

The Montrose Democrat

Dedicated to Politics, News, Literature, Agriculture, Science, and Morality.

S. R. & E. B. CHASE, PROPRIETORS

MONTROSE, PA., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1851.

VOLUME VIII. NUMBER 39.

LETTER

Hon. George W. Woodward.
WILKESBARRE, 6th Sept., 1851.

My Dear Sir:—The demands for the publication of the remarks in regard to the renewed charge of Native Americanism, introduced into my speech at Honesdale last Tuesday evening, were so numerous and pressing, before I left your county, that I dare not withhold them: They must be reported. But as my speech was unmediated and desultory, and I had no notes of it, how can I report it? Without pretending to recover the exact language used, I propose to describe, in the form of an observation on that occasion, and to add some facts and further explanations which were not used then.

Let it be understood then, that I went to attend to no expectation of making a political speech. I went there as I am accustomed to do at every Court in Wayne county, to attend to professional business. Whilst at the Susquehanna Register, a newspaper published at Montrose, fell usually under my eye, in which I found the following article:

Locofoco Comparing Germans and Their Double-Dealing with Foreigners.

The Locofoco party assumes the principles and practice to be supremely those of that who is the friend of the Irishman. The Native American party, in their vocabulary, where Irishmen live, is the Whig party; while Peter Sken Smith, the great Mogul of Nativism, preaches Democracy from the ruins of that burned Chertoh. The Whig party is the Native Party, totally and entirely; and yet a Locofoco Congress turns William E. Robinson, a Whig Irishman, out of the hall, and gives a reporter's desk to young and progressive Democracy. At the top of their voices they shout for Bigler and our "naturalized friends," and send Hon. Geo. W. Woodward to proclaim through the length and breadth of the Keystone the benefits of Bankmanism. With lying professions of friendship to the Irish of our country, they hoot such men as John Boyle out of their Convention, and then coolly turn around after the presentation of a reconstruc-tion signed by six thousand Democrats of Philadelphia city to the Harrisburg Convention, against the nomination of Campbell, and accuse the Whig press of opposing him on account of his religious beliefs. Below is an article from the Harrisburg American, which shows the position of Woodward, Bigler's right-hand stump:

"The Locofoco industriously circulate the charge, that the Whigs have ever been hostile to foreigners. They pretend to be their exclusive friends, and claim that in their exile can the emigrants find any other refuge, since we showed P. F. Stanton, a Locofoco member of Congress from Tennessee, had said he 'could see no difference between carrying a free negro to Africa and bringing a German or Irishman to this country.' We also showed that several prominent Locofocos in Philadelphia city and county, had charged un-naturalized foreigners entirely destroying, in many places the capacity of the delegate system, and then charged that they had charged them with 'gorging the polls with illegal votes,' and striking a severe blow at the party and perpetuity of our institutions; and with ignorance of our political system! We now have another evidence of Locofoco regard for foreigners."

Wm. Bigler is studying the State. Finding his need he has induced G. W. Woodward to accompany him. The Pennsylvania is out for the campaign, that he will speak in Union county on the 16th of September, that he presided in Wilkesbarre at the meeting Mr. Bigler addressed, and that he made there a "big address," and that he made there a "big address" to the U. S. Senate. He was a very prominent candidate for the same post last winter, and would have been nominated on their ticket for the Supreme Bench, had he not refused the nomination of his name. Judge Woodward is thus "high in the faith."

Mr. Woodward moved to amend the amendment by adding thereto the words "and that the said committee be also instructed to report to the Convention, whether it be expedient to amend the Constitution as to the admission of foreigners who arrive after the fourth day of July, 1851, from ACQUIRING THE RIGHT TO VOTE OR TO HOLD OFFICE IN THIS COMMONWEALTH."

