The Huntingdon Globe.

BY W. LEWIS. HUNTINGDON, DECEMBER 12, 1855. VOL. 11, NO. 25.

THE HUNTINGDON GLOBE,

Per annum, in advance, $1 50
" " if not paid in advance, 2 00

No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid.

A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

Terms of Advertising

	1 ins.	2 ins.	3 ins
Six lines or less,	25	37½	50
1 square, 16 lines, brevier,	50	75	1 00
2 " "	1 00	1 50	2 05
3 " "	1 50	2 25	3 00

	3 m.	6 m.	12 m.
1 square, "	$3 00	$5 00	$8 00
2 " "	5 00	8 00	12 00
3 " "	7 50	10 00	15 00
4 " "	9 00	14 00	23 00
5 " "	15 00	25 00	38 00
10 " "	25 00	40 00	60 00

Professional and Business Cards not exceeding 6 lines, one year, 4 00

From the Washington Union.

Conversations with a Know-Nothing. No. 1.

Democrat. You tell me that your party is called the American party. Why do you give it this name?

Know-nothing. Because "foreign influence has become the bane of our republic," and because we desire to "unite Americans for the purpose of ruling America."

Democrat. It is a good name; but have you ever reflected that you really proscribe *one million* and a half native-American citizens because they belong to the Catholic Church? Authentic estimates show that that number of American citizens are attached to that religious persuasion.

Know-nothing. I had not thought of that.

Democrat. And do you ever think that you are just as determined in your opposition to every American belonging to the democratic party, and to every American belonging to the old whig party, who does not belong to your order?

Know-nothing. That is so. I had forgotten that.

Democrat. And so you begin your exclusive Americanism; you begin to "rule America with Americans" by virtually disfranchising, so far as your order can do so, millions of native-born citizens, voters and non-voters; because you will perceive that when you establish a religious test you not only proscribe an adult male, but you affix a stigma upon his wife and his children at the same time.

Know-nothing. But the idea of "ruling America with Americans" is founded in the holiest sentiment of patriotism, and it is because old parties, particularly the democratic party, have gone so far in flattering and coaxing the foreigners, that we believe it full time to organize a thorough American party.

Democrat. You refer to the democratic party as most in the habit of flattering and coaxing the foreigner and the adopted citizen. Will you tell me what party you belonged to before you became a know-nothing?

Know-nothing. I have all my life been a democrat up to the moment when I became a member of the American order.

Democrat. Now, will you tell me what party that was which placed in nomination a candidate for the presidency only three years ago, and which based one of its chief appeals to the voters of the United States upon the allegation that the democracy were opposed to the Catolic persuasion, and that their candidate was in favor not only of the adopted citizen, but most liberally disposed towards the Catholic Church?

Know-nothing. That was the whig party, and you, of course, refer to General Scott; but still you must admit that the democratic party has been more consistent in appealing to the adopted citizens than any other party.

Democrat. I can admit no such thing. I frankly acknowledge that the principles of the democratic party are well calculated to attract the ardent support of the adopted citizen, and to arouse the sensibilities of the foreigner when he lands upon our shores, and are so liberal and so comprehensive that every man who has suffered from the oppression of the Old World, or who looks to the elevation of the masses in the New, instinctively unites himself to that party.

Know-nothing. It matters not how it has come about, we are resolved to put an end to that state of things which has made the democratic party, more than the whig party, and more than any other party, a foreign party more than an American party.

Democrat. Why is the democratic party a foreign party? Can you point me to a single great measure originated or advocated by the democracy which entitles it to the appellation of being a foreign party? Begin at the beginning. Was the purchase of Louisiana by Jefferson an evidence that the democratic party has been committed to foreign prejudices? Did, or do, Americans or foreigners reap the incalculable advantages of that acquisition? Will you tell me that the annexation of Texas, or the acquisition of California, is an evidence that the democratic party is a foreign party? Are the tariff of 1846, the repeal of the bankrupt law, the annihilation of the Bank of the United States, proofs of such a tendency? These are among the monuments of democratic progress, and do you find in any one of them a pretext for the allegation which you make?

