

With the authors respect

AN APPEAL

TO THE

VOLUNTARY CITIZENS

OF THE

UNITED STATES,

FROM ALL NATIONS,

ON

The Exercise of their Elective Franchise,

AT THE APPROACHING

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

BY HENRY E. RIELL.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE EVENING POST, 27 PINE STREET.

1840.

Pure. Western Hemisphere
5 Feb 1973
See Fund

AN APPEAL.

TO THE VOLUNTARY CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.

FELLOW CITIZENS!

Important events are occurring in this republic which call imperatively and especially upon you, its voluntary citizens—upon you, its citizens by enlightened preference and noble choice—to come forth, in the might of your elective franchise, in defence of those principles of liberty, which you have solemnly sworn to maintain, and those inestimable rights and privileges which you have thereby acquired and enjoy.

It is probably not unknown to any of you that a narrow souled, ignoble, and most ungenerous faction has existed for some years past in this country, whose avowed object is the abrogation of an essentially republican clause of the Constitution, by effecting an "entire repeal" of those laws of naturalization which that sacred charter of human freedom expressly ordains, and which were enacted in obedience to its requisitions. This parricidal faction, under the bigoted pretext, or the hypocritical pretence, that the Constitution, in some vague and unspecified respect, is in danger from your secret subversion, or open hostility, would madly destroy it themselves, by driving the dagger of a morbid, reckless jealousy into one of its most vital provisions, and without the full and healthful action of which it would shrink into a withered and shrivelled mockery of the expansive design of its founders, and become the scorn of all liberal men.

The spirit which actuates this faction, "Native American" though it is unworthily called, is precisely of that gloomy, contracted and tyrannically suspicious kind which distinguished the monarchists of the old world and the political bigots of the darkest ages, and is most debasing to the republican character and dishonorable to the American name.—You are familiar, fellow citizens, with the fact, that it was a specific charge against the last monarch of this country, and one of the explicit arguments in the Declaration of Independence against his unrighteous authority, that he had "endeavored to prevent the population of these states, by obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners, by refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and by raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands." This is precisely the same mistaken, small-minded policy which is pursued by the Native American faction, and for which attempts have been made in several recent sessions of Congress, with a degree of bold effrontery revolting, if not alarming, to every republican mind. You are doubtless as familiar with that stain upon our early republican history, the notorious "Alien and Sedition Laws," which were enacted

acted by the old Federal party (or rather *faction*, because the advocates of unconstitutional principles and measures are not entitled to the denomination of a party,) under the administration of the elder Adams. By these atrocious laws, the President was empowered to banish from the broad territory of the United States, without examination, without trial, and even without accusation, any and every foreign resident whom he might suspect, or pretend to suspect, of views hostile to the government; and compel them to leave their property, their families, and their honest avocations, under the penalty of imprisonment and perpetual disqualification for citizenship. This was the despotic power given to the President by the federal faction under the alien law; and the sedition law, which was enacted at the same time, deprived not aliens merely, but virtually all citizens, of the liberty of speech and the press, concerning the affairs of government and the conduct of its officers, by imposing enormous fines, and incarceration in a political dungeon, as the penalty of every constructive offence against its prohibitions. It is unnecessary to remind you how cruelly these laws were enforced, for their effects are memorable in our political annals, and remain as admonitions to us and to our children to resist the attempts which are now making to revive them, and which have been repeated during several of our recent sessions of Congress by a faction which inherits the illiberal spirit from which they originally sprung.

If these attempts were made only by that small and scattered association of "Native Americans," professedly formed "without distinction of party," which has heretofore occasionally burlesqued our general elections by an exhibition of numbers as limited as its principles are contracted, it would be less an object of apprehension than of ridicule. But that faction can now no longer be deemed a small one, nor be safely treated with indifference. Finding that its motives and objects were utterly repugnant to the opinions and the pride of every high minded American who appreciated the constitutional standard and magnanimity of this republic, it sought and received the powerful alliance of that great party which has ever displayed a natural affinity to the illiberal men and measures of every other, and which, in fact, has renovated and perpetuated its existence by the apostates and cast-offs which it has thus acquired. The central association of this body, which exists at Washington, under the title of "the Native American Association of the United States," together with its various branches, which extend to every state and principal town in the Union, subtly penetrating and poisoning every social and political relation of life, and secretly operating with more than

jesuitical cunning and pertinacity of purpose through the whole community, constitute, in reality, the grand organization of the fraudently styled "Whig" party, throughout the country. The prostrate and meagre skeleton has thus become endowed with life and vigor, and stands forth with the iron rod of proscription against every refugee from tyranny and oppression who may seek that asylum in our boundless land and that participation in its freedom, which our institutions guarantee and proclaim.

Fellow citizens: As a native American, and the son of a native American, taught from infancy to revere and love the exalted maxims of equal justice, and the heart expanding breadth of political benevolence upon which our proud system of freedom is founded, I blush with shame at the dishonor which is done to it by those who, from the boasted rights and privileges of their birth, should be the first to do justice to its character, and to protect it from the degrading stigma of inhospitality. I disclaim all fraternity of feeling and connection with such men, and regard them as the worst and the most unnatural of aliens—"aliens in their native land"—aliens in spirit to the institutions which they should proudly cherish as the noblest inheritance of their birthright.

As a native American, I exult in the triumphant truth that the country which gave me birth, is destined, both politically and physically, to be the free asylum for the oppressed and the distressed of the universal world. As an American, with far more than a million millions of the square acres of my native soil around me, I cannot so far crush my feelings of philanthropy and honest pride as to tell mankind that this wide world affords no asylum for suffering humanity—no refuge for the oppressed. On the contrary I would tell them that it is here without money and without price, and that we lay claim to but an humble meed of beneficence, even for this gratuity; for never had a people so much to give at so slight a sacrifice. Sacrifice!—the boasted gratuity is a loan at interest, and the whole commonwealth becomes enriched by the labor, the skill, the industry, which it thus procures. Partial evils there may be—local pauperism, and therefore unequal burdens—but these evils, like those in the economy of a bounteous providence, tends to redress themselves, and are but the concomitants of universal good.