In defense of this amendment, Mr. Woodward (see page 44th, 5th volume) said: "Then follow some sentences extracted from a speech set down to my account in the Debates, which are an extracted and arranged to convey no adequate idea of the speech itself. Then comes the following:—"

"These are Mr. Woodward's sentiments, as we find them on the Journals of the Convention. Look at the double-dealing of the Locofoco party. In Potter county, in Lawrence county, in Mercer county, and in the entire free-soil region, Locofoco denounce Governor Johnson as Free-soiler. In Philadelphia, Locofoco denounce him as an Abolitionist. In one part of the State Locofoco favor a Protective Tariff in other parts they go for Free Trade. In one place they denounce foreigners with protestations of eternal friendship, and in another they seek to proscribe Native Americans by sending Judge Woodward along with Mr. Bigler."

The next day I was invited and urged by gentlemen of the Standing Committee of the Democratic party, and by many other personal and political friends, to attend and address the democratic nomination meeting to be held that evening in the Court House. I took this Montrose paper with me, and when called on in the meeting, in which many large, I rose and proceeded to discuss the principles involved in the present Convention, and contended that the election of Col. Bigler, Seth Clower, and

the whole judicial ticket of the Democratic party was demanded by a due regard to the interests of our State, and the peace and integrity of our Union.

I then proceeded to point out the false issues which Gov. Johnston and certain Whig editors are getting up to divert public attention from the real questions before the public, and among others mentioned this gross and gratuitous assault on me as originating in the Harrisburg American, a paper I had understood to be published by a brother of Gov. Johnston, and in this Montrose sheet which seemed to be the organ of the Hon. William Jessup. In speaking of this paper I said it was published by a Mr. J. C. Miller, whom I did not know—that judging from his columns he seemed to be one of those who delight to "distort the truth—accumulate lies, and pile the pyramid of calumny."

That I found in the columns of the paper before me such language as the following applied to the Hon. Ellis Lewis:

"Hon. Ellis Lewis. Heavens, what a burlesque that such a man should be called Honorable—however it is only in the name, for none think him so, while Whig and Democrat know him to be the dishonorable Ellis Lewis."

"It has been alleged that the charge of this would-be-Democrat (still speaking of Judge Lewis) this deceitful, ambitious demagogue, writing himself into notice, and putting his name and fame through the medium of the public prints was false. This, to be sure, is easy to assert, but the facts can be readily shown. Bradford and various other counties, &c."

And the following language applied to some Montrose Editors who had been discussing Judge Jessup's fitness for the Supreme Bench:

"With pretensions of piety upon their lips, they snubbed to their aid charges alike scandalous and false against their brethren, never raised the accusation. With an impious appeal to the Most High upon their lips, they made up their crowd of approving hearers a false story of their brother's iniquity."

"We can hardly write of this in proper temper. When we see a man professing a belief in the faith of the Bible and Church, leading one who has stood a pillar of our Church for years, with epithets that alike insult truth and disgrace his own professions, we can hardly hold ourselves within proper bounds. Yet these are facts. They have been subjects of street conversation among men who make none of the professions of those editors, who claim no liberty like one of those editors. The cause of liberty was once espoused by the noblest of our race, and betrayed by his Master for silver."

And again the following about the same editors:—

"We have already unmasked those editors to the public, in all their meanness and malignity, and we deem it unnecessary to take any notice of their weekly effusions of personal spite. We have heard but one opinion expressed among all parties in relation to their personal attacks upon Judge Jessup, and that is, that it will injure their paper and their party (Democracy) if they cannot injure us, they have neither character nor honesty to lose in the same procedure with anything else to lose). We coincide with the opinion of an old and prominent citizen of New Milford, that when such an upstart blackguard as the junior editor of the Democrat assaults the character of a good man, the best reply is a whipping post and a raw-hide well laid on."

Such are some of the gems that bestud the paper in which I found myself arraigned.

In view of these eloquent extracts and the opinion of the opinion of the old and prominent citizen of New Milford in point of principle, however it might or might not be justly applicable to the "junior Editor of the Democrat," and my firm conviction that the moral constitution of Mr. John C. Miller would be benefited by some of that same sort of medicine.

