

Democrat and Sentinel.

THE BLESSINGS OF GOVERNMENT, LIKE THE DEWS OF HEAVEN, SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED ALIKE UPON THE HIGH AND THE LOW, THE RICH AND THE POOR.

NEW SERIES.

EBENSBURG, MAY 30, 1855.

VOL. 2, NO. 33.

TERMS:

THE DEMOCRAT & SENTINEL is published every Wednesday morning, in Ebensburg, Cambria Co., Pa., at \$1.50 per annum, if paid in advance, if not \$2 will be charged. ADVERTISEMENTS will be conspicuously inserted at the following rates, viz:

1 square 3 insertions,	\$1 00
Every subsequent insertion,	25
1 square 3 months,	9 00
1 " 6 " "	15 00
1 " 1 year,	25 00
1 " 2 " "	45 00
1 " 3 " "	65 00
Business Cards,	5 00

Twelve lines constitute a square.

Anniversary Celebration of the Landing of the Pilgrims of Maryland, at the site of St. Mary's City, May 15th, 1855.

Dear Sentinel:—On our arrival in good old Baltimore a few days ago, we were invited by a friend to attend the above captioned celebration. And being a descendant of the old Maryland Pilgrims, one of whom came over on the "Ark," "tother on the "Dove," (for it took "two ships" to bring them over) we were much gratified at the opportunity afforded us, to not only see the place where our ancestors had landed, (those who did not "leave their country for their country's good," but who came to establish and found a Republic where all could worship God as to them might seem meet,) but also to have the opportunity of hearing the Anniversary Oration of Hon. Joseph R. Chandler. His address speaks for itself. No feeble eulogy of ours could add aught to its merits. We send it to you for publication, believing that nothing could be laid before your readers, more interesting to the liberal minded patrons of your honest Democratic sheet.

"Truth is powerful, and will prevail," when disseminated to the people through that powerful medium—the press. This speech of Mr. Chandler's should be read, and that too carefully by every one, as in it he brings up facts in relation to the early colonization of this Continent, which are suppressed by Know-Nothing and their adjuncts, for the furtherance of their sinister ends.

Mr. Chandler said:

The desire to make commemoration of distinguished favors, is among the best impulses of the human heart. The justification of the desire has marked domestic, social, and even national movements in all ages, and has had for its sanction not only the spirit of purest gratitude for the benefits of the past, but a hope of connecting the favors and the spirit they suggest with the future.

"Gratitude," says a French satirist, "is a strong sense of favors to come," and the apothegm conveys more of truth than at first blush it seems to imply; and, correctly received, it has less that is offensive than at first strikes the ear, or perhaps was intended by the author.

Nothing merely present deeply concerns a human being. His nature, his instincts, his impulses, lead him to look away from the present and connect himself with the realities of the past, to strengthen his hopes and his enjoyments of the future. This is no accident of position, it is the gift of God. "He made us with such large discourses looking before and after."

Scarcely a festival, domestic or national, among the Hebrews was unconnected with the past. Gratitude for special providences, or sorrows for peculiar offenses, were the motives of the feasts and fasts of the chosen people, and the sanctity of the weekly sabbath, was commemorative of the rest of the Most High.

Their passovers preserved the recollection of the sparing mercies of God towards the male born of their tribes in Egypt, and their Palm kept bright the remembrances of salvation from the destructive edict of the Assyrian monarch.

Year by year pagan nations, pagan municipalities, and pagan individuals, made memorial of important events. Marathon, Leuctra, Thermopylae, were remembered, and the obligations of the present and hopes of the future were cemented with the illustrious past. It was the great work of the orator and the poet, to leave the lustre of eloquence and song upon the left hand of the departed, and it was the delight and honor of an admiring people, to mark the names of the mighty dead, as they left the shadows of the past, to grow lustrous in the praise and gratitude of the present—as the summit peaks of the mountains are kept visible and beautiful by the posthumous rays of that sun which has gone to enlighten other worlds.

