

The Montrose Democrat.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL—DEVOTED TO POLITICS, NEWS, LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, SCIENCE, AND MORALITY.

Chase & Day, Proprietors.

Montrose, Susquehanna County, Penn'a, Thursday Morning, April 29, 1854.

Volume 11, Number 16.

Selected Poetry.

THE VILLAGE.

Oh, a pleasant spot is our village home,
By the side of yon peaceful stream,
Where the waters glide o'er the pebbles white,
Like thoughts through a peaceful dream;
Where the winds sweep by with a silvery sigh
O'er the rich, unfolding flowers,
And the wild bird sings its sweetest song
In our beautiful forest bowers.
That stand all mantled in glorious green,
Round this village church of ours.

The mountain darkness the river's breast,
With its shining robes of green,
And far, far down in the water's depth,
Its shadow is dimly seen:
With the cold spreading its boughs afar,
And the willow drooping low,
Just lightly touching the sparkling waves,
As onward they softly go,
Half mirthful hallooing the ripples bright,
And dry is the golden's brim.

A quiet spot is our village home,
When toils of day are done,
When the weary ones from work return
To their hearth-stones one by one;
No need shouts on the air are heard,
From tavern chaos and din,
No sound is heard on the stilly night,
Save the village evening hymn;
The wine-cup stands on the shelf untouched,
And dry is the golden's brim.

No splendid mansion is reared on high,
In this village church of ours,
But humble, lovely spots have we,
Encircled with vines and flowers;
The windows are mantled with roses bright,
And the jessamine pure and fair,
Which the maidens gather at eve-tide,
To wreath in their braided hair.

There are lovelier homes on this earth I know,
There are lovelier spots than ours,
There are richer scenes, there are softer winds,
There are brighter and sweeter flowers,
But oh, though their mansions may be costly,
Though their windows in grandeur gleam,
Though the scenes around them be brighter far,
Than the poet's or painter's dream,
No place to our bosom can be so dear
As our home by the willow stream.

Educational.

Susquehanna County Teacher's Association.

The Susquehanna County Teacher's Association held its fifth session at the meeting house near U. Burrows, in Gilson, on Friday afternoon and evening, March 30, 1854.

The Association was called to order by the President, and the Rev. Willard Richardson addressed the throne of Grace.

The Secretary then called the roll and read the report of last meeting which was accepted.

There being no miscellaneous business presented for the consideration of the Association, the President called upon the Rev. E. E. Guild, to address the meeting which he proceeded to do in a lecture of uncommon clearness, strength, and originality.

After partaking of refreshments furnished by the good friends of education living here, the Association again assembled and was called to order by the President.

On motion the discussion on text books was again taken up and S. U. Hamilton addressed the committee thereon.

In the absence of the Committee, the propriety of having a Teacher's Institute and the time it should be held, was taken up and discussed by Wm. W. Hayward, B.F. Tewksbury, C. W. Deans and S. T. Scott, with uncommon unanimity of feeling and sentiment.

The Committee on resolutions and a list of text books, now gave notice that they were ready to report, and presented the following through their Chairman, S. U. Hamilton, which was unanimously adopted.

Whereas, in our opinion the want of uniformity in text books is the greatest hindrance to the success of our common schools:

Resolved, That we will use our best endeavors to procure the adoption of a uniformity of books in the schools of this county; and, as a preparatory step, we suggest the following list of books for the consideration of Directors, Teachers, and the community generally—hoping that by such consideration and future discussion we may conclude upon some series of books worthy of general adoption in our common schools.

Text Books. Spelling—Town, Sanders or Webster's.

Reading—Town, Sanders or Manville's series.

Geography—Olney's Smith's Morse's or Mitchell's with outline maps.

Arithmetic, Mental—Colburn's, Emerson's or Thompson's.

Atticatic, Written—Adam's, Colburn's sequel, Thompson's or Perkins's.

Grammar—Bullion's, Brown's, Smith's or Wells's.

Physiology—Cutler's first book of Anatomy, and Hygiene.

Resolved, That we are well aware that there are many good books, not named above, but our object is to ascertain what books may be generally and uniformly used to the best advantage.