I remarked that in former days, when Jas. W. Chapman published the Susquehanna Register, it was a decent paper—that Mr. Chapman was a gentleman, and that Mr. Chapman's paper was a gentlemanly paper, and that the paper in his hands, as depicted in his politics, was not what it now is, but distinguished for the meanness of its humor, and the interests of its columns. That it seems now to have greatly degenerated since it had become the special organ of Judge Jessup. That until further informed, I would not hold Judge Jessup responsible for this gross personal and professional conduct, but that gentleman had always been most happy, and his desire was that they should continue to do so—that anybody opposed I should support his election—that I was for the whole Democratic judicial ticket, not only on account of its justice, but especially of its comparative meanness—because that if I found this assailed on me I would prove to him and his editor, that I was just as competent to discuss him as his editor was to discuss me. That I was in Montrose somewhere about the year 1850, and in the public meeting, at which Judge Jessup, in the presence and with the approbation of the best men of the party in that county, was read out the democratic party, and that I had seen him ever since on his "winding way."

But for the present, I would not review his public career.

I then proceeded to notice in detail the charges contained in the article in which I am made to figure, and which is quoted above. I said it was not true that the Democratic party had sent me to proclaim through the length and breadth of the Keystone, the beauties of Bankmanism. Had ever heard me advocate the nomination of Mr. Buchanan. That the assertion that the article extracted from the Harrisburg American shows the conduct of Woodward, Bigler's right-hand stump, a libel and slanderous. That article contains a garbled and mendacious perversion of a speech impudently made under circumstances hereafter to be explained, and as to my being Bigler's right-hand stump, I did not remember that I ever made a stump speech in my life. If occasional performances in my boyhood, on the stump of my father's farm, there is in my mind any trace of it, it was not the "winding way."

That true it was, that Woodward was "high in the faith," and that I did not know him, and having his share just as doubly

armed. As to my accompanying him, I had not accompanied him a rod. To-day he is west of the mountains, and I am here in Wayne. In all these circumstances, these various journals were in error. If they were important enough to be stated, they were worth stating truly.

"These were Mr. Woodward's sentiments, as we find them on the Journals of the Convention." The speech from which these extracts are taken occupies more than two pages of the volume of debates, and these extracts are scarcely more than one third of that speech—

"Arise Mr. W. and say to the Convention that the Whigs are engaged in diffusing this libel through the county, with a view of injuring Col. Bigler's election. Why am I assailed? I am a private individual, seeking no office, nor in any way before the public. As yet, I have not traveled a mile to promote Bigler's election. I made a speech in Luzerne county the first week in August, because a democratic meeting called on me to do so. The next week, when Col. Bigler came here, I presided at the mass meeting because the Committee of arrangements appointed me to do so. I made no speech on that occasion, save only an introduction of Col. Bigler to the audience, and now I am here on professional business, and I find this stale calumny set afoot, not only to draw off attention from the real and important interests at stake. Well, the subject must now be fully discussed and we shall see how much the Whigs will make by their motion."

I then proceeded to maintain the following propositions:

1. That the introduction into the Convention of a proposition to inquire into the rights of foreigners was not by me, but by Mr. Thomas, a member from Chester county.
2. That when it had been displaced and defeated by my proposed amendment, and that also had been withdrawn, Mr. Konigsmacher, a member from Lancaster county, renewed Mr. Thomas' motion.

Both of these motions were defeated in the Convention, and I had no doubt whether now engaged in promoting Johnson's re-election. I wish, Mr. Editor, to mark here the difference between the propositions of Thomas and Konigsmacher, and mine. Magree's resolution was in these words:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of free persons of color, and fugitive slaves, from other States or territories."

