

by purchase, or as indemnity for war expenses... the right to sell themselves up as a foreign State, if they so liked, and deny the jurisdiction of the United States.

honestly accuse him of having sought personal popularity at the expense of the Constitution; or that he has at any time deserted his official obligations by concealing any section of State...

When he assumed the office it is well known to us, and to all, that two important Territories of the United States were in a condition of revolt and civil war.

In the year 1857, a commercial and financial revolution, overwhelming as it was sudden, swept over the country, threatening not only private but public solvency.

It is a sad and a deadly insult to every natural citizen of the United States, and to the Republic, to see the flag of the Republic flying in honor over the site of the National Democracy of the Union.

When we turn to Mr. Buchanan's domestic Administration, so far from its affording reasonable cause of complaint, it deserves the heartiest commendation of every citizen who scores the petty, personal, party politics of the hour.

THE MONROSE DEMOCRAT. A. J. GERRITSON, Editor. MONROSE, SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY, PA. Thursday, July 21, 1859.

FOR AUDITOR GENERAL: RICHARDSON E. WRIGHT, Philadelphia. FOR SUPERVISOR GENERAL: JOHN ROWE, Franklin.

Democratic County Committee. The members of the Democratic County Committee are requested to meet at the Keystone Hotel in the borough of Monrore on Saturday the 23rd of July at 10 o'clock P. M.

The following named persons compose the committee: H. Hill, D. Buffum, N. West, F. M. Williams, J. O. Bullard, Harrison Finn, Michael Kane, E. A. Maine, C. C. Church, S. D. Turrell, Stanley Turrell, M. C. Sutton, C. S. Gilbert, C. N. Miller, L. Norton, Ira Carpenter, A. Tilden, R. Hill, O. S. Beebe, E. S. Brown, J. Brazie, J. B. Chalkey, N. Camp, A. N. Bullard, T. Boyle, L. Westfall, Geo. Snyder, T. Murphy, W. B. Handrick, G. Curtis, C. Stoddard.

Geo. A. Chase, editor of the Bradford Herald, has been appointed Postmaster at Towanda, vice H. B. McKean, Esq., resigned.

We publish the address of the Democratic State Committee to-day, and ask our readers to carefully read it. It is fully written, and enunciates sound doctrines, such we doubt not, as meet the views of every Democrat.

We have received during the past week, reports of Fourth of July celebrations from several towns in the county, but think their publication, especially at this late day, would hardly be of sufficient interest to justify the large space they would all occupy.

Judging by the reports, the day was well spent, and most, if not all, of the "doings" were highly creditable to the participants, and did honor to the occasion.

The naturalization question. We call special attention to the despatch from the State Department to our Prussian Minister, in regard to the right of expatriation.

It is a sad and a deadly insult to every natural citizen of the United States, and to the Republic, to see the flag of the Republic flying in honor over the site of the National Democracy of the Union.

The Opposition. It is a work of curiosity to trace the history of the anti-Democratic party of the country, through the multiplicity of changes which it has undergone during the past forty years.

1797-1800 Conventional Monarchists. 1800-1808 Anti-Jeffersonian Impressionists. 1808-1811 British Bank Men. 1811-1812 Peace and Submission Men. 1812-1814 Blue Lights. 1814-1816 Washington Conventionists. 1816-1818 No Party Men. 1818-1820 Federal Republicans. 1820-1822 National Republicans. 1822-1825 Anti-Masons. 1825-1831 Anti-Mason Whigs. 1831-1837 Conservatives. 1837-1840 Independent Democratic Whigs. 1840-1844 Log Cabin and Hard Cider Men. 1844-1847 Unionists. 1847-1848 No Party Party. 1848-1852 Fugitive Slave Law Supporters. 1852-1854 Know Nothings and Anti Nebraskaites. 1854-1856 Americans and Republicans. 1856-1857 American Republicans. 1857-1858 People's Party and Plug Uglies. 1858-1859 Opposition.

Their present name is the most appropriate they have ever worn. They are "opposition," and always will be. They never can be the party in power, but will always be found outside, snuffing at the Democracy inside.

Outrageous Cruelty. If the following story from the Troy Budget be true, then that city holds one of the most heartless wretches in existence, and the people of Troy, by permitting such an act, generally assist spiritless creatures, not worthy the name of human.

We have for some time been cognizant of a persistent piece of cruelty towards a lady residing in this city, and who we are informed, whom we hoped ere now to find relieved by the interference of friends.

There are many similar cases in this town and vicinity; in fact the practice has grown into a fashion, to such an extent that community silently sanctions the cruelty of the "heartless wretches."