As a native American republican, too, I would protest against that erroneously assumed superiority of hereditary to inherent and natural right; of fortuitous and involuntary to chosen and voluntary citizenship, upon which the false pride, the haughty prejudices, and the arrogant usurpations of the "Native American" faction and its allies are founded.—To attach merit or demerit to fortuitous events over which we have no control, is identically the fallacious principle upon which hereditary monarchies, the inequitable laws of promogeniture, and all the aristocratic distinctions which exist from birth are founded; but they are utterly exploded and repudiated in our system of government which is based alone upon the natural rights of man. Every feature of our republican constitution harmonises with the fundamental doctrine previously promulgated in the declaration of independence as a self-evident truth, namely, "that all men are created equal, and endowed by their creator with certain unalienable

rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

If this be the prerogative of human nature by birth, then has no man, nor nation of men, any prerogative that contravenes or invalidates it. No nation can righteously deny these natural and equal rights to those who seek them, and, accordingly, our equitable form of government offers them freely to all, upon the reasonable condition that the recipients of them shall solemnly promise to uphold and preserve, for the benefit of others, that constitution which has conferred these blessings upon themselves, and absjure allegiance to every other authority. Nor does the constitution permit the government to make any laws of naturalization that would operate partially and unequally—favoring foreigners of one nation more than those of another, or one class of foreigners from the same nation, more than another. In strict accordance with the doctrine of equal rights, it requires equal laws of naturalization, without which, those rights would be invaded. Every naturalized citizen, therefore, owes it to himself and to the cause of liberty in general, to remember and duly appreciate the truth, that his political position in the United States is in nowise inferior to that of a citizen by birth, except in his disqualification for the two highest offices of the government; and even this exception establishes the general rule of his equality. If the native citizen claims any other superiority from the adventitious circumstance of birth, and would attach any disparagement to the title "adopted," or "naturalized" citizen, he proves himself unworthy of the privileges which accident, rather than choice, has conferred upon him; and he might well be asked for the same pledge of fealty to the institutions of his country that you, its voluntary citizens, have given.

The presidential and congressional election which approaches, is a contest between the advocates of the largest and the smallest liberty, for the ascendancy of their respective systems and the legislation which would flow from them. It is into these two classes that the two great political parties of the republic are and ever have been divided. The friends of the largest liberty are those who advocate equal rights and advantages, and equal laws to obtain and ensure them. The friends of the smallest liberty, are the advocates of partial rights and advantages, and of those partial laws which would produce and perpetuate them.—The latter are the friends not only of those special privileges in pecuniary credit and financial operations which cause undue extremes in the conditions of men, creating aristocratical distinctions, and making the rich man more rich by the very process which makes the poor more poor—placing the workingman's daily wages upon the uncertain tenure of a credit capital which is perpetually liable and eventually sure to explode, and leave its dependants either destitute of all employment for long periods, or reduced to wages by which they can scarcely procure the mere necessaries of life—but the friends also of special privileges in the elective franchise. They would not only make laws which must eventually deprive the great mass of the people of all property, by accumulating it in comparatively few hands; but also deprive them of their elective franchise, by requiring a property qualifica-

tion, which it would thus be impossible for the mass to obtain. Nor is this all. Their theory of the smallest liberty, includes "that entire repeal of the naturalization laws," which would leave a large and constantly increasing portion of our population without the rights of citizenship, and thus expose the country to those intestine animosities and commotions which would inevitably arise from such an inequality of privilege, instead of binding all classes together in the happy bonds of equal advantage, interest and regard.

These parties, fellow citizens, need no other distinctive designations than those which are stamped upon their characters by their own acts, attempted schemes, and avowed intentions. To remind you of these, and more particularly of such as relate to the rights of aliens, is the object of the following extracts and remarks, which will afford you an unequivocal rule of judgment in deciding which of these parties is entitled to your suffrages and support.— In the recent attempts of the modern "whigs," in reality Tories, to substantially revive the alien and sedition laws of the old federal party, and in the insolent arrogance, slander and misrepresentation with which these attempts are accompanied and enforced, you will see that party sailing under its original colors, tolerating only the smallest conceivable amount of human freedom, and composed of the most anti-republican of men that can pretend to the republican name. In the steady and intrepid resistance to these schemes, and in the bold and generous advocacy of liberal principles, feelings and measures, which are exhibited by the democratic party, you will see the republicanism of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and that magnanimous championship of the rights of men which becomes our character as American freemen. From the comparative view which you will thus take of the opposite conduct of the two parties, you will perceive that the memorable contest of '98, which resulted in the triumph of democratic principles, and the election of THOMAS JEFFERSON, is again at hand, with the same principles at stake, and equally important objects of our republican regard, to be lost or won.

That you, fellow citizens, will be found wanting at such a crisis—that you, over whose rights the great political battle of '98 was fought and won,—that you, who have ever been among the foremost in the ranks of high-minded freemen, faithfully contending for the purest and loftiest doctrines of our republican creed, and the most vigilant in detecting the insidious designs of our opponents—that you will side with the enemy on *this* occasion, can be supposed only by those who basely accuse you of insincerity in your past professions and conduct, and with a secret antipathy to the institutions of our country. On the contrary, I, who know you well, and have never hesitated to incur the obloquy of defending you from these slanders, am convinced that, while the noble and righteous cause of the democracy of this land will receive from you that spontaneous and ardent support which the great majority of naturalized citizens have heretofore given to it; there are few, very few, even of those who may have acted with our opponents, on occasions and measures of inferior moment, who will not unite with us *now*, under one common impulse. The revived

questions which are now again at issue, appeal directly and specially to the self-respect, the honest pride, the social dignity, the parental duty, the republican professions, and the sworn obligations of every naturalized citizen in the country, whatever may be his opinions upon other questions, or the exercise of his suffrage in other times.

HENRY E. RIELL.

EXTRACT I.—*Federal (or Whig) Petitions for the repeal of the Naturalization Laws.*

The following petition was presented to the House of Representatives on the 6th of February, 1840, by the Hon. John T. Stuart, of Illinois, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

"Fellow Citizens: The petition of the undersigned citizens of the United States, and of the State of Illinois, respectfully shows their belief, that time has fulfilled the object had in view by our fathers at the period of adopting the Constitution, when they gave Congress the power of passing laws for the naturalization of foreigners; and your petitioners also show their belief, that the farther admission of foreigners to a participation in the political rights of native Americans, would be hurtful to the interest of our country, and if continued will, sooner or later, prove destructive to our Republican institutions. Your petitioners, therefore, ask the attention of your honorable body to the various petitions for a repeal of the naturalization laws, which have been formally presented to your honorable body; and they further ask your honorable body to repeal entirely the laws which now exist in regard to the naturalization of foreigners."

Here we have one of a multitude of other federal petitions of precisely the same purport, praying that no person who was, or may be, born in any other latitude and longitude than those included within the United States, shall hereafter be permitted to participate in the political rights of native Americans. The petitioners profess to think that the continuance of the constitutional privilege would be hurtful to the interests of the country and subversive of our republican institutions. Why they think so, they do not say. They do not charge naturalized citizens with any overt acts of treason; with having refused to shed their blood for the common weal; or with propagating anti-republican doctrines and feelings. It might not have been convenient to substantiate such charges; and as native Americans, forsooth, the petitioners probably considered it beneath their amazing dignity to assign any reasons whatever for an opinion which they acknowledge to be contrary to the constitution of their country.

The Hon. John Reynolds, a Democratic representative in Congress, from Illinois, says in a letter to his constituents on the subject of the above petition, that he "was truly astonished that the doctrines of the old alien law were about to be revived in the State of Illinois," but that so many of like character have been presented to Congress, during the last and preceding sessions, "from different parts of the Union, that it seems to be a concerted attack on foreigners, and a settled determination to circumscribe, or prevent entirely, the naturalization of aliens." And he adds, "Societies are formed in many of the cities of the Union, expressly for the purpose of obtaining from Congress the repeal of all the naturalization laws, and in future to prevent foreigners from participating in our free institutions."