Thomas' motion as originally made by him and renewed by Konigsmacher, was to add foreigners to the inquiry and the resolution, as they proposed to amend it, would read thus:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

That is, they proposed that the committee should inquire into the expediency of excluding all foreigners from our soil, whether coming to Pennsylvania from other States or from foreign countries. A denial of all political privileges was involved in their proposition, for if we were to shut out foreigners from our soil, we would not let them set foot on our soil, how could they vote or hold office amongst us? Aye, all political and social privileges were to be denied them—all chance to engage in the business, and industry, and enterprise of the State, was to be cut off from them, and for their families, and for their children, all this was involved in this proposition. According to the motion from the Whig side of the house all foreigners were to be put on a footing with negroes, and like them to be fenced out of Pennsylvania. Such was the proposition assumed by Whiggery.

Now, that the committee be also instructed to inquire into the propriety of so amending the constitution as to prevent any foreigners who may arrive in this State after the 4th of July, 1851, from acquiring the right to vote or to hold office in this Commonwealth.

This was in November, 1837. Nearly four years of contemplation and discussion, and a long time enough to go over the world. And who were to be affected by it? Nobody, then in our country, or who for nearly four years thereafter, should come to our country, but only the subjects of Foreign Princes, who should arrive after that period. And as to those of our own country, and those from other fields of enterprise, they were to be excluded, and make their homes amongst us, and rear their families, and live in all respects as we do, except only that unless they arrived before the time specified they were not to vote or to hold office. The sons of even such foreigners as may amendement would touch, were to be voters and eligible to office as well as ourselves.

Now, such was this I propose to modify the present Whig proposition? They proposed an iron rule of exclusion of all foreigners from all that we possess. I proposed an exclusion of those only from our political privileges who should choose to come to us after full notice that political privileges were to be withheld.

Who could complain of my proposition? Certainly no foreigner, then in our country, nor one on his way to our country, nor one who should choose to come before the 4th of July, 1851, for none of these were to be excluded from anything, either a residence or political privileges amongst us. Nor could those who should choose to come after July 4th, 1851, complain for they would have full notice, nearly four years notice, that they were not to share in our political privileges. Consider these distinctions, Mr. Editor, and ask your readers to consider them. See the bare, and important difference between the two propositions. The Whigs say the Democratic party is responsible for my proposition—then, by equal reason the Whig party are responsible for that of Messrs. Thomas and Konigsmacher. Consider them: Study the points of difference and native or foreigner, say not which is the most sensible and reasonable proposition, but which exhibits the most disregard and intolerance towards foreigners. Consider also, that their prop-

osition was original and voluntary—that mine was superinduced and occasioned by theirs. The original sin was with the Whigs, and the deeper sin was theirs.

And yet, whoever heard before, of the agency of Thomas and Konigsmacher in this business? That is covered up. I have been reviled and defamed for years on this subject, and am now held up as the champion of wealth, as having committed an unpardonable sin against foreigners—and Col. Bigler and the Democratic party are sought to be prejudiced on account of it, whilst the agency of these Whigs in first proposing this inquiry in a speech, is made than his, but I did not intend a disapprobation to yield the subject. I believed also that they meant to get at the political privileges of foreigners, and through my amendment was hastily suggested, my purpose was in part to bring the Whig majority in that body to a direct vote on that point.

The Whigs were most worthy there. An extraordinary motion like Thomas' was introduced by Mr. Thomas, a member from Lancaster county, and now I am here on professional business, and I find this stale calumny set afoot, not only to draw off attention from the real and important interests at stake. Well, the subject must now be fully discussed and we shall see how much the Whigs will make by their motion."

I then proceeded to maintain the following propositions:

1. That the introduction into the Convention of a proposition to inquire into the rights of foreigners was not by me, but by Mr. Thomas, a member from Chester county.
2. That when it had been displaced and defeated by my proposed amendment, and that also had been withdrawn, Mr. Konigsmacher, a member from Lancaster county, renewed Mr. Thomas' motion.

