when the democracy of that old democratic state will rise above the narrow and selfish feeling that now actuates a portion of it, and come out boldly against fostering an interest to the detriment of all others, and again occupy a position which was elevated in principle and ennobling in character, as any state in the Union.

[From the American Sentinel—a firm and zealous advocate of the Tariff of 1842.]

I may be permitted to say in regard to one gentleman from Pennsylvania, (I mean the Hon. Mr. WILMOT) that his entire course in Congress—his vote on the Tariff as it finally passed the House of Representatives, will be fully vindicated, triumphantly sustained, by an intelligent and patriotic constituency.

Mr. Wilmot, in his vote, has acted in perfect harmony with the past character, thereby showing to the world that his devotion to professed principles and measures were not assumed for the occasion, but sincere, and of a lofty and pure character which will ever be remembered as an able and eloquent defender of the rights and paramount interest of the country. Conduct so worthy and patriotic can only, in the end, to bring with it the respect, confidence and the credit so eminently due.

[From the York Gazette.]

For the justification of Mr. Wilmot for his course in relation to the bill, he has furnished abundant argument on the floor of the House. He delivered during the discussion of the bill in Committee of the whole, one of the ablest speeches of the session, against the injustice, the gross inequalities, of the bill of 1842. Brilliant as was his first effort, on the Oregon question and high as was the intellectual rank assigned him by general consent on that occasion, he took all greater surplus on Wednesday, when his speech to the House almost entirely from his own sickness, he obtained the floor, and being physically somewhat enfeebled, he delivered a tariff of 1842 some of the hardest blows ever received from any quarter. I will send you a copy of his speech, as soon as published. You will find that it justifies all I have said, and can say in relation to it—and justifies fully the application of the terms in which the Washington Union refers to Mr. W. as "the bold and fearless, the truly able and eloquent Wilmot."

[From the Troy Banner.]

Mr. Wilmot, in accordance with the expectations of his friends, has proven himself a consistent man—a firm adherent to the principles, and an able supporter of the measures, of the Democratic party. In all this, however, he has done no more than his duty; his constituents required, no more than he stood pledged to do. Although upon a recent trying occasion he stood alone, so far as the Congressional Delegation from this State was concerned, yet he did not flinch from duty, he met the issue, and knew he would meet it fearlessly, and by his voice upon the occasion, helped to repeal one of the most odious acts of the "Hardy Cider" Congress of 1842. For this he deserves and will receive the thanks of his constituents. They will award to him the praise of, "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

[From the Lancaster Democrat.]

The entire Pennsylvania delegation—with one solitary exception—voted against the bill. That solitary exception is, the Hon. DAVID WILMOT, of Bradford county. We presume, in consequence of this vote, that Mr. Wilmot will be assailed with no little bitterness by a portion of the Democratic presses of the State as well as by the invited Whig press; and that not only will his motives and integrity be called in question, but that he will be boldly accused of having misrepresented the wishes of his constituents. It is but justice to Mr. Wilmot to state that he has used no disguise, no reference to his hostility to a protective Tariff, and that the views which he entertains on the Tariff question, are entertained by a large majority of the citizens of Bradford and Troy counties, the district which he so ably represents. When a candidate for the seat which he now holds, he was opposed by Mr. Bell, an ardent friend of the Tariff of 1842. Protection and anti-protection was the leading issue made at the polls, and Mr. Wilmot triumphed as the candidate of the anti-protectionists! Mr. Wilmot would have sacrificed his own views of right, and the views of his constituents, if he had not voted as he did. It is said that Mr. Wilmot defined his position on the Tariff question in a speech of rare ability and eloquence.

[From the Huntingdon Globe.]

HONOR TO WHOM HONOR IS DUE.—The Hon. DAVID WILMOT stands alone in the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress on that great national question, the Tariff. I would ask, what does he stand with the great Democratic party of the nation? You find him there with the majority, justifying for the principles of equity and justice—the principles on which we have always understood the Democratic party is founded—while even the Democratic delegation from this State are contending for the principles proclaimed by the great leader and pensioned-advocate of the whig party, DAVID WENSTER, who has declared that it is the duty of the Government to take care of the rich, and the rich to take care of the poor.

[From the New York News.]

The only vote from Pennsylvania for the bill was given by Mr. WILMOT, the eloquent and truly sound Representative from the Bradford District. With this exception, the members from Pennsylvania, who were all present, voted in solid phalanx against the bill.

[From the York Democrat Press.]