Miscellaneous business being next called for by the President, B. F. Tewksbury offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That the thanks of this Association are due to the Rev. E. E. Guild, for the able and satisfactory manner in which he discharged his duty in capacity of a lecturer.

Resolved, That the principles presented and illustrated by the lecturer form the only true basis of educational improvement and reform.

The attendance on the meeting in the afternoon was exceedingly meagre, many not seeming to be fully aware of the true character of the Association; but in the evening the assemblage exceeded all expectations, being larger, by far, than at any previous meeting.

It manifested its deep and heartfelt interest in the course of universal popular education by an attentive listening to the proceedings of the Association till nearly ten o'clock at night.

By unanimous consent it was agreed that the next meeting be held at Montrose on the afternoon and evening of Monday, April 24th 1854.

The thanks of the Association are tendered to the liberal proprietors who professed it such ample accommodations for its meeting.

of the United States to petition Congress upon any subject properly before them, was one which he hoped never to see denied. All such memorials should be received and treated with the respect due to them.

He hoped never to see the day when the Senate would treat such petitions otherwise. The memorial, however, was of a character different from others.

It came from a class of persons who had a right to petition Congress, and address their petitions as ministers of the Gospel—they petition as ministers of the Gospel and not as citizens.

As ministers of the Gospel they come here, and denounce the action of the Senate, in anticipation, or after it has taken place. They do not stop there.

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. Ministers of the Gospel, as such, were not known to the constitution, or to our forms of government, and God forbid they should be known to it.

It was the wise policy of our fathers, and it had been the universal desire of all the people, to keep all the 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 manner in which the petitioners of the North had shown the evils of recognizing ministers of the Gospel as forming any part of the government.

In all countries and in all times, when vested with power, they proved to be the most arrogant of all others. On this occasion they come here, and in the name of the Almighty God they invoke his vengeance upon us for our action on a political measure.

Let three thousand citizens of New England, or three hundred thousand, or all of New England, or all of the citizens of the United States, protest as it is their right, against any legislative action and their petition will be treated respectfully.

But these people do not come here as citizens; they come here as ministers of God—his vicegerents, as the Senator from Texas said, or servants of their Divine Master, and in his name they protest against a deed of moral wrong, which they as ministers of the Gospel declare to be committed by an act of this body.

It is not the receipt of a memorial conched in such terms, and professing to speak by any such authority. Without any disrespect for the cloth, which to say the least, they do not grace, he moved, as the proper course, that the memorial be not received.

Mr. CUTLER said he had always entertained the highest respect for the ministers of the Gospel. His respect was so high that he would almost submit to have any act of theirs performed in his official capacity.

But that respect was for them in their appropriate and sacred calling; and when they abandoned their duty, and assumed a more high position—when they forgot the religion of the Lamb, and mingled with the waters of the turbid pool of political strife, his respect no longer continued.

They have quit the political arena, and they speak as vicegerents of God on earth, and presume in His name solemnly to pronounce upon the Senate the judgment of the Almighty. He could no longer respect them, when they themselves abandoned their sacred duties.

When they had abandoned the religion which they professed—the religion which they were called by the people to profess, and took up the character of the political lion, going round, seeking whom they might devour, they do violence to the gospel and the religion of our Saviour.

He knew not what more was to be done than that Senators should express their condemnation of this proceeding. He thought they deserved the censure of the Senate.

on all political ones, they must receive as commonly known as the Western rifle, which shall be used with one charge of powder and one round ball.

The distance shall be sixty paces. The parties shall stand erect, with their feet not more than twelve inches apart.

The weapons shall be placed in the hands of the principals by their respective seconds, cocked, pointing to the ground, not more than three feet from the left toe.

The word shall be given in the following manner:—Gentlemen, are you ready?—Fire—once—two—three—with a pause of at least one second between the words.

Neither party shall be at liberty to raise his piece before the word fire, or after the word three. If the parties are ready, no response shall be given; if not ready, he will respond promptly, not ready.

Before the parties are armed, the word shall be given in blank by the seconds, who has not in it, as nearly the same manner as it will be given when they are to fire.