Know-nothing. I do not refer to measures so much as men.

Democrat. Let us come to men, then. Will you be so good as to point out the adopted citizens whom the democratic party has elected to office, that party which you say is constantly flattering and coaxing the foreigners? Will you please point me to the Catholic who has been elected to office by the democratic party, to the Catholic or naturalized citizen who has been elected governor of a State, member of Congress, senator, &c., &c.?

Know-nothing. I confess your question is new to me, and, now that I think of it, there are very few either Catholics or adopted citizens whom the democratic party has elected to office.

Democrat. And, now, if you will go with me and take up the muster-rolls which contain the names of the gallant men who fought in the first and second wars for our independence, and also of those who fought in the late war with Mexico, and then take up the Blue Book, which records the names of the officers of the general government at Washington, and at the custom-houses, and post offices, and other offices throughout the country, you will perceive that while foreigners and adopted citizens have been found by thousands in the ranks of the American army whenever the honor of the country has been involved, comparatively very few are to be found on those lists which contain the names of the office-holders of the federal government; and the same thing may be said with equal truth of the officers of the respective State governments.

Know-nothing. But you are certainly wrong in reference to persons holding office under the present administration. Gen. Zollicoffer, of Tennessee, who is famous as a man of intelligence and honor, and who is one of the leaders of the American party, has made a prodigious speech which has *gone very far* to convert many to our order. In this speech, I find that he says "that seven-tenths of our army officers and soldiers are said to be foreigners, a fourth of the sailors in our navy, and 3,321 out of 4,303 officers in various departments of the general government in 1854." How is this?

Democrat. As to the number of officers in the army and navy who are adopted citizens, I suppose Gen. Zollicoffer himself knows that all such are exceptions to a very general rule; and, if he is the *intelligent* man you say he is, I presume he will not consider it an evidence of doubtful patrotism that foreigners are willing to fight and die for this country in the ranks of the army and navy. A list of the birthplaces of persons employed in the various offices of the public services in Washington and elsewhere presents the following extraordinary contradiction of Gen. Zollicoffer's other figures: Take the office-holders of the grades paid out of the revenues of the United States, beginning with the Secretary of State, and running down to the smallest post office in the country, including every department of the general government, and you will find that out of 4,476 persons employed in these offices but 469 were born abroad. It may be well for me to say to you that this statement is based upon a report prepared from the official records at Washington by the Hon. A. H. Stephens.

Know-nothing, I have got tired of the constant reference of the democratic papers to foreigners fighting the battles of our country; and of course you could not overlook it. Nearly all our armies have been composed in a great part of native-born citizens.

Democrat. Then you forget the fact presented in the very last war in which we have been engaged, that of Mexico. When Gen. Taylor lay with his army on the American side of the Rio Grande, where he fought the first battle of Palo Alto and Besaca de la Palma, his troops were almost entirely composed of adopted citizens. You cannot forget that at that time the native-American party, the seed from which your present order has sprung, existed in Philadelphia; and if you will turn to the files of the native-American organ, the Philadelphia Daily Sun, of that day, you will find varions predictions that when these "Catholic foreigners" were led into Mexico they would desert in a body at the first sight of the Catholic cross held up before their eyes by the Mexican priests. The danger of enlisting foreigners in our army was largely descanted upon, and the government was bitterly blamed for allowing it to de done. History tells the rest of the story. From that day to the battle of Buena Vista, on the one line, and to the capture of the Halls of the Montezumas on the other, crowds of adopted citizens fought under the American flag against the Catholic government of Mexico, and rescued from that government, as a new theatre upon which American institutions and the Protestant religion should hereafter flourish, the fair and lovely region of California.