But I have said that gratitude for the past connects itself with the enjoyments of the present and the hopes of the future. No event deserves special commemoration that does not appeal to the present for evils avoided or benefits procured; and that anniversary which is not sanctified by a commemoration of what belongs to the present and relates to the future is unworthy of general or individual observance.

We commemorate to-day the landing, in 1634, of the emigrants from Great Britain on the very spot on which we stand. Their advent has been deemed of consequence sufficient for special memorial. In these times, every day brings to our coast more than a thousand European emigrants, who are crowding our cities, peopling our plains, filling our forests, swelling our commerce, and augmenting our national resources and national importance. Let the future commemorate the benefits which they shall have derived from these their ancestors. But to-day the shadows of the past are entered, and the arrival of only two boat loads of men, women, and children, is selected for a commemoration in which science and the arts, patriotism and religion, are deemed to have an interest. What claim have the immigration and colonization of Calvert and his followers—men, women and children—upon our gratitude for a commemoration? Is it that we have descended from the stock of these

educated, high-minded and generous emigrants, and would do honor to the families of which we are a part? Probably not half of this assembly can trace their ancestral line to any of that company. Is it that these Pilgrims fled away from religious persecution at home and thus became confessors in the cause of Christian truth? Why, almost every one of the original colonies of this country owes its foundation to the same spirit of religious intolerance on one side and religious independence on the other. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania, present strong instances of attachment to creeds, and of sacrifices for their enjoyment. Is it that they fled from intolerance at home and sought religious liberty here, were of our own creed, and thus appeal to our denominational sympathies for grateful remembrance and ceremonious commemoration?

We may safely say as members of that church of which these immigrants formed a part, that mere endurance of persecution for conscience sake is too general for special commemoration; and the bare profession of Catholicity is no enforcement of an appeal to perpetual distinction.

Mr. Chandler then proceeded to say, that considered only as of and for themselves, the pilgrims of St. Mary's though demanding our admiration for purity of character, loftiness of purpose, and clear, well-defined sense of justice in their aims; yet considered as only for themselves and their own times, these pilgrims entitled themselves to no special commemoration, and they established as certainly they preferred, no claim upon the gratitude of succeeding ages. The past and the present must be concerned to give character or effect to a public celebration. That it would be his aim on the present occasion to invite and lead his audience to a consideration of certain important and distinguished characteristics in the early movements of the colony of Maryland; and incidentally institute a comparison of the conduct, laws and customs of some of the other colonies with those of Lord Baltimore, especially with regard to the influences of creed upon the pursuits of the colonists; of the effect of that creed upon the treatment of the aboriginal inhabitants, the owners and occupants of the soil, which the colonists desired to possess, and, above all, because connected with the motive which influenced their emigration from Europe. Mr. Chandler said that the character of the St. Mary colonists could be judged of by their intercourse with the Indians, and their legislation with regard to that people whose existence and rights seem to have been a stumbling block to the most of the colonies. The acquisition of territory by the various bodies of the colonists was made by different modes—some by a distribution of miserable trinkets which lost their value as soon as the Indian found he had bartered away the realities of power for the worthless insignia of condition—some by debasing the appetites of the aborigines—others by treaties which had neither reason nor right, and for the breaking of which the colonists exterminated the aborigines with vengeance, and made even Christianity terrible to these worshippers of the Great Spirit by the vindictiveness of its professors.

In strong and beautiful contrast, continued Mr. Chandler, with these various modes of transferring the possessions of the nations, and of alienating their affections, is the plan adopted by the Catholic Pilgrims of Maryland, who acknowledge the poor Indian to be the proprietor of the soil, and recognized in him the form of the Creator and the object of the sacrifice and redemption of the Saviour.

They purchased the lands and paid for them. They offered peace and peaceful associations, and they presented the most attractive points of the Christian religion for the admiration and confidence of the Indians, viz: peace among themselves and kindness and justice towards others.