But have any such petitions been sent by the members of the *Democratic* party, or have any adherents to the *Democratic* creed enrolled themselves members of such societies? We may all safely unite in challenging a disproof of the assertion that there has not been one. Such sentiments and objects, indeed, are cherished only by American Federalists, the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Calmuc Tartars; and are utterly repudiated by the people of every other part of the civilized world. Let us now compare this proscriptive, blind, and miserable spirit with the high and generous soul of democracy upon this question:

EXTRACT II.—*Democratic resolution of the late Baltimore Convention, concerning the naturalization of foreigners.*

On the 6th of May, 1840, the Democratic Convention at Baltimore, which nominated President Van Buren for re-election, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"9. Resolved, That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which make ours the land of liberty, and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith; and every attempt to abridge the present privilege of becoming citizens, and the owners of soil among us, ought to be resisted, with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute book."

And in this obviously republican resolution, the whole democratic party throughout the Union most cordially concurs. It expresses at once the convictions of their judgments, the feelings of their hearts, and the cardinal principles of their republican faith. Let us now see what our democratic President, Martin Van Buren, says upon the subject to which this resolution refers:—

EXTRACT III.—*President Van Buren on the Alien and Sedition laws.*

The following paragraphs are extracted from a letter written by the President, on the 4th of July, 1840, in reply to an invitation to attend a great democratic festival at the White Sulphur Springs, in Scott County, Kentucky, on the 11th of that month. They eloquently refer to the resolutions passed by the patriarchs and the democracy in general, of Kentucky and Virginia, in the noble detestation of the Alien and Sedition laws of '98, which the Federalists of the present day are attempting substantially to re-enact:

"That I have been so fortunate as to secure 'the entire approbation of the Democracy of Kentucky;' that they look upon me as 'true to the Constitution of the United States,' 'the representative and advocate of their principles in the Executive department' of our Government, cannot but afford me peculiar satisfaction, coming as it does, from a highly respectable portion of the ancient and time-honored patriots of that noble State, and from the sons of those who, in their day, were the pillars of the Republic—History, gentlemen, must be false to her duty when she ceases to inform mankind, that it was by Kentucky that the first effectual blow was struck at the dangerous principles introduced into the administration of our Government soon after the adoption of the Constitution—principles which had already led to acts of fearful usurpation, and threatened speedily to destroy as well the rights of the States as the liberties of the people. It was the Kentucky resolutions, backed by those of her patriotic parent State, which changed the current of public opinion and brought back the administration of the Government to the principles of the Revolution. For forty years the Democracy of the Union have looked upon those resolutions as the creed of their political faith; political degeneracy has been marked by departure from that standard; and like the original lan-

guage of the Bible in matters of religion, they are the text book of every reformer.

"Nothing could more effectually prove the purity of the principles then announced than the progress they have since made in the minds of men. While even the name of the proud and powerful party which opposed them, has come to be considered a term of reproach, if not of ignominy and insult, the principles of the Kentucky resolutions, in profession if not in fact, now enter into the creed of every political sect, and the once derided name borne by their apostates and advocates, is considered an essential passport to popularity and success. Nay, more, the people almost with one voice have recently recognized and consecrated the principles of those resolutions by an act as impressive and emphatic as it is possible for a nation to perform.—Since your letter has been lying before me waiting for a reply, it has become my agreeable duty to confirm the fiat of the nation settling forever the unconstitutionality of the sedition laws of 1798 by approving an act for the relief of the heirs of Matthew Lyon, refunding to them a fine collected of their ancestor, under the law in question. Party prejudice, judicial authority, dread of the precedent, respect for that which has assumed the form of law for forty years have successfully resisted this act of justice; but at length all are swept away by the irresistible current of public opinion, and the sedition act has been irreversibly decided to be unconstitutional by a tribunal higher than the courts of justice—the sovereign people of the United States. The patriarchs of Kentucky and Virginia, the men who in that day, midst obloquy and insult, voted for or sustained the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1799, cannot but rejoice with joy unspeakable in witnessing the final triumph of the pure principles to which they then announced their allegiance. They and their descendants have a right to glory in seeing those principles recognized, even at this late day, by the acclamations of a nation, and one of the tyrannical acts against which they protested virtually expunged from the records of the country.

"While to aged patriots it is a subject of congratulation and joy, it teaches the young that efforts at reform in the government of their country ought never to be considered hopeless as long as there is any thing to improve, and that if the fathers do not enjoy the fruits of their exertions in the cause of Democratic principles, they are certain to fall in blessings upon the children."

The Matthew Lyon to whom the president refers in the middle paragraph of the above extract, was an Irish naturalized citizen, the editor of a paper at Vergennes, Vermont, and democratic member of Congress elect. He was indicted and tried, under the sedition law, for publishing a political article against John Adams, then President of the United States, and having been found guilty, he was fined a thousand dollars and sentenced to four months imprisonment. He paid his fine and endured the term of his dungeon sentence; but to the honor of democratic principles, be it known, Mr. Van Buren, with the permission of Congress, has refunded the original fine and costs, amounting to \$1,060-96 cents, to Matthew Lyon's heirs, together with the forty years interest upon the fine, which the government justly owed them.

This act of President Van Buren, is strictly in unison with the course of President Jefferson, under the same circumstances. He promptly discharged all those who were suffering persecution for opinion's sake under the sedition law, immediately on his coming into office. In one of his letters, he says, "I discharged every person under punishment, or persecution, under the sedition law, because I considered, and now consider that law to be a nullity as absolute and palpable as if Congress had ordered us to lie down and worship a golden image; and that it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage, as it would have been to rescue from the fiery furnace those cast into it for refusing to worship the image. It was accordingly done in every instance, without asking what the offenders

had done, or against whom they had offended; but whether the pains they were suffering were inflicted under the pretended sedition law." Yet it is no longer ago than the last session of Congress, that the following virtual revival of the sedition law was attempted by the federalists, both in the Senate and in the House:—

EXTRACT IV.—*The new Sedition Law of the Federal Party in the year 1839.*

The following bill was presented in the Senate by Mr. Crittenden, the Federal Senator from Kentucky:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the first day of April, in the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-nine, no marshal or deputy marshal, no postmaster or deputy postmaster, no receiver or register of a land office, or any of their deputies or clerks, no surveyor general of the public lands, or any of his deputies or assistants, no collector, surveyor, naval officer, weigher, gauger, appraiser, or other officer or person whatsoever concerned or employed in the charging, collecting, levying, or managing the customs, or any branch or part thereof, no engineer, officer, or agent employed or concerned in the execution or superintendence of any of the public works, shall by word, message, or writing, or in any other manner whatsoever, endeavor to persuade any elector to give, or dissuade any elector from giving, his vote for the choice of any person to be elector of President and Vice President of these United States, or for the choice of any person to be a Senator or Representative in the Congress of the said United States, or for the choice of any person to be Governor or Lieutenant Governor of any State, or of any person to be a Representative or member in the Legislative Department of any State of this Union, or for the choice of any person to serve in any public office established by the law of any of said States; nor shall any such officer or person intermeddle in any of the elections above mentioned, or use any means with intent to influence or control the same, otherwise than by giving his own vote; and every person offending therein shall forfeit the sum of five hundred dollars; one moiety thereof to the informer, and the other moiety thereof to the United States aforesaid, to be recovered, with costs of suit, by any person that shall sue for the same, by action of debt, bill, or plain in any of the district or circuit courts of the United States; and every person convicted, on any such suit, of the said offence, shall thereby become disabled and incapable of ever bearing or executing any office or place of trust whatsoever under the said United States."