Know-nothing. You refer to the Protestant religion. There is one thing in which you democrats, without seeming to know it, make a great mistake, and that is the custom of underrating the Protestant sentiment, so deeply seated in the American mind, hostility to the aggressions of the Catholic Church, and particularly to the temporal power exercised by the Pope of Rome over the members of that church.

Democrat. I will shouldbe sorry to agree with you; that the democracy underrate what you call "this deep-seated sentiment," because I think the manner in which we treat that public sentiment shows very high confidence in the intelligence of the American masses. I admit, at the start, that hostillity to the Church of Rome has for hundreds of years been the cause of frequent excitements in different countries, but I believe that in all the excesses which this feeling has given rise to, nothing has been more discreditable to the human character (considering our advanced civilization) than the excitement which now prevails throughout the republic on that subject. The democratic party, as you are well aware, rarely stops to count the cost when once convinced that it is right. You allege that the Pope of Rome exercises almost unlimited sway over the Catholic mind in this country?

Know-nothing. And I will, prove by recent occurrences, that the Pope of Rome does exercise a vast power over the Catholic mind. I give you the following proof:

"The people of Piedmont, the other day, feeling the oppressive weight of the vast property which the Bishops of the Romish Church had collected together in that small kingdom, passed a law sequestrating the whole church property, amounting to $8,000 000, and giving it into the hands of the civil authorities, and the King of Sardinia approved the law. On the 22d of January, of the present year, Pope Pius the Ninth issued an allocution, which is precisely the same style his predecessor treated Magna Charta; he cancelled, abrogated, and annulled the law; 'and we *reprove*,' says the Pope, 'and *condemn*, not only all the decrees already issued by that government upon the rights and the authority of the general of churches and the Holy See, but likewise the objectionable law proposed, and we declare all these acts to be entirely worthless and invalid.'"

Democrat. I perceive you have been reading Mr. Ullman's speech delivered at Troy, New York, on the 23d of October last.

Know-nothing. Well, if I have, I will be obliged to you for answering the fact which he has so forcibly presented in proof of the assertion I have made.

Democrat. I will answer it, and I think satisfactorily. You, of course, remember that in Great Britain there is an institution known as "Church and State." You know, also, that the established church of that kingdom, which is the Episcopal church of our own country, is supported in part by revenues extracted from the Catholics of Ireland, who are compelled to pay tithes to their English oppressors for the support of this Episcopal Church—a church to which they are not attached, but to which they are conscientiously opposed; and thus they are compelled not only to contribute to the maintenance of an aristocracy ecclesiastical nobility who are attached to the established church, but at the same time to support their own pastors.—Would it not be a most unjust thing to hold the Episcopal church of the United States responsible for the conduct of the high church of Great Britain? and do you not think that Mr. Ullman and yourself have gone out the way for the purpose of holding the Catholics of the United States responsible for the act of the Pope, (on a matter *within* the jurisdiction of the Catholic Church, and not affecting political obligations,) supposing what you have quoted to be correct in reference to the King of Sardina? I might go on multiplying instances to show that if this rule is carried out the Protestant Church in the United States would be constantly held responsible for the injustice of those who call themselves Protestants in the Old World.

Know-nothing. Why, Mr. Brownson, one of the leading oracles of the Catholic Church, has admitted this temporal power of the Pope.

Democrat. Now, you perceive you are directly running into the same error from which I have just rescued you. I might as well quote Dr. Pusey, and judge of Protestantism from reading his celebrated tract number 90, as to judge of Catholicism from Brownson, and you ought to remember that Mr. Brownson has appeared in a late letter, in which he disavows the doctrine of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, and corrects his former asseveration. In support of my opinion, however, I refer to the celebrated response from the principal bishoprics of Europe and from the council of Catholic bishops at Baltimore, and also to the opinion of Bishop Spaulding, of Kentucky, to show that such a thing as allegiance to the Pope in temporal matters is a practical absurdity. The very last instance shows that these doctrines are not abandoned. I now quote from an address issued by the Catholic archbishop and bishops of the province of St. Louis at the late provincial council held at Cincinnati:

"Unwillingly do we allude to the frivolous and unworthy pretexts which are alleged by the enemies of the church in justification of their hostility. You are held up to the suspicions and hatred of your fellow-citizens as persons holding doctrines and recognizing principles incompatible with your obligations as citizens of this republic. We need not tell you, brethren, that the church imposes upon you no obligations incompatible with your allegiance to the government under which you live, or that your religious principles are the best guarantee your country can have that hereafter, as heretofore, you will be found faithful to your duties as citizens, while you are jealous of your obligations as Christians. You know that all power is from God; that society is constituted as a divine basis; that every offence against the laws of your country is an offence against God; and that, consequently, you are to obey, only for the purpose of avoiding the punishment which the magistrate inflicts on the transgressor, but from the higher motive of conscience. Nor is this obligation weakened or frustrated of its effect by the paramount obligation of observing the divine law. You know that while rendering to Cæsar what is Cæsar's you must give to God what he necessarily demands. All who profess the Christian religion acknowledge this principle. But while others are left to the suggestions of their own individual conscience, or to the direction of some purely human tribunal, to ascertain what conscience requires in the event of a real or apparent collision between their duties as citizens and as Christians, you have an authority to guide you which the promises of Christ show to be a certain means avoiding mistake, and which, even to those who do not recognise its divine character, must, if calmly reviewed, be regarded as safer than the dictates of the individual reason, and more worthy of confidence than any other tribunal on earth.

"It is only by an entire misrepresentation of these principles, and by confounding things essentially different, that the enemies of the Church can represent her as hostile to the well-being of society, or her children as unworthy of the blessings of civil liberty. The exploded calumny of a divided allegiance, which alone, it is said, Catholics can, consistently with their principles, give the government of their country, is now *seriously* renewed, as if it had not already been refuted by every kind of argument, as well as by the testimony of history and experience. We are mortified to be obliged to refute a charge which argues extreme ignorance or extreme malice in those who prefer it. We owe no temporal allegiance to the Bishop of Rome.—We recognise in the government under which we live the power established by God for the regulation of society; supreme in all that concerns the civil order, and always to be obeyed, whenever its requirements are not obviously opposed to the law of God."

Know-nothing. You have made a long speech, which I will answer with a short extract from General Layfaette, who said, in a letter written during the revolutionary war, "If ever the liberties of this country are destroyed, it will be by the Roman Catholic priests!"

Democrat. And I will answer that quotation by telling you that you have been imposed upon; that it is a gross forgery; that Jared Sparks, the biographer of Washington, has appeared in which he proves conclusively that General Layfayette used this quotation as an extract from another letter, and used it not to approve but to disapprove it; and if it needed anything more to establish its falsity, I might add that General Lafayette was himself a member of the Catholic Church.—But why should you appeal to such prejudices as these and such means as these, when you know that in many of the States your order has solemnly repudiated all responsibility for the doctrines you have been deliberately advocating?

Know-nothing. I do not conceive myself bound by the action of the councils of those States.

Democrat. Then you belong to a party which differs in one of its essential principles, which professes in one part of the country to be liberal and tolerant to the Catholics, and in another undertakes to persecute and proscribe them after the fashion of the olden times.

Know-nothing. I assert that, notwithstanding the declaration of the councils you have alluded to, the practice of the American order is that of unexceptionable hostility to the principles of the Catholic Church.

Democrat. True; and what a confession you have made to me in this! You assert that the profession, the pledge, the solemn declaration of your own brothers, your own friends, your own confederates, is a falsehood and a cheat. You assert that their proclamation of liberality to the Catholic is a fraud.—Now, I will say that none of the old parties have ever yet been thus publicly convicted of tampering with the feelings and the supposed credulity of the American people.

Know-nothing. Well, if we needed authority and precedents for this, we could find it in the acts of the Jesuits, who, with all their seeming sanctity and avoidance of politics, are constantly taking part in party struggles, and managing nominations and conventions.