The choice of position and the giving of the word shall be determined by lot; the parties holding the same position so long as the fight may continue. But previous to each fire the seconds shall again cast lots for the word.

Respectfully, your ob't servant,
T. T. HAWKINS.

Col. Monroe to Col. Hawkins.
WASHINGTON, March 29, 1854.

Sir—I requested a statement embodying your views of the terms of the meeting of Mr. Breckenridge and Mr. Cutting, with the hope that our views would coincide as to the weapons, distance, &c. But my principal is wholly unacquainted, and the terms otherwise objectionable, it becomes my duty to stand on our rights as the challenged party, and I am under the necessity of proposing the following:

Proposed terms of the meeting between the Hon. J. C. Breckenridge and the Hon. F. B. Cutting.

1. The parties are to meet at 10 o'clock, on the 30th day of March, at Montrose.

2. Weapons to be the ordinary duelling pistols; distance ten paces; pistols to be held downwards in a perpendicular direction.

3. The choice of weapons and giving of the word are each to be decided by lot, in a manner to be agreed upon by the seconds.

4. The word is to be given in the following manner:—Gentlemen, are you ready? (upon each party responding "ready") "Fire—once, two, three, halt"—not less than one, nor more than two seconds to elapse between each word from "fire" to "halt."

5. Neither party shall be permitted to elevate his pistol from a perpendicular position "halt" under the penalty of forfeiting the word by the second of the adversary of the offending party.

6. The pistols are to be loaded with the ordinary charge of powder and one round ball, each to be loaded alike, by some person or persons to be selected, by and under the supervision of the respective seconds.

7. The positions having been marked out by the seconds, the choice thereof is to be decided by lot.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
JAS. MONROE.

[Endorsed] Correct, T. T. Hawkins.

Col. Hawkins to Col. Monroe.
WASHINGTON, March 29, 1854.

Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of this date.

There seems to be a misapprehension as to the relative positions of Mr. Breckenridge and the Hon. Mr. Cutting. Mr. Breckenridge, I am confident, considers himself the challenged, not the challenging party.

I never entertained the idea that my principal occupied any other attitude.

Under these circumstances, I conceive that the rights appertaining by custom to the challenged party belong to Mr. Breckenridge, who stands only in a defensive position, and not to Mr. Cutting, who addressed the original note to him on which the correspondence is based.

I have the honor to remain, with assurances of high respect, your obedient servant,
T. T. HAWKINS.

[Endorsed] Correct, T. T. Hawkins.

Col. Monroe to Col. Hawkins.
WASHINGTON, March 29, 1854.

Col. T. T. Hawkins—Sir—I have the honor to say that, in my opinion, the misapprehension to which you allude has arisen from a misconception of the exact character of Mr. Cutting's original note.

On referring to that note, I find that Mr. Cutting uses the following language:—"In the course of the debate in the House this morning, in reply to what I considered to be a legitimate criticism upon your argument, you asserted that what I had said was false. I now call upon you to retract this assertion, or make the explanation due from one gentleman to another."

I am not able to regard this in the light of a challenge, and I am confident it was not so regarded by my principal, nor did it seem to me so considered by Mr. Breckenridge in his reply of the same date.

To enable me, however, to speak with certainty on this point, I wish to confer with my principal, and will apprise you of the result of that conference to-morrow morning.

of language used in debate; I have merely to refer you to Mr. Breckenridge's note to Mr. Cutting of the 27th of March. I remain with assurances of high esteem, your obedient servant,
T. T. HAWKINS.

[Endorsed] Correct, T. T. Hawkins.

Col. Monroe to Col. Hawkins.
WASHINGTON, March 30, 1854.

Col. T. T. Hawkins—Sir—I have just received your note enclosing one from Mr. Cutting to Mr. Breckenridge of the 27th inst. to Mr. Cutting. I have the honor to enclose to you the reply which Mr. Cutting made to that note the next morning, and which when then tendered to you, you declined to receive, and which I beg leave to request you will now present to your principal.

I remain, with assurances of high respect, your obedient servant,
JAS. MONROE.

[Endorsed] Correct, T. T. Hawkins.