In this we behold not only an attempt to deprive every person holding an office of the right of expressing his political opinions, "by word, message, writing, or in any other manner whatsoever," but an aggression upon the rights of the States, by a direct interference with their elections. In the House of Representatives a bill of similar effect was presented by Mr. Bell, a Federal member from Tennessee, in which the fine proposed was \$1000. Let us contrast the arbitrary, tyrannical character of such Federal laws, with the glowing liberality of an old and true democrat, as evinced in the following sentiments concerning laws of the same kind.

EXTRACT V.—*Vice President Johnson on the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798.*

The following is an extract from the reply of Col. Richard Mentor Johnson, to an invitation to attend the Democratic festival at White Sulphur Springs, Kentucky, on the 11th of July, 1840:

"Among the patriarchs of our state we together imbibed the free spirit of democracy. The principles of civil and religious liberty were unfolded to our youthful minds, as we regaled ourselves at the family board or surrounded the social fire, when the toils of the day were ended. The sentiments were then engraven upon the tablets of our hearts, that all men were upon an equality—that no disparity of fortune or profession could change the relations in

which we stood as equals—that the election polls were the fountain whence all power flowed, and that every freeman exerted the same strength there. Our minds were unfettered with those metaphysical distinctions which always tend to elevate one class and depress another. The highest title to which we aspired was that of American citizen; and this was our peerage, our hereditary prerogative.—When we chose one to represent us we regarded him merely as our agent to represent our principles—and we canvassed all his acts, and held him responsible for his doings. It was on this principle alone that I became your representative, and on this alone that you could ever give to any person your suffrage.

"We could scarcely think it possible that in these Republican States, a different sentiment should find an advocate till the earliest political excitement which I recollect was produced in 1798, by the passage of the alien and sedition laws. We had regarded our country as a refuge for the oppressed of all nations; but when we saw one man clothed with power to banish every victim of despotism who sought an asylum on our shores, and without the proof or accusation of a crime, we could not remain insensible to the danger. When we saw an ordinance which would protect the President and Congress from scrutiny by heavy fines and cruel imprisonment, without any reciprocal action upon them in favor of the citizen, we felt that a distinct order was established, and the rights of equality invaded.

"When we saw, in the passage of these laws, an assumption of power the constitution had not delegated, and a direct violation of the restrictions which it had interposed, we raised the standard of opposition. Kentucky could breathe no other atmosphere than that of freedom; and she would not and could not brook the usurpation. Amidst the excitement which these measures produced, our Democratic principles became more than ever riveted in our hearts; and the only effect produced was that of teaching us to be more constant in our vigilance and more rigid in our scrutiny."

EXTRACT VI.—*Something worse than the Alien Law, and a Great Mystery explained.*

As an additional and striking illustration of the malignant Tory spirit of the self styled "Whigs" of the present day, towards foreigners who seek to enjoy the freedom of this republic as good, faithful and industrious citizens, I will present an extract from "An Address of the Louisiana Native American Association, to the citizens of Louisiana, and the inhabitants of the United States," which is signed by a Committee of more than one hundred persons. The following explicit paragraph is from the 18th page of the Address, and it will be seen that it embodies a congenial hint from the inaugural message of Governor Seward, of New York:

"The present Executive of the State of New York, Governor Seward, in his inaugural message, says: 'There is another resource which is ours, neither by inheritance nor by purchase, nor by violence nor by fraud. It is the LABOUR, the incalculable LABOR of the European States. The truth of this statement every native American is proud to admit; it is, indeed, by their labor, AND BY THAT ONLY, that foreigners render ANY SERVICE to the United States; and it is the duty, as it is the just prerogative of the American people, TO CONFINE THEM TO THIS THEIR ONLY PROPER VOCATION IN OUR COUNTRY'"

In this frank disclosure we have a satisfactory explanation of the mysterious phrase, "the bone and sinew of the country," as applied by the "whig speakers and prints, in those amiable and affectionate moments immediately preceding an election, to the great body of our naturalized citizens. It has hitherto appeared strange that they should ever pretend to appreciate this large portion of our laboring classes; but now the mystery is made perfectly clear. They appreciate your bones and sinews for the work you can perform with them—and for "THAT ONLY." They are graciously pleased to say that they think pretty highly of you as *working animals*, and so much so that they declare they would con-

fine you to this, your "only proper vocation." Upon those of you that are particularly active, strong and enduring, they may possibly set as high a value as they would upon a tolerably good horse, or ox, or jackass. Surely, fellow citizens, you feel deeply obliged to Governor Seward and his party for so high a compliment as this. They do not wish your votes, of course; for this would be taking you out of your "only proper vocation;" yet you must certainly feel bound to request that they will *accept* of your suffrages at the next election, as a grateful return for the flattering notice they have taken of your bones and sinews!

The sentiment of Governor Seward, which is seized upon by the Louisiana Association of Native American Federalists as a pure gem of thought which cannot be too highly valued, and which they hold forth to the admiration of the citizens of Louisiana and the inhabitants of the United States," including, therefore, yourselves, is even more abhorrent to a truly republican mind than the Alien law of 1793, which called forth the universal host of the democracy to cancel and obliterate it forever. That old Federal law empowered the President to banish all the foreign residents he chose from the country, still permitting them, however, to hold all their rights and privileges upon this tenure of his arbitrary will. But the modern Federal proposition would not leave the foreigner even a chance for any other right or privilege than that of hard work, upon any tenure or condition, and leave him on an equality only with the cattle of the field—protected by law, as the cattle are, in order that he may work, but not treated as a being of a capacity for intelligence and freedom, or possessing the natural and equal rights of man. As recently as the late discussion in the New York Legislature upon the obnoxious Registry Law of this city, Gen. Erastus Root, a "Whig" (alias Tory,) member of the Senate, spoke of our naturalized citizens as "paupers, strangers and other *cattle*."

Is this republicanism? Is it manliness? Is it civilization?—for we may well ask this fraternity of political bigots and despots where their Native Americanism would have been, had the Native American savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers no greater kindness and confidence than they would extend to emigrants? As compared to these true Native Americans, we are all foreigners. It is scarcely three generations since our ancestors were unable to boast of being the citizens of a free and independent country, and many of them are now living who remember that period. Nay where would have been the Native Americanism of many of those haughty upstart proscribers, had even the last generation proscribed *their* fathers, as they would now proscribe you? Neither their fathers nor they would be in the land, but be the foreigners whom they now with mushroom self importance and arrogance, denounce and despise. Not so was the disposition of the founders of American liberty. In their addresses to foreign nations, they ever held forth the pledge that this country should become the asylum of the poor and the oppressed?