Both of these motions were defeated in the Convention, and I had no doubt whether now engaged in promoting Johnson's re-election. I wish, Mr. Editor, to mark here the difference between the propositions of Thomas and Konigsmacher, and mine. Magree's resolution was in these words:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

Thomas' motion as originally made by him and renewed by Konigsmacher, was to add foreigners to the inquiry and the resolution, as they proposed to amend it, would read thus:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

That is, they proposed that the committee should inquire into the expediency of excluding all foreigners from our soil, whether coming to Pennsylvania from other States or from foreign countries. A denial of all political privileges was involved in their proposition, for if we were to shut out foreigners from our soil, we would not let them set foot on our soil, how could they vote or hold office amongst us? Aye, all political and social privileges were to be denied them—all chance to engage in the business, and industry, and enterprise of the State, was to be cut off from them, and for their families, and for their children, all this was involved in this proposition. According to the motion from the Whig side of the house all foreigners were to be put on a footing with negroes, and like them to be fenced out of Pennsylvania. Such was the proposition assumed by Whiggery.

Now, that the committee be also instructed to inquire into the propriety of so amending the constitution as to prevent any foreigners who may arrive in this State after the 4th of July, 1851, from acquiring the right to vote or to hold office in this Commonwealth.

This was in November, 1837. Nearly four years of contemplation and discussion, and a long time enough to go over the world. And who were to be affected by it? Nobody, then in our country, or who for nearly four years thereafter, should come to our country, but only the subjects of Foreign Princes, who should arrive after that period. And as to those of our own country, and those from other fields of enterprise, they were to be excluded, and make their homes amongst us, and rear their families, and live in all respects as we do, except only that unless they arrived before the time specified they were not to vote or to hold office. The sons of even such foreigners as may amendement would touch, were to be voters and eligible to office as well as ourselves.

Now, such was this I propose to modify the present Whig proposition? They proposed an iron rule of exclusion of all foreigners from all that we possess. I proposed an exclusion of those only from our political privileges who should choose to come to us after full notice that political privileges were to be withheld.

Who could complain of my proposition? Certainly no foreigner, then in our country, nor one on his way to our country, nor one who should choose to come before the 4th of July, 1851, for none of these were to be excluded from anything, either a residence or political privileges amongst us. Nor could those who should choose to come after July 4th, 1851, complain for they would have full notice, nearly four years notice, that they were not to share in our political privileges. Consider these distinctions, Mr. Editor, and ask your readers to consider them. See the bare, and important difference between the two propositions. The Whigs say the Democratic party is responsible for my proposition—then, by equal reason the Whig party are responsible for that of Messrs. Thomas and Konigsmacher. Consider them: Study the points of difference and native or foreigner, say not which is the most sensible and reasonable proposition, but which exhibits the most disregard and intolerance towards foreigners. Consider also, that their prop-

osition was original and voluntary—that mine was superinduced and occasioned by theirs. The original sin was with the Whigs, and the deeper sin was theirs.

And yet, whoever heard before, of the agency of Thomas and Konigsmacher in this business? That is covered up. I have been reviled and defamed for years on this subject, and am now held up as the champion of wealth, as having committed an unpardonable sin against foreigners—and Col. Bigler and the Democratic party are sought to be prejudiced on account of it, whilst the agency of these Whigs in first proposing this inquiry in a speech, is made than his, but I did not intend a disapprobation to yield the subject. I believed also that they meant to get at the political privileges of foreigners, and through my amendment was hastily suggested, my purpose was in part to bring the Whig majority in that body to a direct vote on that point.

The Whigs were most worthy there. An extraordinary motion like Thomas' was introduced by Mr. Thomas, a member from Lancaster county, and now I am here on professional business, and I find this stale calumny set afoot, not only to draw off attention from the real and important interests at stake. Well, the subject must now be fully discussed and we shall see how much the Whigs will make by their motion."

I then proceeded to maintain the following propositions:

1. That the introduction into the Convention of a proposition to inquire into the rights of foreigners was not by me, but by Mr. Thomas, a member from Chester county.
2. That when it had been displaced and defeated by my proposed amendment, and that also had been withdrawn, Mr. Konigsmacher, a member from Lancaster county, renewed Mr. Thomas' motion.