Democrat. And you believe this too! Now, let me put a series of questions to you, which I intend as home questions. Who are the leading abolitionists of the United States? Who are the men that keep alive the dissentions between the North and the South? Who are the men that rail upon the people of the slave States? Who are the men that preach discord from the pulpit? Who are the men that make politics paramount to religion, and who lead in the division of Christian churches? To what denominations did the three thousand preachers who protested against the passage of the Nebraska bill belong? Who are the men that have drawn temperance into politics?—Who are the men who seek to elevate the black to a social level with the whites? Answer me fairly. Can you lay your hand upon a single Catholic who has appeared in any of these politico-religious demonstrations?

Know-nothing. I admit that I am unable to name any Catholic who has done so.

Democrat. And yet you have just now made a sweeping charge upon the Jesuits, which you are manifestly unable to sustain, and not only to sustain, but you are compelled to admit that almost the same charge you make against them is true of others.

Know-nothing. I perceive that your opposition to the American order is rapidly tending to opposition to the Protestant Church and, *vice versa*, to a championship of the Catholic creed.

Democrat. You perceive no such thing.—You perceive only that all proscription, such as that in which you are engaged, is certain to end in the elevation and increased power of the very people you proscribe. Let me appeal to you as a man of generous sensibilities: you are passing along the street, and if you see a dog beset by half a dozen curs of low degree, do you not feel impelled to rush in and protect him from his enemies? or, you see a dozen ruffians falling foul of an unprotected man; do you not kindle against these violators of manly courage, and take the side of the weak? Such is the history of all religious persecutions; and I am no more a Catholic, or the friend of his creed, because I defend him against blind and infatuated persecution, than was the eloquent divine, Chalmers—that star and guide of the Protestant Church—when he threw the weight of his great intellect against religious intolerance in Great Britain, and resisted the laws of disqualification heaped upon the Catholics.—The truth is you are making Catholics much more rapidly than the priests themselves, for while you are denouncing the power of the Church and declaring your determination to put it down, and rallying others to disfranchise all who belong to it, and in all this making no exception, striking down the purest citizens, even depriving poor female school-teachers of their livelihood because of their attachment to this church—while all this is passing before our eyes, hundreds and thousands who have heretotore been opposed to the Catholic Church, and who have believed all that their own pastors have told them in regard to it, find themselves changing if not in favor of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, at least in favor of those who belong to it, and who, in many cases, are their intimate friends and neighbors.

Know-nothing. Will you let me ask you why it is that so many of the democratic papers and leaders have conceived it to be their duty to find fault with Protestant clergymen simply because such clergymen have exercised the right of opinion? I can recollect, when I was a democrat, how kindly we cherished all ministers of the Gospel who were known to agree with us in political sentiment.

Democrat. I have never known an instance in which a democratic paper has censured a clergyman, unless where that clergyman has deemed it consistent with his obligations to the Divine example to interfere publicly and offensively in politics; and if this is wrong, you should blame all those truly Christian pastors who are constantly rebuking their own brethren for intermeddling in abolitionism and know-nothingism. To what denomination do you belong?

Know-nothing. I am a member of the Methodist Church, I have seen enough of Catholic influence to have made up my mind that the American order is the only way to put it down; and, therefore, while I have deplored many of the expressions of Methodist clergymen, still I can forgive much of their feelings when I know how the laity themselves think on this exciting subject.

Democrat. I understand you, when you speak of the know-nothing order, as being a member of that order in full communion?

Know-nothing. Yes, and I am not ashamed to say so.

Democrat. Well, then, I take the ground that you, as a member of the Methodist Church, in attaching yourself to such an order as the know-nothing order, directly violate the discipline of the church as well as some of the main articles of faith. I prove this by citing the following passage in the discipline of the Methodist Church, of which you are an active and prominent member?

"As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by James, His apostle, so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth."

This "article of faith" is avowedly based upon what is said by our Saviour in Matthew, v. 34:

"But I say unto you, swear not at all; neither by Heaven for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is His footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King. But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil."