EXTRACT VII.—*Address to the People of Ireland from the Continental Congress.*

The following is an extract from an Address to the People of Ireland, "from the delegates appointed by the United Colonies of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the lower counties in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, in general Congress at Philadelphia, the 10th of May,

1775," the year before the declaration of independence. It is copied from the first volume of the journals of Congress:

"Permit us to assure you that it was with the utmost reluctance we could prevail ourselves to cease our commercial connection with your island. Your parliament had done us no wrong. You had ever been friendly to the rights of mankind; and we acknowledge with pleasure and gratitude that your nation has produced patriots who have nobly distinguished themselves in the cause of humanity and America. On the other hand, we were not ignorant that the labor and manufactures of Ireland, like those of the silk worm, were of little moment to herself; but served only to give luxury to those who neither toil nor spin. We perceived that, if we continued our commerce with you, our agreement not to import from Britain would be fruitless, and were, therefore, compelled to adopt a measure to which nothing but absolute necessity could have reconciled us. It gave us however, some consolation to reflect, that should it occasion you much distress, the fertile regions of America would afford you a safe asylum from poverty, and, IN TIME, from oppression also: an asylum in which thousands of your countrymen have found hospitality, peace, and affluence, and become united to us by all the ties of consanguinity, mutual interest and affection."

Such is the contrast between the genuine, whole-souled Whigs of the Revolution, and the minimum minded imposters who nefariously usurp their illustrious name at the present day, with regard to their justice and liberality, the warm hearted, industrious, and zealously republican sons of poverty and oppression, who arrive in our boundless territory from unhappy Ireland. Let us now take an illustration of the difference of feeling towards such classes of our citizens, in a spurious whig and a true democrat, as lately displayed at the City Hall, New York:—

EXTRACT VIII.—*Vice President Johnson, a New York "Whig," and our naturalized citizens at the City Hall.*

The subjoined characteristic incident, is copied from a communication to a morning paper by an eye and ear witness:

"When Colonel Johnson was receiving calls at the City Hall, hundreds of noble hearted foreigners rushed to his presence to take the brave old man by the hand, and he received the most poor and unfortunate with apparently more real good feeling than he did wealthy and better clad citizen. A whig who was standing near me full of the natural hatred and bitterness of the whole whig party, frankly declared, as they passed out of the door, one after the other that 'he had no feeling in common with the vile wretches—that they were not fit to be recognized as human beings, and should not be entitled to participate in any of the affairs of the country,' and this was said almost at the very moment when Colonel Johnson, in his speech, was boldly and eloquently declaring that 'he rejoiced in the prosperity and happiness of the foreigner—that our fathers sought for liberty in its broadest sense, for all who would come and enjoy it, and that they were entitled to all the rights and privileges of the native born citizens—that they were as good as he was, and were fully entitled to hold any office in the government, with the exceptions of President and Vice President of the United States.' Such was the truly democratic sentiment of the whole souled Johnson; how little effect it had upon the feelings of the whigs—how little they appreciate those real democratic and Christian principles, are seen in the sentiment expressed above by an aristocratic whig in my presence."

The two examples might serve as perfectly fair specimens of the opposite tone of feeling which prevails in the two political parties to which these individuals respectively belonged. The Tory-Whig, haughty, malignant and intolerant; and the true old Democrat, urbane, friendly and philanthropic.

EXTRACT IX.—*Senator Root's Federal opinion of our Irish citizens and the Catholic faith.*

Volumes might be compiled of the scurilous abuse and unblushing calumnies that have been poured by

the Whigs and their organs upon the heads of our worthy and esteemed naturalized citizens from Ireland, and upon the ancient christian faith which they profess. But the following pithy extract from the late speech of Gen. Erastus Root in the Senate of New York, on the discussion of the Registry law may serve as an epitome of the whole. It is brief and to the purpose :—

"Most of them are paupers, strangers, sojourners, loafers and other cattle, who contribute not one cent to the maintenance of the government, and are not found save on the days of election and never seen afterwards. They swear falsely with perfect impunity, as respects punishment in this world, and, according to whose faith, perhaps the price of a days labor gives them absolute security for the next."

Here we have a direct allegation made by a whig senator in his place in the senate of a sovereign state, that the Catholic creed and clergy permit wilful perjury to be compounded for by money. This senator is the right hand friend and counsellor of Gov. Seward who, for the purpose of cajoling them into the ranks of a party which notoriously despises both them and their religion, has hypocritically recommended it as an object of his special favor. I trust that every Catholic, however, has seen through the sinister design, and scorns to have his religion polluted by the corrupt alliance. How different is the honest and republican plan of equal rights and privileges to all, and special favors to none, which was sustained by Gen. Washington, the father of his country :

EXTRACT X.—*President Washington's Letter to the Roman Catholics of the United States.*

Shortly after the election of Gen. Washington to the Presidency of the United States, a letter of reverential acknowledgement and fervent congratulation was addressed to him by the Catholics of the country, signed by Arch Bishop Carroll, in behalf of the Catholic clergy—Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Daniel Carroll, Dominick Lynch, and Thomas Fitz Simons, in behalf of the Catholic laity. In this letter is the following paragraph :—

"This prospect of national prosperity is peculiarly pleasing to us on another account ; because, whilst our country preserves her freedom and independence, we shall have a well founded title to claim from her justice the equal rights of citizenship, as the price of our blood spilt before your eyes, and of our common exertions for her defence, under your auspicious conduct—rights rendered more dear by the remembrance of former hardships."

In replying to this, General Washington did not tell these Catholic citizens and foreigners that their religion sanctioned and encouraged perjury at the polls, for the purpose of putting money into the purses of the priests ; nor did he deny their blood-bought title to claim from the justice of the United States, the equal rights of citizenship which they fully assert ; but in concluding his reply to them, he said as follows :

"As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. *I hope ever to see America amongst the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality.* And I presume that your fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed.

GEORGE WASHINGTON."

This GEORGE WASHINGTON, it may be fairly presumed, was as good a native American, and had the interest of his country, through all future time, as much at heart and at head as any of the native

Americans of the present day, with whose maudlin mock-patriotism we are so bountifully surfeited.— Hoping, as he did, "ever to see America amongst the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality," what would he have thought of the Americanism of those "Native Americans," *par excellence*, who could exhibit such an example of "justice and liberality" as the following, which would disgrace the most intolerant nation, in the most intolerant age of the world :

EXTRACT XI.—*The Magnanimous Americanism of the "Native American Democratic (!!!) Association of New York."*

The widely distributed address of the convention of this pre-eminently patriotic and democratic association, contains the following resolution, which comprises the incarnate liberality of the whole body :—

"We do solemnly resolve to oppose the election or appointment of any but American citizens to office, and henceforward use our united efforts and unsparing zeal, to procure such an alteration in the naturalization law as shall exclude from the right of suffrage all foreigners who come into the country after such law has passed."