The only operative difference in the circumstances of the colonists of Maryland, and those of Virginia and New England, Mr. Chandler thought, consisted in their religious creed and the educational influences immediately and necessarily resulting therefrom, combined with the painful experience to which that creed has exposed them, and the lofty motives of purity and justice which the Christian religion supplies to all its followers, at all times, but which it suggests with great cogency when it also exposes them to the persecution of a tyrant king, or a thoughtless infuriated populace. There is scarcely a more beautiful page in history, sacred or profane, than that which records the dealing of Leonard Calvert and his followers with the aborigines, who tilted us on when we stand, as if indeed, as a proprietor, but as a visitor. He addressed the native chief, not as one who comes to conquer, but as one who came to purchase. His manners were not those which offended first and then irritated to hostility. They awakened caution, but they conciliated esteem and secured confidence. When the intrigue of an enemy in disguise provoked a portion of the savages to a war, the followers of Calvert made it a duty of the colonists to restore lands acquired by conquest, and made it a penal offense to kidnap or sell a friendly Indian, and a high misdemeanor to supply them with intoxicating liquor. Surely in these arrangements not only is there manifested the true spirit of Christianity with the fruits of charity and justice, but we must find in them something which appeals to our approval more than does the conduct of some of the other colonists; and I may as well add that the difference in the conduct of Calvert and that of the Governors of the other colonies was noticed at the time, and an old contemporary writer says, "Justice Popham and Sir George Calvert agreed not more unanimously in the public design of planting than they differed in the private way of it.—The first was for extirpating heathens; the second for converting them. He sent away the lowest, this, the soberest people. The one was for present profit, the other for reasonable expectation. The first set up a common stock out of which the peo-

ple should be provided by proportions. The second left every one to provide for himself."

Mr. Chandler then continued as follows: There are personal rights so sacred to every man that even the form of protection is an outrage. There are things too sanctified in their character or uses, for protection or defence; so blended with the character of one Government as to be inoperative or offensive in another, and yet above all assault from abroad, as they are above all defence at home—as the Jewish ark brought disease and disasters to the Philistines, who dared assault it, and death to the Hebrews who reached forth in its support. That sanctity belongs to religious creeds in our country, and is fully recognized in the Constitution, in the first place by withholding from the Government the right to apply any religious test to candidates for office, and thus are the professors of any single creed saved from the outrage of direct proscription. And in the second place, it is provided for in that sacred instrument that no legislation shall be had by which individuals of any creed shall be especially favored, nor any form of worship established or proscribed.

While we admire the beautiful theory of the Government which thus manifests itself in the fundamental law of the nation, we may, without inquiring into the neglect or violation of these principles and provisions, look back and find in the theory and practice of the first colonial Government of Maryland the only precedents for such provisions—precedents I mean, not merely in the idle declamation; not merely in pompous assertion, Utopian schemes—but precedents which rest on the plan and ample fulfillment of that plan by men who knew that the theory which they promulgated was unfashionable, who knew that while the opposite plans of Government were excluding them from the protection and political benefits of all the other colonies, their own plan was exposing them to the imminent risk of persecution and disfranchisement in their own colony.

It is to be remarked of the history of the colonies of which our Union was formed, that almost every one claims to have owed its existence to persecution at home, and almost every one made intolerance a leading feature of its own Government. And it is still more remarkable that not one of these colonies was formed by immigrants who had left their country on account of the intolerance of Roman Catholics. Nor is this all: while almost every colony owes its existence to Protestant intolerance, none but Maryland, the only Catholic colony of them all, attempted to practice religious liberty. She proclaimed universal liberty to every sect and division of sect that professed a belief in Jesus Christ, and knowing that France had contributed to the amount of our colonial population by the violence of a Catholic Government against its Protestant subjects, she opened her heart, and her fields also to their ingress, and as the peculiarity of their position might make them doubtful of their welcome, she passed a special law inviting fugitive Huguenots to come and enjoy in Catholic Maryland the freedom to worship God, which had been denied to them in France.