And on the injunction in the General Epistle of James, v. 12:

"But, above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by Heaven, neither by the earth, *neither by any other oath*; but let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay, lest ye fall into condemnation."

You will see that the discipline of you church, though it does not go so far as the practise of the Quakers, must be considered as prohibiting you from taken all such extra-judical oaths as you have taken as a member of the know-nothing order. Now answer me frankly; had you this article of your faith in your mind when you entered the lodge and before and upon the Holy Evangelists took the terrible oath that you would obey the decrees of the order, "*on penalty of being denounced as a wilful traitor to your God and your country?*"

Know-nothing. You have presented a new view in the contrast between my religious and my political obligations—one upon which I shall deeply reflect.

Democrat. But I am not quite through with you as a member of the Methodist Church. The brightest ornament of your denomination in his day and generation, the celebrated Dr. Adam Clark, in his commentaries uses the following admonition to all Methodists: "He that useth any oath except that which he is solemnly called by the magistrate to make, so far from being a Christian, does not deserve the reputation of decency or common sense."

Know-nothing. At any rate, if I am wrong in my hostility to the Catholics, and in my union with the American order in order to gratify that sentiment, I am no more wrong than the illustrious John Wesley, the founder and father of Methodism.

Democrat. But you would not surely quote John Wesley's opinion in support of your action now, because if you should do so, you would also be compelled to support his opinions in favor of Church and State, and his opinions on civil government; and I know you do not support them. The political doctrines anvocated by him have been exploded upon these shores, and you should recollect that when he spoke of the Catholics he spoke under very different circumstances from those which now exist. Your church aught to be the last church to unite against the foreigner or against the Catholic.

Know-nothing. Why so?

Democrat. Why, simply because the history of your church is a warning against intolerance and persecution. Methodist preachers were treated with contempt, stoned, and thrown into prisons—and by whom? Not by catholics, but by Protestants; and you must not forget that the first Methodist society organized in this country was composed of Irish emigrants. Philip Embury, who organized this society, was an Irish emigrant, and the pioneers of Methodism in Maryland were all Irish emigrants.

Nnow-nothing. You certainly have presented some data which I have never yet heard of, but there is one point, I presume, upon which both you and I will agree—and that is, the importance of so limiting the facilities to citizenship presented by our laws to foreigners as to check the undue influence which they now wield in our elections.

Democrat. How do you propose to check this influence?

Know-nothing. By a thorough amendment of the naturalization laws.

Democrat. Do you think a national party necessary to effect such a modification?

Know-nothing. Certainly. I do, because Congress has power over the whole subject.

Democrat. You do not, then, believe that the respective States have the sole right to define what is citizenship within their borders?

Know-nothing. I only look to the fact that the five years term of naturalization was fixed in a law of Congress.

Democrat. But you overlook the other fact, that in a number of the States foreigners are allowed to vote after they have been in the country a much less period, and also that our leading statesmen have come to the conclusion that the whole subject is within State jurisdiction.

Know-nothing. It matters little to me how the object is accomplished, whether by national or State legislation.

Democrat. But if by the latter, it supersedes a national organization entirely, so far as the amendment of the naturalization laws is concerned, and that is abont all that is left of your creed. I will, however, answer your question frankly, and say that the attempt to limit the term of naturalization would only be fetter upon future emigration, and would operate to the disadvantage of the best interests of the country. I am, therefore, unhesitatingly opposed to such modification.

Know-nothing. I wish you to understand me that I am not opposed to emigration, nor do I understand the American party as being opposed to it.

Democrat. But this seems to me to be a new piece of inconsistency. You say you are in favor of emigration and yet are for throwing obstacles in the way of emigration.

Know-nothing. I hope you will not say to me that the amendment of the naturalization laws will have any effect to rednce emigration.