I have said that this would disgrace the most intolerant nation of the world. That nation is generally considered to be the Japanese, which will not permit a foreigner, from any country on the globe, to set his foot upon its soil. But such a resolution as the above, enforced by law, would disgrace both the hearts and the heads of the legislators of Japan. It would disgrace their hearts, because, instead of excluding foreigners altogether, as they now do, it would admit them upon the base stipulation of becoming slaves. And it would disgrace their heads, because it implies a mental obliviousness to the fact, that foreigners, equal, at least, in intelligence and love of freedom, to themselves, could not long accumulate in their country, under the ban of social degradation, without asserting their natural rights, and creating anarchy and insurrection. Indeed, these very Japanese once made the experiment. They permitted Catholic missionaries to introduce christianity among them, and to preach it for many years, until the christian converts and emigrants amounted to considerably more than a million persons. Finding that this new class of their population was becoming too liberal and reforming for the immemorably established despotism of that empire, their "Native Japanese" patriotism ignited like tinder, or like that of our "Native Americans," and they resorted to the only practicable remedy for the growing evil that the exigency of the case allowed, and which would be the only one, in fact, that our "Native American" guardians could employ to avert the ulterior consequences of their own proposed law—the Japanese authorities, by secret concert and simultaneous movement arose, one fine morning, and cut the throats of a round million of the intruders before sunset.—Vide Travels of the Jesuits.

In how manifold a degree would the proposed "Native American" law be disgraceful to American character, philanthropy and foresight! If the old adage were not almost self-evident, that "it takes all sorts of men to make up a world," it would seem incredible that a class of Americans could be found of so monomaniacal, and antinational a genus, as to brand upon their own brow the disgusting stigma of so thoroughly recreant a proposition. Forgetting that the insurrectionary union of the colonies,

the war of the revolution, and the whole fabric of our republican and independent nationality, were based upon the justice and the freedom of the elective franchise—upon the inherent right of every man, in a social state, to vote for or against the laws by which he is to be governed, as the only equitable condition of his obedience to those laws—these apostates from the essential principles of American liberty, would inflict upon an already large and irresistibly augmenting portion of our population, the very system of crying injustice against which our manly fathers so successfully rebelled. They would place our country in the wrong, and its foreign multitude in the right; rendering the complaints much more formidable in the undeniable righteousness of their cause, than in the ever-swelling numbers; and indelibly staining our unsullied soil with the bloodshed of an iniquitous war. They would make this free land hideous with political Bastilles thronged with the victims of hideous oppression, who sought freedom and found chains. They would make it a marvel of contemptible inconsistency in the eyes of mankind, an object of the perpetual jeers of the world—

“And the laughter of hate and the hisses of scorn,
“Would burthen the winds of our sky.”

Of the democratic pretensions of the above “Native American Democratic Association of New York”, it is unnecessary to speak. They are sufficiently elucidated by its avowed principles; but if a farther exemplification were wanting, it could be found in the fact that it was this association which convened a meeting at the Howard House in the spring of 1837, to express its approbation of the nomination of Mr. Aaron Clark, for the Mayoralty of the City of New York, and which adopted an address and resolutions accordingly. This meeting had Alderman Ira B. Wheeler for its president; Isaac Hatch, Alexander Hamilton, James Monroe and James Gulick, for its vice-presidents; and Charles Weeks, Junr., and James Taylor, for its secretaries, gentlemen, I believe, who pretend to no greater super-abundance of democratic faith and feelings than is common to “Democratic Whigs” in general!

EXTRACT XII.—*The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions on the dangerous tendency of the Alien and Sedition Laws.*

That the patriotic states of Kentucky and Virginia, considered the alien and sedition laws, now attempted to be substantially revived by the federal or tory party, as most dangerous, not to the rights of aliens only, but to those of the whole people, is evident from the extracts which follow. They are those referred to in the letter from President Van Buren before quoted, and were written by Jefferson and Madison. The 9th resolution of the Kentucky legislature contains this passage:—

“That the friendless alien has indeed been selected as the safest subject of a first experiment; but the citizen will soon follow, or rather has already followed; for, already has a Sedition Act marked him as its prey: that these and successive acts of the same character, unless arrested on the threshold, may tend to drive these states into revolution and blood, and will furnish new calumnies against Republican Governments, and new pretenses for those who wished it to be believed that man cannot be governed but by a rod of iron; that it would be a dangerous delusion, were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights, that confidence is every where the parent of despotism; that free government is founded in jealousy and not in confidence; it is jealousy, not confidence, which prescribes limited Constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power; that our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go; and let the honest advocate of confidence read the Alien and Sedition Acts, and

say if the Constitution has not been wise in fixing limits to the government it created and whether we should be wise in destroying those limits? Let him say what the government is, if it be not a tyranny, which the men of our choice have conferred on the President, and the President of our choice has assented to, and accepted *over the friendly strangers, to whom the mild spirit of our country and its law had pledged hospitality and protection*; that the men of our choice have more respected the bare suspicions of the President, than the solid rights of innocence, the claims of justification, the sacred force of truth, and the forms and substance of law and justice.”

The fourth resolution of the Virginia legislature is as follows:

“That the General Assembly doth particularly protest against the palpable and alarming infractions of the Constitution, in the two late cases of the ‘Alien and Sedition Acts,’ passed at the last session of Congress; the first of which exercises a power nowhere delegated to the Federal Government; and which, by uniting Legislative and Judicial powers to those of Executive, subverts the general principles of a free government, as well as the particular organization and positive provisions of the Federal Constitution; and the other of which acts exercises, in like manner, a power not delegated by the Constitution; but, on the contrary, expressly and positively forbidden by one of the amendments thereto; a power, which, more than any other, ought to produce universal alarm; because it is levelled against that right of freely examining public characters and measures, and of free communication among the people thereon, which has ever been justly deemed the only effectual guardian of every other right.”

In answer to the objection that the law against aliens had for its object, not a *penal* but a *preventive* justice, the committee who reported upon the communications of the various states concerning this law, remarked as follows:

“It can never be admitted that the removal of aliens, authorized by the act, is to be considered, not as a punishment for an offence, but as a measure of precaution and prevention. If the banishment of an alien from a country into which he has been invited, as the asylum most auspicious to his happiness; a country where he may have formed the most tender connections; where he may have invested his entire property, and acquired property of the real and permanent, as well as of the moveable and temporary kind; where he enjoys under the laws a greater share of the blessings of personal security, and personal liberty, than he can elsewhere hope for, and where he may have nearly completed his probationary title to citizenship; if, moreover, in the execution of the sentence against him, he is to be exposed, not only to the ordinary dangers of the sea, but to the peculiar casualties incident to a crisis of war, and of unusual licentiousness on that element, and possibly to vindictive purposes which his emigration itself may have provoked; if a banishment of this sort be not a punishment, and among the severest of punishments, it will be difficult to imagine a doom to which the name can be applied.”

In answer to the still hackneyed argument, in justification of this and similar powers over aliens, that the admission of them into the country being a matter of *favor*, not of *right*, the favor is at all times revocable, the committee said:

“To this argument it might be answered, that, allowing the truth of the inference, it would be no proof of what is required. A question would still occur, whether the Constitution has vested the discretionary power of admitting Aliens, in the Federal government or in the State governments.”