At the present moment, when it is the object of political proscriptionists to conceal or deny the existence or display of virtues in members of the Catholic Church, we hear it gravely asserted that the tolerance, the Christian liberty that distinguished the laws and government of the Maryland colony, was due to the respect which those colonists and the noble proprietors owed to the feelings and wishes of the Protestant monarch of England. If such an explanation of the motives of the various colonies with regard to tolerance or intolerance be admitted, it will prove to much. It may, indeed, deprive the Catholics of some portion of the credit for voluntary tolerance claimed in their behalf, but it makes it fairly inferable that the Protestant Governments made it not only a *sine qua non*, that Catholics should not disturb Protestants, but that Protestants should persecute Catholics, as some of the Protestant colonies enacted laws against sects differing from the dominant religious party, and most of them, even when a little charitable to Protestants of different views, fixed their cannons against Roman Catholics, and some of the children of persecution themselves assigned as a reason for intolerance, the special hostility of the British Government to the Papists, and the necessity of accommodating themselves and their laws to the wishes of the King and the home government.

The Catholic colony, according to a certain class of modern commentators, was charitable and tolerant out of fear of the King, while the Protestant colonies were intolerant and persecuting from love of the King. I admit of neither. I demand that each colony be judged by its own acts, without any reference to the imaginary wishes of the parent government, and I do this the more earnestly because I know that, whenever it suits the purposes of certain writers, they will make the state of the British government and the British King, during the early part of the seventeenth century, the means and the motive for conduct exactly opposite to that imputed to the respective Catholic and Protestant colonies. It is just to all parties to allow to each that amount of credit for motives which is fairly deducible from their acts, and in a period of much religious intolerance a colony hedges itself about with edicts of the most persecuting character, and inflicts penalties, pains and death on those whose views of Christian requirements differ from those of the majority, it is but just to suppose that they left the parent country with no disavowal of intolerance itself, but only as it affected their non-conformity; and it is no less fair to believe that a colony which, leaving an intolerant country, gives freedom to religious creeds, and makes it criminal to interfere with the differences of men's belief, that not only admits to equality all that are within its borders, but invites to itself, as to an asylum for the oppressed, the sufferers in other colonies.

It is fair, I say, to conclude that such a

colony has in itself a better appreciation of human rights and Christian freedom than exists among its intolerant neighbors. And I shall not, I hope, be considered as departing from the proprieties of these exercises, if I ask to present the facts of the tolerance or intolerance of the colonies in another light.

It is a favorite mode of attack with some writers of all recent times, and especially with certain demagogues of the present day, and in our own country, to seize upon the facts of history and deduce therefrom arguments against the Catholic creed which these facts in no way sustain—which they scarcely suggest. The intolerance of certain Governments of Europe, in which the Catholic religion is a part of the State, is made an argument against that religion, as if Catholicity leaned upon the State for support, and required intolerance for its maintenance. Though equal intolerance exercised by a Protestant Government connected with a State religion is passed over without comment, or as if supplying no argument against the requirements of that creed.

Denying, as we of the Catholic Church must deny, and as I do not deny, that there is aught of political intolerance in the creed of the Catholic Church, and asserting, as I do assert, that political man, and not the religious creed, is responsible for the evils done in the name of Church and State to sustain my assertion in behalf of Catholicity, and I appeal to no such destructive or deteriorating association to prove that Protestantism has been bellicose and intolerant.

The colonies, whence sprang the States that constitute this nation, afford admirable means of judging of the character of the religious creeds transplanted to this soil, as no necessity was laid upon any colony to enact laws intolerant of religious sects, no commands of the parent government fixed the religious creed of any association or rendered necessary the observance of prescribed forms and ceremonies. The whole were in a remarkable degree independent and therefore each may well be supposed to act upon the impulses or suggestions most naturally springing from its religious principles, without regard to considerations of State or municipal benefits. Nothing can be more evident than that the emigrants who left England to establish these colonies (the more needy adventurer, the money-loving and the involuntary immigrant excepted) made it a part of their plan to divest their new government of all that seemed to them oppressive in its character and disagreeable in its operation at home, to place themselves, where neither proscription nor habit rendered necessary a countenance of custom and laws that operate unequally, or that seemed by a change of circumstances to have out-lived the necessities of time in which they originated, or the character of the age that rendered them appropriate or tolerable.