Both of these motions were defeated in the Convention, and I had no doubt whether now engaged in promoting Johnson's re-election. I wish, Mr. Editor, to mark here the difference between the propositions of Thomas and Konigsmacher, and mine. Magree's resolution was in these words:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

Thomas' motion as originally made by him and renewed by Konigsmacher, was to add foreigners to the inquiry and the resolution, as they proposed to amend it, would read thus:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

That is, they proposed that the committee should inquire into the expediency of excluding all foreigners from our soil, whether coming to Pennsylvania from other States or from foreign countries. A denial of all political privileges was involved in their proposition, for if we were to shut out foreigners from our soil, we would not let them set foot on our soil, how could they vote or hold office amongst us? Aye, all political and social privileges were to be denied them—all chance to engage in the business, and industry, and enterprise of the State, was to be cut off from them, and for their families, and for their children, all this was involved in this proposition. According to the motion from the Whig side of the house all foreigners were to be put on a footing with negroes, and like them to be fenced out of Pennsylvania. Such was the proposition assumed by Whiggery.

Now, that the committee be also instructed to inquire into the propriety of so amending the constitution as to prevent any foreigners who may arrive in this State after the 4th of July, 1851, from acquiring the right to vote or to hold office in this Commonwealth.

This was in November, 1837. Nearly four years of contemplation and discussion, and a long time enough to go over the world. And who were to be affected by it? Nobody, then in our country, or who for nearly four years thereafter, should come to our country, but only the subjects of Foreign Princes, who should arrive after that period. And as to those of our own country, and those from other fields of enterprise, they were to be excluded, and make their homes amongst us, and rear their families, and live in all respects as we do, except only that unless they arrived before the time specified they were not to vote or to hold office. The sons of even such foreigners as may amendement would touch, were to be voters and eligible to office as well as ourselves.

Now, such was this I propose to modify the present Whig proposition? They proposed an iron rule of exclusion of all foreigners from all that we possess. I proposed an exclusion of those only from our political privileges who should choose to come to us after full notice that political privileges were to be withheld.

Who could complain of my proposition? Certainly no foreigner, then in our country, nor one on his way to our country, nor one who should choose to come before the 4th of July, 1851, for none of these were to be excluded from anything, either a residence or political privileges amongst us. Nor could those who should choose to come after July 4th, 1851, complain for they would have full notice, nearly four years notice, that they were not to share in our political privileges. Consider these distinctions, Mr. Editor, and ask your readers to consider them. See the bare, and important difference between the two propositions. The Whigs say the Democratic party is responsible for my proposition—then, by equal reason the Whig party are responsible for that of Messrs. Thomas and Konigsmacher. Consider them: Study the points of difference and native or foreigner, say not which is the most sensible and reasonable proposition, but which exhibits the most disregard and intolerance towards foreigners. Consider also, that their prop-

position was original and voluntary—that mine was superinduced and occasioned by theirs. The original sin was with the Whigs, and the deeper sin was theirs.

And yet, whoever heard before, of the agency of Thomas and Konigsmacher in this business? That is covered up. I have been reviled and defamed for years on this subject, and am now held up as the champion of wealth, as having committed an unpardonable sin against foreigners—and Col. Bigler and the Democratic party are sought to be prejudiced on account of it, whilst the agency of these Whigs in first proposing this inquiry in a speech, is made than his, but I did not intend a disapprobation to yield the subject. I believed also that they meant to get at the political privileges of foreigners, and through my amendment was hastily suggested, my purpose was in part to bring the Whig majority in that body to a direct vote on that point.

The Whigs were most worthy there. An extraordinary motion like Thomas' was introduced by Mr. Thomas, a member from Lancaster county, and now I am here on professional business, and I find this stale calumny set afoot, not only to draw off attention from the real and important interests at stake. Well, the subject must now be fully discussed and we shall see how much the Whigs will make by their motion."