President Polk's Views. On Popular Sovereignty are very plainly expressed in the following extract from his last annual message: "The people of the Territories, when assembled in convention to form State constitutions, will possess the sole and exclusive power to determine for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits."

Such is the feeling and sentiment of the Opposition party generally, North and South, and they act it out whenever and wherever they have the power. They have done so in Massachusetts, by their two year amendment to the constitution of the State, and they attempted it in New Jersey, New York, and in other States.

The Hon. Daniel E. Sickles has become notorious for his wife, and is now living in marital relations with her, before the death of the late Philip Barlow, Key. In relation to this remarkable step, Sickles has alienated himself from many, if not all those personal and other friends and sympathizers who devotedly adhered to him during his recent imprisonment and trial.

The reconciliation between Mr. and Mrs. Sickles was consummated while Mr. Sickles was residing at the house of a friend on the Bloomingdale Road, about half a mile from the former home of Mr. S., which, for some time past, Mrs. S. has occupied, either alone or with some of the members of her own family. The suspicions of his host were excited by the repeated absence of Mr. S. at unusual hours, and when he came in very early one morning, he was interrogated by the host and another friend who was present, and on his positively denying their right to question him, as relating to give an explanation; they took him by the collar, and he has since addressed letters to his former friends acquaintances, notifying them formally of the termination of conjugal relations between himself and Mrs. Sickles.

Agents are wanted in every part of the country. Back numbers and volumes on hand. Address John A. Gray, publisher, 16 & 18 Jacob Street, New York.

The Naturalization Question. So much misapprehension prevails in reference to the views of the Administration on this question that we submit the following briefly furnished by a practical case which has recently arisen in the Kingdom of Hanover to refer to again.

The case is that of a naturalized citizen of the United States who is a native of Hanover and who, when he left his native country, was neither an actual resident in the Hanoverian army nor had been drafted to serve in it, but who has yet, upon his return to Hanover, been deprived of his liberty and compelled to do military duty.

The interference of our Government having thus become necessary, the whole subject of the rights of naturalized citizens has received the renewed and careful consideration of the President; and his views, as well as those of his entire cabinet, upon this important subject, will be found in the following extract which we are permitted to make from a dispatch transmitted a few days ago from the Department of State to our Minister at Berlin in relation to the case referred to.

It is impossible to add anything to the strength and clearness of this statement; and we are persuaded that it will meet the full concurrence of every reflecting man in the country.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes the natural right of expatriation, by conferring upon Congress the power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." It is a duty which is not confined to the United States, and is not confined to the United States, and is not confined to the United States.

There has since been no period in our history when laws for this purpose did not exist, though their provisions have undergone successive changes. The alien in order to become a citizen, must declare on oath or affirmation that he will support the Constitution of the United States, and at the same time he is required to absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, State or empire, which he was before a citizen.

The exercise of the right of naturalization, and the consequent recognition of the privilege of expatriation, are not confined to the United States. There is not a country in Europe, I believe, at this moment, where the law does not authorize the naturalization of foreigners in one form or other. Indeed, in some of these countries this law is more liberal than our own toward foreigners.

The question then arises, what rights do our laws confer upon a foreigner by granting him naturalization? I answer, all the rights, privileges and immunities which belong to a native citizen of their full extent, with the single qualification, that he must be a native-born citizen, or the offspring of a native-born citizen, or the offspring of a native-born citizen.

If this Government were to undertake such a task, we might soon be involved in trouble with nearly the whole world. To protect our citizens against the application of this principle of universal law, in its full extent, we have treaties with several nations securing exemption to American citizens when residing abroad from some of the onerous duties imposed upon them by the laws of the foreign countries.

Where no such treaty exists, a naturalized citizen has committed a crime, or incurred a penalty for violating any municipal law, whatever of the country of his temporary residence, he is just as liable to be tried and punished for the offense as if he had resided in it from the day of his birth.

The very same principle and no other is applicable to the case of a naturalized citizen, should he choose to return to his native country. In that case, if he had committed an offense against the law of his native country, he is responsible for it in the same manner as a native American citizen, and is liable to be punished by the laws of his native country.

From the Constitution. A foreigner, upon voluntarily returning to his native country, is not bound to his crime, which would be appeal to his country, but he is bound to his adopted country to protect him against his responsibility to the United States or any of the States.

While these principles cannot be contested, great care should be taken in their application, especially to our naturalized citizens. The moment a foreigner becomes naturalized, his allegiance to his native country is severed forever. He experiences a new political birth. A broad and impassable line separates him from his native country. He is no more responsible for anything he may say or do, or omit to say or do, after assuming his new character, than if he had been born in the United States.

Should he return to his native country, he returns as an American citizen, and in no other character. In order to entitle his original Government to punish him for an offense, this must have been committed while he was a subject and owed allegiance to that Government. The offense must have been committed before his expatriation.