“But it cannot be a true inference, that because the admission of an Alien is a favor, the favor may be revoked at pleasure. A grant of land to an individual, may be of favor, not of right; *but the moment the grant is made, the favor becomes a right, and must be forfeited before it can be taken away*. To pardon a malefactor may be a favor, but the pardon is not, on that account, the less irrevocable. To admit an Alien to naturalization, is as much a favor, as to admit him to reside in the country, yet it cannot be pretended that a person naturalized can be deprived of the benefits any more than a native citizen can be disfranchised.

"Again, it is said that Aliens not being parties to the Constitution, the rights and privileges which it secures, cannot be at all claimed by them.

"To this reasoning, also, it might be answered, that although Aliens are not parties to the Constitution, it does not follow that the Constitution has vested in Congress an absolute power over them. The parties to the Constitution may have granted, or retained, or modified the power over Aliens, without regard to that particular consideration."

The Constitution has granted the favor of naturalization to aliens, and it has therefore become the right of every alien who demands it upon the conditions that may be prescribed; nor can that right now be taken away, without an alteration of the Constitution. Congress, itself, has not now the power to cancel this Constitutional right, and in confirmation of this assertion, I will quote the following invaluable opinion from the same report of the above Virginia committee:—

"There is an express and solemn declaration by the convention of the State, that they ratify the Constitution in the sense, that no right of any denomination can be cancelled, abridged, restrained, or modified, by the Government of the United States, or any part of it, except in those instances in which power is given by the Constitution, and in the sense particularly; that among other essential rights, the liberty of conscience and freedom of the press cannot be cancelled, abridged, restrained, or modified by any authority of the United States."

But the broad democratic and christian principles concerning the right of aliens to inhabit this country and participate in its blessings, is well and warmly expressed by a fearless American writer of our own times:—

EXTRACT XIII.—*The late William Leggett's declaration that foreigners have as much right to inhabit this country as its natives.*

With his characteristic moral courage in the cause of truth and liberty, the late lamented and revered William Leggett boldly asserted this great principle in the *Plaindealer* of July 22d, 1837:—

"But with regard to those poor creatures who are flocking to our country as the boasted asylum of the oppressed of all the world, we ought to welcome them hither—not meet them with scowls, and raise a deafening clamour to excite unkindly prejudices against them, and drive them back from our inhospitable shores. For our part, we open our arms to them, and embrace them as brothers—for are they not a part of the great family of man? It is a violation of the plainest principles of morals; it is a sin against the most universal precepts of religion, to harden our hearts against these men, and seek to expel them from a land which they have as much right to tread as we, who assume such a lofty port. The earth is the heritage of man, and these are a portion of its heritors. We are not bound to support them; they must support themselves. If they are idle, let them starve—if they are vicious, let them be punished; but, in God's name, as they bear God's image, let us not turn them away from a portion of that earth which was given by its maker to ALL mankind, with no natural marks to designate the limits beyond which they may not freely pass.

"The glorious principles of democracy, which recognize the equal rights of all who bear the human form, forbid the intolerant spirit which is displaying itself to these friendless, homeless exiles. Democracy, which is the divine system of Christian morals applied to politics, embraces, in its comprehensive creed of equal rights and equal duties, the whole family of man. It bids those who suffer from the oppressive governments of other countries, all hail! as they approach our shores, and welcomes them to a land, the institutions of which, founded on the true principles of human dignity, are intended to promote the greatest good to the greatest number, not the exclusive advantage of a few."

The opinion to which I have called special attention is this eloquent extract, is precisely that which was proclaimed in the Expatriation Act of Virginia, which was passed on the 26th of June, 1779. After

stating the conditions of naturalization, and declaring who shall be deemed citizens and who aliens, on terms the most liberal and democratic, the act proclaims to the world that "All men have a natural right to relinquish the country in which birth or other accidents may have thrown them, and to seek subsistence and happiness wherever they may be able, or may hope to find them." But we must now leave the pure and expansive radiance of these ennobling democratic sentiments, and revisit the murky gloom of Federal intolerance and exclusiveness.

EXTRACT XIV.—*The Pauper (or poor!) argument of the Federalists against the admission of foreign emigrants.*

The report of the Hon. David Russell, a Federal member of Congress from Washington county, state of New York, presented on the 2d of July, 1838, from the select Committee of the House of Representatives to whom were referred various memorials on the subject of foreign paupers and the naturalization laws, may be considered the *vade mecum* and complete digest of all the brains and bile, hypochondriacism, monomaniaism, and patent patriotism of the "Native American Democratic Whig" and Federal factions (*tria juncta in uno*) of the country. It is moreover a public document which will be quoted by our future historians, to illustrate and corroborate their descriptions of the bigotry, malignity and mendacity of a powerful party, against which the enlightened friends of the republic had to contend in the first century of its existence.

The greater part of this report consists of exaggerated statements concerning local and indeed individual examples of emigrant pauperism in our principal seaport cities; concerning the alleged, but subsequently disproved, deportation of droves of paupers, malefactors, aged and insane vagrants and "eccentric" individuals from foreign countries by their public authorities; and concerning the comparative numbers of the "Native American" and foreign inmates of our jails and penitentiaries. The remainder of the report consists of palpable demonstrations of those mental infirmities and moral distempers of its author and his triune party, to which I have already alluded. The main and most convincing argument of this portion of the report is, that the intolerably miserable, indescribably ragged, and inordinately hungry wretches, who arrive in this country, must be too enthusiastically attached to the institutions of their own, ever to become good citizens in a land of liberty, pantaloons and plenty.

Unfortunately for the general effect of the local pauperism details which occupy the first part of the report, it states on its third page, and on the very threshold of its poor house economy, (which reminds one of the honor stricken Mr. Bumble, the parish beadle, when *Oliver Twist* "asked for more!") that the whole number of paupers in the United States, both "Native American" and foreign, from a population of about seventeen millions, amounts to but one hundred and five thousand; notwithstanding it is stated on the second page that one hundred and forty-six thousand foreigners arrive here every year. So that, admitting its conjectural estimate that one half of all the paupers in the United States were foreigners, it appears that all the foreign paupers now on hand, after the accumulation of half a century, do not amount to half the number of productive,

specie-bringing, and useful foreigners, that arrive here in a single year!

I might here dismiss the first part of this the Report without any extract or farther remark; for it has already been seen that Gov. Seward, of New York, and the "Native American Association of Louisiana in common, (it is to be presumed,) with the whole Federal fraternity, admit the incalculable value of the 'labor' of our foreign emigrants, if we could but 'confine them to this, their only proper vocation.'"

For, in this confession, the pauper argument for their exclusion is virtually abandoned, and a powerful one is assigned for their free and welcome admission. The real objection, therefore, as we have perceived from the beginning, is purely a political one, under a very thin and transparent disguise. But before we analyse the elements of this actual objection, let us examine some of the specimens of the pauper argument, which is the pretended one. On the third page of the report it is said:—

"There is probably a pauper population in the United States of about 105,000, who are supported at the public expense! and it is estimated that more than one half of the number, (and these the most helpless and expensive) are foreigners."