It does not appear that all had definite views of all that would result from their new arrangements, or that they fully anticipated the harvest that was to be gathered from their planting. But great changes certainly were contemplated by the leading minds—important corrections of painful abuses. The tyranny of a few over the rights of the many was to have a remedy in the political association in Plymouth, and no one can doubt that Lord Baltimore fore-ordained the religious tolerance that distinguished his colonists, and planned for careful observation the scheme of justice, kindness and equality with which his people dealt with the Indians. What, then, is the course adopted by the leaders of various colonies with regard to this recurrence to first principles, this divesting themselves of the conventionalisms of ages, under social and political circumstances that need have no operation on this side of the Atlantic? Where each religious creed was allowed to present itself and its suggestions without the intervention of political influences, and to stand forth unaffected by any concessions to temporal power—the influences of persecution or favoritism!

I invite the curious in history, I invite the searcher after truth to investigate the subject, and to see what was the effect of the divers creeds upon the different colonies; that they may determine which colony (regarded as a political body and an exponent of certain views of forms of Government) manifested a practice which involved not merely the greatest good of the greatest number, but which invited the greatest portion of its members to direct action in all legislation that concerned the whole; and which colony as the professor and exponent of a particular religious creed, manifested the most of Christian charity—the most of forbearance to others; and which exercised the largest liberty to all without making the possession or profession of the various creeds (which even at that day distinguished the Christian world) a claim for special favor, or a bar to domestic quiet, social equality and political preferment.

It appears to me that this is a view of the subject that ought to be taken; and as we seek for truth, and truth only, we ought not to neglect the suggestion which the facts of the history of such a remarkable juncture present. I need not tell this audience again what were the statutes and ordinances of the Eastern colonies with regard to those who professed religious opinions at variance with the creed of the dominant sect. History furnishes the record; and there are none to deny or doubt its correctness. And while quakerism, anabaptism, anti-unitarianism, unitarianism or any other less, than that which was the distinctive of the majority, was made the cause of imprisonment, stripes, banishment, and death in one colony, it is a lamentable truth that the colony formed by the persecuted, the whipped and the banished excepted from the operation of its enforced toleration, the religious denomination that included the largest part of Christendom. Nay, leveled its cannons of intolerance and prohibition against that Christian denomination which all of those gathered in this New World had, by special enactment, proclaimed equality to all other sects, and which gave laws indeed to almost

the only colony in which the persecuted persecutors could have had a resting place out of their own narrow confines; yea, Rhode Island, the child of persecution, persecuted. The little colony, whose inhabitants were drawn together by the sound of the whip, and the threats of the rope, menaced other Christians with banishment, and devised instruments of persecution; and if it did not banish, it was because by its threats, it precluded admission to those who, by entering the colony, would have become obnoxious to the penalties of her uncharitable statutes.

It seems then as if the spirit of intolerance was a part of the creed that influenced some of the colonies; and, without going into details, we may say, that just in proportion as religion was made prominent in some of the colonies, did the hostility to those of other sects manifest itself in the laws and customs of Pennsylvania may have formed to the evidence of general hatred of denomination, it is evident that the founder and proprietor of that colony yielded up to fear and expediency, what others sacrificed with a hearty good will, and his dread of "Mass house" was superior to his love of tolerance.