Col. Hawkins to Col. Monroe.
WASHINGTON, March 30, 1854.

Col. James Monroe—Sir—I have just received your note enclosing one from Mr. Cutting to Mr. Breckenridge, which was shown to me on the 28th inst. by Maurice, and which, in my judgment, could not be received, as I considered a challenge then pending between the parties, and it would involve an impropriety to receive it before the delivery of my principal's response.

I will deliver Mr. Cutting's note to Mr. Breckenridge to-night and hand his answer to you in the morning.

I have the honor to be, with high regard, your obedient servant,
T. T. HAWKINS.

[Endorsed] Correct, T. T. Hawkins.

Mr. Breckenridge to Mr. Cutting.
WASHINGTON CITY,
March 30, 1854, 10 o'clock, P. M.

Hon. F. B. Cutting—Sir—The correspondence between Col. Monroe and Col. Hawkins, our respective friends, has been submitted to me by the latter, by which it appears you did not intend the note originally addressed to me as a challenge, but a demand for an explanation of the language used by me in the debate, and at the same time Col. Hawkins delivered to me your note of the 28th inst.

In reply to that note, I state that the disavowal it contains of an intention on your part to be personal in the language which led to my remark, is satisfactory, and I willingly withdraw the expressions which I used in reply. A similar declaration at the moment would have prevented me from ever giving them utterance.

Permit me to express my regret that any misunderstanding should have occurred between us, and my gratification at its explanation.

I remain, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
JOHN C. BRECKENRIDGE.

when you may find that beyond a certain line, a few master spirits (not the masses of the people) may be found to advocate the dissolution of the Union, without the fear of the cry of treason to stifle them into a "second thought." Sir, I thank God that my country has had hope beyond Mason and Dixon's line, and that there, sir, in the midst of abused and misrepresented south, we have humane masters and patriotic servants, devoted to the best interests of the Union, who will join in the sentiment in a shout of inspiring nationality and admiration—"The Union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

Sir, I admitted the ingenious and eloquent argument of the gentleman from Columbia, and was fully prepared for the sentiments he uttered. He proved himself unworthy follower of his illustrious prototype, and that like him he was a northern man with southern principles. He puts aside gracefully the old-fashioned northern truths, "expresses no horror of human servitude, and but carries out his theory by apparently countenancing the regulation of public faith and congressional enactments, in the exercise of his own judicial judgment. At least such is his own judicial opinion when you find him treating the ordinance of 1787, and the compromises of 1820 and 1850, as so many useless foot-boards. These points have been grasped in such a masterly and overreaching manner by the gentleman from Dauphin, that they will require but a passing word from me.

The gentleman from Columbia, with a sophistry that may be pardonable in a lawyer or speculating philosopher, but without the ingenuousness of the statesman, following in the path of pro-slavery orators, although his language might forbid the construction, leads the hearer to believe that the law admitting New Mexico and Utah as territories expunged the compromise of 1820. He used language similar to that of Mr. Douglas. "I say my bill nulls the Missouri compromise. If it does, it has hardly been done by the act of 1850, for these words were copied from the act of 1820, for when it was interrupted by the inquiry, "why did you do it over again," Mr. D. promised to come to that point directly, but never reached it.

Sir, the compromise of 1850 did not wipe the Missouri act from the statute book. The course of the Senator refutes the declaration, when he finds necessity to advocate another blow on its integrity. Yet, sir, it is desired to wipe out all the advantages of the compromise from the reach of the North, whilst the South are already in full enjoyment of more than their share of the advantages of the compact, which, from the magnitude of its object should be considered as sacred as an act of parliament or a magna charta itself.

Sir, the abstract question of the right of the people to make their own laws, is not a debatable question. The universal sentiment is affirmative but from the conventional arrangements of those who have preceded us, our laws are what we deem it expedient to have.

Society is formed by compromises and the mutual giving up of natural right. It is so with the comity of nations, and our first moments of national existence and national independence were distinguished by patriotic submissions and sacrifices. Sir, when some legislative acts can be passed, under the auspices of the master-minds of the land, with the promise of permanency fresh upon their lips, and to-morrow be violated, with impunity, the cords that bind the States together as a harmonious whole, will soon have been severed, and chaos be made to rule the day. Our institutions are sustained by moral force, and not by awe of bristling bayonets.