I then proceeded to maintain the following propositions:

1. That the introduction into the Convention of a proposition to inquire into the rights of foreigners was not by me, but by Mr. Thomas, a member from Chester county.
2. That when it had been displaced and defeated by my proposed amendment, and that also had been withdrawn, Mr. Konigsmacher, a member from Lancaster county, renewed Mr. Thomas' motion.

Both of these motions were defeated in the Convention, and I had no doubt whether now engaged in promoting Johnson's re-election. I wish, Mr. Editor, to mark here the difference between the propositions of Thomas and Konigsmacher, and mine. Magree's resolution was in these words:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

Thomas' motion as originally made by him and renewed by Konigsmacher, was to add foreigners to the inquiry and the resolution, as they proposed to amend it, would read thus:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

That is, they proposed that the committee should inquire into the expediency of excluding all foreigners from our soil, whether coming to Pennsylvania from other States or from foreign countries. A denial of all political privileges was involved in their proposition, for if we were to shut out foreigners from our soil, we would not let them set foot on our soil, how could they vote or hold office amongst us? Aye, all political and social privileges were to be denied them—all chance to engage in the business, and industry, and enterprise of the State, was to be cut off from them, and for their families, and for their children, all this was involved in this proposition. According to the motion from the Whig side of the house all foreigners were to be put on a footing with negroes, and like them to be fenced out of Pennsylvania. Such was the proposition assumed by Whiggery.

Now, that the committee be also instructed to inquire into the propriety of so amending the constitution as to prevent any foreigners who may arrive in this State after the 4th of July, 1851, from acquiring the right to vote or to hold office in this Commonwealth.

This was in November, 1837. Nearly four years of contemplation and discussion, and a long time enough to go over the world. And who were to be affected by it? Nobody, then in our country, or who for nearly four years thereafter, should come to our country, but only the subjects of Foreign Princes, who should arrive after that period. And as to those of our own country, and those from other fields of enterprise, they were to be excluded, and make their homes amongst us, and rear their families, and live in all respects as we do, except only that unless they arrived before the time specified they were not to vote or to hold office. The sons of even such foreigners as may amendement would touch, were to be voters and eligible to office as well as ourselves.

Now, such was this I propose to modify the present Whig proposition? They proposed an iron rule of exclusion of all foreigners from all that we possess. I proposed an exclusion of those only from our political privileges who should choose to come to us after full notice that political privileges were to be withheld.

Who could complain of my proposition? Certainly no foreigner, then in our country, nor one on his way to our country, nor one who should choose to come before the 4th of July, 1851, for none of these were to be excluded from anything, either a residence or political privileges amongst us. Nor could those who should choose to come after July 4th, 1851, complain for they would have full notice, nearly four years notice, that they were not to share in our political privileges. Consider these distinctions, Mr. Editor, and ask your readers to consider them. See the bare, and important difference between the two propositions. The Whigs say the Democratic party is responsible for my proposition—then, by equal reason the Whig party are responsible for that of Messrs. Thomas and Konigsmacher. Consider them: Study the points of difference and native or foreigner, say not which is the most sensible and reasonable proposition, but which exhibits the most disregard and intolerance towards foreigners. Consider also, that their prop-

position was original and voluntary—that mine was superinduced and occasioned by theirs. The original sin was with the Whigs, and the deeper sin was theirs.

And yet, whoever heard before, of the agency of Thomas and Konigsmacher in this business? That is covered up. I have been reviled and defamed for years on this subject, and am now held up as the champion of wealth, as having committed an unpardonable sin against foreigners—and Col. Bigler and the Democratic party are sought to be prejudiced on account of it, whilst the agency of these Whigs in first proposing this inquiry in a speech, is made than his, but I did not intend a disapprobation to yield the subject. I believed also that they meant to get at the political privileges of foreigners, and through my amendment was hastily suggested, my purpose was in part to bring the Whig majority in that body to a direct vote on that point.