While the colonies in general were manifesting this settled hostility against those who refused to conform to the religious creed of the majority, and especially against the Roman Catholics, Lord Baltimore's colony took possession of the grant on the Chesapeake, and commenced the work of government. Free from the trammels of foreign influences, unfettered by any laws of conformity, and, as yet without the vexations of inconvenient customs, he had no bad precedents to embarrass him, he had no favorites to reward, and no enemies to defeat, or punish. The people who followed his brother understood the object of their mission, and had received lessons of political wrongs and religious persecutions to make them love with tolerance, and they possessed too much of the spirit of Christianity to deny to others what they coveted for themselves.

The world had seen in other colonies the effect of dominant sectaries yielding themselves to the suggestion of their creeds, and it was evident that nothing had been gained by making any sect the repository of power. It was, therefore, evidently the intention of Lord Baltimore to give a new feature to colonization, by allowing his own creed to suggest the treatment to others and to make Catholicity, untrammelled by State dependence, the exponent of religious rights and the minister of political equality. Hence the Protestant Historian is enabled to say "with a policy the wisdom of which was the more remarkable, as it was far in advance of the spirit of the age (that is because it was not derived from the spirit of the age but from the spirit of the gospel)." Lord Baltimore laid the foundation of his province on the broad basis, of freedom in religion and security to property. Christianity as a part of the old common law of England, was established by the proprietor, without allowing any pre-eminence to any particular form of its exhibition.

How truly christian, as we all understand christianity, as we hear it cited around us, every day, are the views thus imputed to Lord Baltimore thus entering into and influencing all his plans for the colonial government. But I know it may be said, say, it will be said, that the profession of a founder of a colony may be truly admirable while the experience of his colonists may be very different from the hopes which these professions warranted. That the real intentions, indeed, of the founder and proprietor may be neglected by his secular officers, and the administration of affairs be in entire opposition to his plans. Such it may be supposed was the case in some of the colonies. Such it is certain was not the case in Maryland, while the religion of which the founder and most of the colonists were professors, was allowed its operation in the legislation of the inchoate state, and with a view of securing and perpetrating that freedom of conscience for which he labored, Cecil Calvert prescribed for the Governor of his province from 1636 onward the following oath of office:—

"I will not, by myself, or any other directly or indirectly, trouble or molest, or discombrace any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for or in respect to religion; I will make no difference of persons in conferring offices, favors or rewards, for or in respect of religion, but merely as they shall be found faithful and well deserving, and endowed with moral virtues and abilities; my aim shall be public utility; and if any person or officer shall molest any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ on account of his religion, I will protect the person molested and punish the offender."

Surely the spirit of entire equality never did a more perfect work, than that proposed by Lord Baltimore, and carried out by his colonists. Persecuted at home; oppressed with legal disabilities, and still more embarrassed with the annoying antagonism of a dominant party, and the incitatory hostility of numerous sectaries, agreeing only in that hostility, those colonists manifested a spirit of Christian kindness that does infinite credit to the creed which they professed. And if subsequent observation enables us to say that it was the true mode of perpetuating the colony, by securing immigration to the oppressed and suffering of other creeds, it may be said in reply that the dictates of Christianity are always the most expedient in a full experiment; and we have advanced in our argument if we show a perfect consistency in the practice of those elements and the dictates of Christianity, and made apparent the coincidence of their creed, with their beautiful practice.

I have felt called on to present the action of the early colonists of Maryland with regard to religious liberty as a strong contrast with the facts which history presents in its record of the proceedings of the colonies, not because

*Chalmers as quoted by Hawkes.

it is agreeable to throw a shadow over the glory of the settlers of other portions of this country, or that under ordinary circumstances, such comparisons are expedient, it would be more agreeable to dwell on the sterling virtues of other colonists, and they had stern and sterling virtues, and to give them credit for a subsequent adoption of that practice which distinguished the Pilgrim Fathers of St. Mary's. But we do not, and we ought not, to conceal from ourselves, or attempt to deny to others, that we celebrate the landing of these Pilgrims—the advent of men of a certain creed—and that the circumstances of the people of the various colonies at that time render it easy to compare the character of the motives by which each community was influenced, and to judge of the nature and propriety of the leading principle of all, by the effects which that principle wrought upon the conduct, wishes, and legislation of the several bodies.