Democrat. I say so most unequivocally. I not only allege that it will do so, but that it has done so; that the mere menace of amending the naturalization laws, of shortening the term of probation, added to the scandalous mummeries and violence on the part of the know-nothing ordor, have excited distrust on the part of the people, and exultation on the part of the monarchs of Europe. Some of the leading newspapers in Germany have liberally discussed the know-nothing movement in the United States, and have admonished the German people against trusting themselves in this country.

Know-nothing. Well, it must come sooner or later, for it cannot be denied that thousands and tens of thousands of those who land upon our shores, even after they have been naturalized, are incapable of appreciating our institutions and of becomeing in heart citizens upon whom the glorious right of suffrage is conferred.

Democrat. Your beau ideal of a citizen and a voter is that a man should be native-born. Well, we have had some exhibitions of the fitness of such Americans as you are anxious should rule America within the last few weeks; not to speak of Louisville or of Cincinnati, let us refer to what has just taken place in New Orleans and in Maryland.—Here we find the men you set up as patterns of intelligence and of decency illustrating their devotion to American institutions by going armed to the ballet-boxes, by driving off those whe are opposed to them in politics, by knocking down like beasts the adopted citizens, by overthrowing the ballot-boxes, beating the officers of election, and by openly threatening to deluge the streets with blood, rather than allow those to vote whose rights are guarantied by our constitution and our laws. These are the men whom you hold up to me as eminently competent—nay, as the men who should alone be permitted to vote.

Know-nothing. But you must not condemn the whole American order because of the violence of a few of its hotheaded members.

Democrat. Alas! I am not now referring to the exemptions, but to the rule. I am not referring to rare, but to common occurrences. There is not a city or a town in the Union in which your order boasts any considerable number of men in which more or less of violence and fraud are not ressored to. In some places you secure all the officers of the election, and compel them to disregard their own solemn oaths to act according to the laws of the State in which they serve, and to obey only the mandates of your secret order; in others you pack juries, so as to rescue the guilty from punishment; and in more than one instance you have been known by sheer force of numbers to intimidate the judges upon the bench. It is this example, I repeat, that you hold up before the American youth and before the people of the Old World as a sublime specimen of pure Americanism. I will conclude this picture of know-nothing misrule in the United States by giving you a description of a far-distant country, away off on the eastern shores of Asia, in which know-nothing doctrines have been practically illustrated for seven hundred years. The Louisville Courier says:

"No foreign foot may tread that soil, no foreign eye profane its sights. Foreigner and devil are synonymous terms in the language spoken in that happy realm. There are no emigrants there—no naturalization laws, no *foreign* vote—the one great fundamental principal of government is, that none but Japanese shall rule Japan. They hate the Pope, they mob the missionary, they trample under foot the cross, they keep out a foreign ship, whether it comes in famine or distress. When the stranger begs for bread they give him a stone—sometimes a dozen or two at once. No foreigner votes there.—There is no Bible there, no Catholic Orphan Asylums, no Catholic Sisters of Charity, no honesty, no integrity in the judiciary, no safety for the stranger, no respect for God, no ships arrive there laden with foreign mechanics, and no ships depart, their living freight replaced by agricultural products; no horde of uneducated Germans and Irish come between the wind and Japanese nobility, and the consequence is that mines of coal and iron lie worthless in the ground."

How do you like the picture?

Know-nothing. It is an ingenious comment, I admit; but still you must indulge me in the honest belief that I am for Americans rulling America.

Democrat. The sentiment of Americans ruling America suits me exactly. I have always been in favor of that; but I will thank you to tell me what kind of Americans you mean shall rule America. Do you mean such an American as Santa Anna, who began his career by driving all the foreigners out of his country, Americans and Spaniards, by taking by the hand the negroes of Mexico, and ended it by proclaiming *himself Emperor*? or do you mean Soulouque, now called Fapatin the First, who began *his* career by driving all the foreigners out of the country, and by instituting a monarchy, in which the negroes controlled everything, and finally made him Emperor? Are these the Americans that you would have rule America? Or, to come down to our own time, will you have such