It must have been of such a character that he might have been tried and punished for it at the moment of his departure. A future inability to serve in the army will not be sufficient, because, before the time can arrive for such service, he has changed his allegiance, and has become a citizen of the United States.

It would be quite absurd to contend that a boy brought to this country from a foreign country with his father's family when but 12 years of age and naturalized here, who should afterwards visit the country of his birth when he had become a man, might be seized and compelled to perform military service, because, if he had remained there throughout the intervening years and his life had been spared, he would have been bound to perform military service.

To submit to such a principle would be to make an odious distinction between our naturalized and native citizens. For this reason, in my dispatch to you of May 12, 1859, and again in my letter to Mr. Hoar of the 14th ultimo, I confine the foreign jurisdiction in regard to our naturalized citizens to such of them as "were in the army, or actually called into it" at the time they left Prussia.

That is, to the case as actual desertion or a refusal to enter the army after having been regularly drafted and called into it by the Government to which at the time they owed allegiance.

It is presumed that neither of these cases presents any difficulty in point of principle. If a soldier or a sailor were to desert from our army or navy, for which offense he is liable to a severe punishment, and after having become a naturalized subject of another country, should return to the United States, it would be a singular defense for him to make that he was absolved from his crime because, after his commission, he had become a subject of another Government.

It would be still more strange were that Government to interpose his behalf for any such reason. Again, during the last war with Great Britain, in several of the States—might mention Pennsylvania in particular—the militia man who was drafted and called into the service was exposed to a severe penalty if he did not serve, or if he deserted himself into the service, or in default thereof, procured a substitute.

Suppose such an individual, after having incurred this penalty, had gone to a foreign country and become naturalized there and then returned to Pennsylvania, is it possible to imagine that for this reason the arm of the State authorities would be paralyzed, and these examples to show ideas clearly both the extent and the limitation of rightful Hanoverian jurisdiction in such cases.

It is impossible to foresee all the varying circumstances which may attend cases of this nature; and it is believed that the principles here laid down may generally be sufficient to guide your conduct.

The Losses of Solferino. The French Government has not yet published its estimate of the losses at Solferino. The Paris correspondent of The Times says that it is believed that 10,000 French were killed and wounded.

While these principles cannot be contested, great care should be taken in their application, especially to our naturalized citizens. The moment a foreigner becomes naturalized, his allegiance to his native country is severed forever. He experiences a new political birth. A broad and impassable line separates him from his native country.

It would be quite absurd to contend that a boy brought to this country from a foreign country with his father's family when but 12 years of age and naturalized here, who should afterwards visit the country of his birth when he had become a man, might be seized and compelled to perform military service.

To submit to such a principle would be to make an odious distinction between our naturalized and native citizens. For this reason, in my dispatch to you of May 12, 1859, and again in my letter to Mr. Hoar of the 14th ultimo, I confine the foreign jurisdiction in regard to our naturalized citizens to such of them as "were in the army, or actually called into it" at the time they left Prussia.

That is, to the case as actual desertion or a refusal to enter the army after having been regularly drafted and called into it by the Government to which at the time they owed allegiance.

It is presumed that neither of these cases presents any difficulty in point of principle. If a soldier or a sailor were to desert from our army or navy, for which offense he is liable to a severe punishment, and after having become a naturalized subject of another country, should return to the United States, it would be a singular defense for him to make that he was absolved from his crime because, after his commission, he had become a subject of another Government.

It would be still more strange were that Government to interpose his behalf for any such reason. Again, during the last war with Great Britain, in several of the States—might mention Pennsylvania in particular—the militia man who was drafted and called into the service was exposed to a severe penalty if he did not serve, or if he deserted himself into the service, or in default thereof, procured a substitute.

Suppose such an individual, after having incurred this penalty, had gone to a foreign country and become naturalized there and then returned to Pennsylvania, is it possible to imagine that for this reason the arm of the State authorities would be paralyzed, and these examples to show ideas clearly both the extent and the limitation of rightful Hanoverian jurisdiction in such cases.

It is impossible to foresee all the varying circumstances which may attend cases of this nature; and it is believed that the principles here laid down may generally be sufficient to guide your conduct.

The Pittsburgh Post, known as Anti-Leocompton, while Leocompton was unsettled, says it has "never known more popular nominations made by any political organization than those of Messrs. Whitcor and Rows, the candidates of the Democratic party for Auditor General and Surveyor General of the Commonwealth."

Our informant from almost every part of the Democracy confirms us in the belief that the unfortunate disagreement about a by-gone aid and Leocompton is a union support of Messrs. Whitcor and Rows, and they will receive the full party vote, if not more, at the October election.