The Whigs were most worthy there. An extraordinary motion like Thomas' was introduced by Mr. Thomas, a member from Lancaster county, and now I am here on professional business, and I find this stale calumny set afoot, not only to draw off attention from the real and important interests at stake. Well, the subject must now be fully discussed and we shall see how much the Whigs will make by their motion."

I then proceeded to maintain the following propositions:

1. That the introduction into the Convention of a proposition to inquire into the rights of foreigners was not by me, but by Mr. Thomas, a member from Chester county.
2. That when it had been displaced and defeated by my proposed amendment, and that also had been withdrawn, Mr. Konigsmacher, a member from Lancaster county, renewed Mr. Thomas' motion.

Both of these motions were defeated in the Convention, and I had no doubt whether now engaged in promoting Johnson's re-election. I wish, Mr. Editor, to mark here the difference between the propositions of Thomas and Konigsmacher, and mine. Magree's resolution was in these words:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

Thomas' motion as originally made by him and renewed by Konigsmacher, was to add foreigners to the inquiry and the resolution, as they proposed to amend it, would read thus:—

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, as to prohibit the future emigration into this State, of Foreigners, free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States or territories."

That is, they proposed that the committee should inquire into the expediency of excluding all foreigners from our soil, whether coming to Pennsylvania from other States or from foreign countries. A denial of all political privileges was involved in their proposition, for if we were to shut out foreigners from our soil, we would not let them set foot on our soil, how could they vote or hold office amongst us? Aye, all political and social privileges were to be denied them—all chance to engage in the business, and industry, and enterprise of the State, was to be cut off from them, and for their families, and for their children, all this was involved in this proposition. According to the motion from the Whig side of the house all foreigners were to be put on a footing with negroes, and like them to be fenced out of Pennsylvania. Such was the proposition assumed by Whiggery.

Now, that the committee be also instructed to inquire into the propriety of so amending the constitution as to prevent any foreigners who may arrive in this State after the 4th of July, 1851, from acquiring the right to vote or to hold office in this Commonwealth.

This was in November, 1837. Nearly four years of contemplation and discussion, and a long time enough to go over the world. And who were to be affected by it? Nobody, then in our country, or who for nearly four years thereafter, should come to our country, but only the subjects of Foreign Princes, who should arrive after that period. And as to those of our own country, and those from other fields of enterprise, they were to be excluded, and make their homes amongst us, and rear their families, and live in all respects as we do, except only that unless they arrived before the time specified they were not to vote or to hold office. The sons of even such foreigners as may amendement would touch, were to be voters and eligible to office as well as ourselves.

Now, such was this I propose to modify the present Whig proposition? They proposed an iron rule of exclusion of all foreigners from all that we possess. I proposed an exclusion of those only from our political privileges who should choose to come to us after full notice that political privileges were to be withheld.

Who could complain of my proposition? Certainly no foreigner, then in our country, nor one on his way to our country, nor one who should choose to come before the 4th of July, 1851, for none of these were to be excluded from anything, either a residence or political privileges amongst us. Nor could those who should choose to come after July 4th, 1851, complain for they would have full notice, nearly four years notice, that they were not to share in our political privileges. Consider these distinctions, Mr. Editor, and ask your readers to consider them. See the bare, and important difference between the two propositions. The Whigs say the Democratic party is responsible for my proposition—then, by equal reason the Whig party are responsible for that of Messrs. Thomas and Konigsmacher. Consider them: Study the points of difference and native or foreigner, say not which is the most sensible and reasonable proposition, but which exhibits the most disregard and intolerance towards foreigners. Consider also, that their prop-

POETRY.

Gleams from Memory's Magic Mirror.

By Jessie Jones.

The brook comes dapping on its way
As was its early wont,
And beauteous in the rising spray—
As when a child, I came to play
Around these jutting turret grey,
Wishing their heights to mount.

These old pine trees, that wave on high
Like sentinels on guard;
To the sweet-scented south winds sigh,
In mourning music make reply,
As pines of long forgotten joy
An saddened wings come floating by,
To form the sweet accord.