And let me add, that the circumstances of the present times, fully justify the inquiry. Nay more, these circumstances render such an inquiry, and such a comparison, a solemn duty to ourselves and our creed, and we may regard this celebration as one of providential occurrence, supplying the opportunity and the means of a deserved and triumphant vindication. Not for the triumphant but for the vindication.

In the particular instance of religious tolerance the comparison is presented, not by the records of men of the creed of the early colonists of St. Mary's not by men who from education, association or interest could be supposed to lean towards that unfriended creed. The history of all those events is from writers who are strongly hostile to the creed of which Lord Baltimore had adopted, and in one instance it is presented by a historian whose life is dedicated to the promulgation of the doctrines of another church. His work does honor to himself and his principles, and appeals to judgment against the prejudices of the ignorant and the erring.

If the peculiar characteristic of the early institutions of the colony are found prevailing in a superior degree the theory of our national government, and the broad and expansive liberality of the colonial legislature is, more than the legislation or practice of any other colony, reflected in the constitutional provisions of our general government, it may not be an extravagant presumption to conclude that these institutions, and especially that liberality, had much to do with the formation and cultivation of a state of policy which led to the declaration and achievement of national independence. I have no time now to trace up these effects to their natural causes, nor to seize upon the admitted circumstances of the Maryland colony, and follow them down with their constantly augmenting effects, until they connect themselves (as causes with results) with the movements of the colonies towards a redress of wrongs, and then with these events which led to our existence as a nation, and the moulding of the government and the adoption of the constitution is a form so truly democratic in its theory.

It is the opinion of many British writers who have access to American anti-revolutionary documents, that it was the fixed and well-arranged purpose of the American colonists, at an early age, to become independent of the parent government. I do not possess the means of arriving at such a conclusion; but, to me, it is rather evident that the democratic character of the colonial governments, the various degrees of freedom recognized under them, and the habits of self-reliance inculcated and formed, were certain to lead to that independence, which may, therefore, be regarded as the inevitable result of peculiar circumstances, rather than the accomplishment of any preconceived plan. Surely it is more to the lasting honor of our ancestors of the early colonies than the national independence and national character were rather the natural results of practical virtues of liberal principles, adopted for the sake of their liberality, and of a lofty estimation of human rights, than the effect of any idea of rebellion first, and victory afterwards. Both produce a nation, but each proceeds from a separate class of motives, and each, when successful, is productive of different national characteristics.

I do not deny that our ancestors very early entertained an idea of separation from the mother country; but still I doubt it. It is not quite consistent with all their professions. Our independence was the inevitable result of early circumstances; and a state of feelings and a mode of action almost necessarily resulting from such circumstances; and with that view, I think it easy to see how the spirit of the Pilgrims of St. Mary's co-worked not only to produce that great result, but also how it co-operated to mould the features of that result to the particular form, they presented in 1776 and 1788, and how they have led to the amelioration of such which, though at that time it was considered at with the general feeling of the public, subsequently required an accommodation to the advances in public sentiment. We must never overlook the important fact that though truth is inimitable in its character, it is altogether progressive in its influence. And good principles operate not always to the extent of their goodness so much as the capabilities and power of their subject, and different co-efficients express that power under different circumstances. He who saw "men as trees walking" was using the full measure of his perception, and the fulness of the grace that had wrought the miracle, as much as he was when he became enabled to direct his vision to a proper estimate of forms and distances. It was not the principle, it was not the power restoring the sight, that was deficient; it was the weakness of the unprepared organ that was unable to accommodate itself to the blessing, that it was in itself to grasp the full measure of the gift, but had from its own imperfection to await the result of those principles which had begun its operation.

So while I see, and we all acknowledge as

Dr. Hawkes, Historian of the Episcopal Church in Maryland and Virginia.