Do not then weaken them by a reckless impetuosity—but pray the God of Heaven to stay the fury that must follow a departure from duty, and thus release the advocates of this measure from the "rock" to which they are bound in "frigid chains," and from which the Senator from Columbia will fail to deliver them by "stealing fire from the Sun."

I cannot pass the attempt of the gentleman from Dauphin to give a political complexion to the decision of this question, without regretting its purpose. At the moment it is ungenerous to make so serious a charge as to the views of either the President or his distinguished Cabinet. He will fail to point out any record of this alleged charge of sentiment at Washington. It has always been my effort to resist the dangerous errors of extremes—to ally the storms that threaten to break up the peace and harmony of the country—to conform to the wise counsel of the faith of the republic, by avoiding all geographical differences, and I am yet found what others may think where a principal is involved, "without fear, favor or affection," ready and vigorous to repress the agitation consequent to the attempt made by the introduction of the Nebraska bill into Congress, and to ward off, as far as lies in my feeble power, this attempt to reduce the area of freedom. Sir, I feel this readiness and disposition imposed on me, not only as a Pennsylvanian, but as a citizen of the nation, as a Pennsylvanian led to the duty by recurring to her past history—to the annual of a State illuminated with acts of peace, philanthropy and patriotism—as a citizen of a great nation that promises in its future greater brilliancy and glory than has been witnessed in its unexampled past; the duty is made prominent by the love I bear mankind, and the faculty I possess toward her institutions, by the necessity of preventing constant and ruinous changes in her fundamental laws, and finally by a desire to resist encroachments on her charter of freedom.

Sir, I bow to present laws, even where slavery is protected, whilst it is right, proper, and with the hearts best will, that I must resist its further advance.

The gentleman from Columbia charged the agitation on the present occasion, to the movers of these resolutions. Sir, does not that Senator know that the storm clouds that arose in the Susquehanna and Allegheny valleys, have been accompanied by the halls by the whirlwinds of public opinion, moving from all points of the compass?

The calm and sober expression contained in the resolutions, are calculated to allay irritation, rather than to create it. They were due to our representatives at Washington further removed from the source of power and position than we are, and will lead them to nothing else—to cool and deliberate judgment.

Were there no other objection than the single one of the dismemberment effected by the Clayton amendment, the bill would fall to command my support not only on account

REMARKS OF MR. CUTLER.

OF ALLEGENT COUNTY.

On the final passage of the joint resolutions against the passage of the Nebraska bill.

MR. SPEAKER—Before the vote is taken on the resolutions, which I am sure, have parted with none of the elements of success by their long repose on our files, I propose to say a few words.

They constitute plain and intelligible propositions, that will not fail to be endorsed by the people of this Commonwealth, namely, that the compact or compromise of 1820, is still unrepaid, and should remain unrepaid—"now and forever."

Viewing the Compromise act of 1820, a finality on the perplexing subject of slavery, and recognized as such by the Baltimore platform of 1832, I am constrained to resist every effort to revive the perilous agitation that threatened the peace and happiness of the country at that period.

Pennsylvania stood foremost with the olive branch, and was the first to stretch her hand toward the national ark, to insure its inmates that the waters were subsiding.

She submitted to unpalatable, inopportunities, and with the promise, that thereupon, all geographical differences should cease.

At the very moment of repose, when the country was dreaming of a brilliant and glorious future; when the law of 1820, after its execution, the fire of agitation is again kindled, threatening to apply the torch to our matchless institutions.

No objection exists to the erection of Nebraska and Kansas into territories, and if any congressional action has interfered with the validity of the Missouri compromise, as is alleged by those who have charge of the matter, where was the necessity for a word, or a line, in the territorial bill to raise the question.

Sir, I admit the bold and open projector who will not fail to be endorsed by the people of this Commonwealth, namely, that the compact or compromise of 1820, is still unrepaid, and should remain unrepaid—"now and forever."