One democrat from Pennsylvania voted for the Tariff Bill, Mr. WILMOT, of Bradford County. This gentleman boldly declared his opposition to the tariff of 1842, when a candidate

for the office of Governor of this State, and was elected by a majority of 3000. He was elected by a majority of 3000, and in strict conformity to his expressed sentiments, and the known will of his constituents, he voted with the phalanx of democracy for such modifications of the *old tariff* bill of 1842 as local and conflicting sectional interests enabled the majority to obtain. It is alleged that he has violated the instructions of the

legislature of the State—his constituents had the right to instruct him. Our political experience has taught us to distrust both the propriety and validity of legislative instructions. We remember when men professing democracy offered at democratic meetings, resolutions in favor of the United States Bank, and we also remember that a democratic legislature passed resolutions in favor of the re-charter of that bank, and that every federal paper and bank vassal predicted eternal ruin to the country, if that, then insolvent and swindling institution was not re-chartered.—We never believed that the resolutions above alluded to spoke the sentiments of the people of Pennsylvania, neither do we now believe that the democracy of Pennsylvania will make the tariff of 1842, or any other tariff ever yet passed, or hereafter to be passed, the test of their political faith. A tariff is a question of expediency as well as principle, depending on existing circumstances at the time of its passage, and has under the increased momentum of the protecting principle, which Clay's Compromise Bill had for a while stifled, become with many a mere scramble for dollars and cents. The great and fundamental principle of democracy so far as we are informed, is, first, to levy on the people the least possible amount of revenue or taxes, and in its assessment to discriminate in favor of protection to all the great interests of the country, and to distribute the burdens of taxation with greatest possible equality. Such are the views of Mr. Wilmot, and we shall take great pleasure in laying his speech before the public, which is said to be one of the ablest made on the subject during the late debate.

[From the Westfield Standard.]

It will afford great pleasure to the democrats of this Congressional district, to notice the just estimation of the talent and ability of its member, and of his course in Congress. There are some here envious of his fame and reputation, and who would crush him, if they could. But it is of no use. There is a too deep settled and fixed attachment for him, for such shafts to reach. He is winning the laurels which it was ever believed were in store for him. May they cluster more and more, by the devotion of his talents to the cause of the people.

[From the *Westfield Standard*.]

Hon. DAVID WILMOT, of the Bradford County district, was the only member from Pennsylvania, who had the moral courage to vote for a reduction of the Tariff to a revenue standard. He deserves the thanks of Democrats, every where, for his firmness of purpose in thus adhering to the principles of democracy, so shamefully deserted by his colleagues.—That he will be sustained by his own constituents we have not a doubt, for he is remembered that it is the interest of democracy, and the weak and cowardly party leader, and not the hardy yeomanry of Pennsylvania, that are disposed to make common cause with whiggery upon the tariff question.

[From the Chester County Democrat.]

Every member from this State voted in the negative, except Mr. Wilmot from Bradford and Susquehanna counties, an agricultural district. Mr. Wilmot is a high-minded and honorable man, and we doubt not truly represents the views of his constituents on this subject. When he was a candidate for the seat he now so ably fills, he took open and decided ground against the Tariff of '42, and was elected by a majority exceeding 3000.

[From the Washington Union.]

From Pennsylvania, so distinguished in support of the war of '76, and 1812, and so ever ready to pour out the life-blood of her sons in defence of the country—so devoted to the Union—so true to the democratic faith on all other questions but the tariff, there was but a single vote for this great measure—and that came from the bold and fearless, the truly able and eloquent Wilmot. Let him wait but a year to see the operation of this bill defeat all the predictions of his opponents, and his vote, though now alone, will be the vote of Pennsylvania.

[From the Carbonate Democrat.]

As our readers will perceive, we are able this week to lay before them the important intelligence of the triumphant passage of the *Reform Tariff Bill* through the House. It has been only from the peculiar urgency of our Foreign Relations, that the measure has been so long delayed. It has been anxiously waited for by the friends of the Administration, and its success will be hailed with joy by every true Democrat. To Mr. WILMOT, belongs the honor of correctly representing not only his own constituency, but a large portion of the Pennsylvania Democracy. An integrity, an honesty, rendered so conspicuous by the surrounding defection is worthy of all praise. All eyes are now turned anxiously to the Senate. We predict its success, though it will not be without a fierce struggle.

[From the Clinton Democrat.]

In the discussion of the bill in the House several of the Pennsylvania delegation gave their views at large, and among others Mr. Wilmot of Bradford. I deeply regret that I did not hear him, for it is universally conceded that he made a most brilliant effort. I was told by a prominent whig, that he made the best speech upon the subject. Mr. W. is quite a young man—amiable in manners, and modest in deportment; and tho' the architect of his own fortune, already stands prominent among the most prominent men of Congress. Talents of so high an order, controlled, as they are, in his case, by unwavering integrity, and genuine democratic principle, cannot fail to become the property of the great and glorious old Keystone.

[From the Elmira Gazette.]

Hon. DAVID WILMOT, of Bradford County is the only member of Congress from Pennsylvania, that voted for the new tariff bill. He not only voted for it but made one of the ablest speeches in the House for it. It is really gratifying to find one pure democrat among the members from that state. One that has not been influenced by the iron-masters and owners of our lands, but who feels it his duty to legislate for the interest of the masses instead of the aggrandizing few. That vote of his elevated him far above his colleagues with the democrats of that state, who hold principles as paramount to interest. His star is in the ascendant and the time will come when the democracy of the state will point with pride to that vote, and exult that they had such a man in the councils of the nation. Thousands of them now speak his name in praise. We pretend to know something of the views of its democracy, and can assure the friends of the protective system that the people are not so unanimous in favor of a protective tariff as the vote of its members of congress indicate.