Now on the 9th page of the same Report, it is said, after an estimate of what is termed the "natural" increase (a very equivocal expression, if the increase consists of children) of the population.

"If this estimate is correct, it shows that our population is increased *annually* 146,325 by other than natural causes; and whence this increase but by emigration from abroad? And when it is borne in mind that *this foreign pauper population* produce little, if any thing, from their own labor, but are supplied principally, if not entirely, from the labor of our own citizens, the reason for our importing bread-stuffs from abroad will be measurably accounted for."

The very uncivil manner in which the latter of these extracts contradicts the former, and the rudeness with which the former retorts upon the latter, must be peculiarly unpleasant to their intimate friend, the writer, who is equally bound to defend the veracity of both. The one says that there are but 105,000 paupers in the whole country, but about one half of which are foreigners; and the other says that 146,325 paupers, arrive in the country *every year*, the whole of whom are foreigners, who produce little if anything for their own support, but are supplied by the labor of our own citizens! And this "measurably" accounts for our importing bread-stuffs from abroad! This, we takes it, is rather an unlucky "Native American" hit, for when is the labor of our citizens to maintain foreigners if the bread they eat comes from their own country? It would rather seem as if their mothers knew they were "out," and sent them their dinners. The unmanly, supercilious, low-fellow practice of classing all foreign emigrants as paupers, is thus forcibly reproved by the democratic writer last quoted:

EXTRACT XV.—*William Leggett on the alleged pauperism of foreign emigrants.*

The following energetic reply is from the number of the *Plaindealer* last cited:—

"The people who are daily landing here are not paupers, if the capacity and disposityn to labor may exempt a man from that appellation. They are, for the most part, the sons and daughters of useful toil. They are men and women of hardy frames, accustomed to earn their living by the sweat of their brows. They are a class of which, in truth, we stand much in need. We want men to till the earth, to break up the rich soil of our western prairies, to fell the

forests which shut out the light of heaven* from millions of acres that might easily be made to furnish support to additional millions of fellow beings.

"When we depend, for the very bread we eat, on the agriculture of foreign countries; when we annually import the commodities of other lands to the extent of fifty millions of dollars beyond the sum of our surplus products; when, in many parts of the country the fields be untilled, and the wheels of the manufactory stand idle, for the want of the assistance of labor; when these things are so, how can it be said with any show of justice, that the people who are flocking to our shores will be a burden on our hands?"

"The aristocratic party seem to entertain very vague notions of pauperism. They set down as paupers, in their vocabulary, all who have no property beyond the sound minds and sound bodies which nature gives. These men are not paupers, and if they become so it is the fault of our own laws. Let us not lay our sins, then, at their doors.— We have perfect control over the matter. We are not obliged to open our poor houses to those who are able to work; and, indeed, we believe it would be far better for the community, if we did not open them to any class of indigence or misfortune. The care of those really disqualified by nature or accident from taking care of themselves should be left to voluntary charity, not to that wretched system of compulsory charity which poor laws enjoin.— We are too reluctant in this country to trust the voluntary principle. We are for doing every thing by law; and the consequence is, that hardly any thing is done well."

"While a wretched spirit of aristocratic selfishness is endeavoring to excite the worst prejudices of the community against the houseless emigrants who are coming amongst us, it would be a fit employment for democratic philanthropy, on the other hand, to devise means for conveying these wanderers into the interior of our vast country, where a soil, rich with the alluvial fertility of ages, invites them to labor, and would yield to industry a grateful return. These *paupers* would then soon relieve us from the degrading necessity of importing our bread from foreign lands; and we should find in the reversed balance of our commercial account with other countries, that an influx of the hardy peasantry of Europe, to fill up our waste lands and cover them with harvests, is not a clog in our progress, but a new and vigorous spring in the great machinery of national wealth.

"We have ourselves asked these men to our country with an emphasis of invitation which no rhetorical additions could have heightened. When we send our purveyors abroad to gather up the harvests of other lands in order to supply our citizens with bread, we offer an inducement to the foreign laborer to come among us, to which no form of express invitation could give augmented force. With what propriety can we now tell them that they are intruders where they are not indeed, and seek to drive them away with ungracious and opprobrious taunts?"

With regard to the the utter distitution of emigrants who land on our shores, as alleged in federal taunts, it may not be amiss to quote the following foreign complaint on the opposite side of the case:

EXTRACT XVI.—*Ten millions of dollars in specie annually brought into this country by emigrants from Great Britain alone:*

The following is from the *Liverpool Mail*:

"EMIGRATION—The average number of emigrants to New York is estimated at 10,000 per month. As far as numbers go, we can easily spare them, but it becomes an important question, when viewed in connexion with the heavy draw of money which is a concurrent consequence. On the lowest average—including passage money and the cost of provisions, and other necessaries for the voyage—the mere transport of each emigrant to America cannot cost less than 5*l*. Here, then, on the very lowest estimate, is an annual expenditure of 500,000*l*. of which about one third may be disbursed to English ship owners, for the popular prejudice is exceedingly in favor of American vessels, as affording the means of the quickest transport. But this outlay, large as it is, must be considered as a *trifle* in comparison with the hard cash carried out of the country by emigrants. It is a curious fact, that the smallest sums are carried out by English, and the largest by the Irish.— If we take 15*l*. as the average of what, one with another, the emigrants individually carry out (and we believe it is very much under the actual average) we shall have nearly

2,000,000 l. in specie, carried to America each year, without receiving anything for it. It is so much gold drawn from the producing capital of the country—so much thrown into the resources of America."

This estimate appears to be moderate and probable; but if it be even partially correct it is a sufficient off-set against the "bread stuffs," and may "measurably" account for the extraordinary increase of specie in this country within the last twenty years, notwithstanding that the balance of trade has been so much against us. It is, in truth, the only explanation of a great anomaly in our financial statistics which has been apparent to all who carefully examine them, although it seems to have entirely escaped the attention of writers upon the subject. The aggregate amount of wealth which the country has thus acquired from its foreign emigrants must necessarily be immense, independently of the value of their industry. This has never been taken into consideration by those who display so much zeal in developing the statistics of our foreign pauperism, or it would have entirely reversed the conclusions which they have drawn from them. Instead of giving this fair and impartial view of the subject, they think to excite popular feeling against the reception of foreigners by *ad captandum* statements like the following:

EXTRACT XVII.—*Foreign pauperism and the American Navy.*

From Russell's Report, page 7:

The evidence of the wisdom of the American people, if not their pride, is to be found in their naval armament, which costs them annually something over five millions of dollars, and we are paying within half a million of that amount for the support of our poor, and one-half of them at least for foreigners.

In other words, the maintenance of our foreign paupers costs about half as much as the support of our navy, and therefore quite as much as a great many other valuable things that might be enumerated. Yet, it appears, that the amount of money which is brought into this country by foreigners every year, is twice as much as is required to support the pauper portion of them, and the American navy together.—Upon the same false ground, therefore, that these writers taunt foreigners with living on our charity, might they boast that they maintain our army and navy. But in connection with this subject, there is another fact which might drive these unhappy patriots almost to madness and despair. If they will persist in making these invidious distinctions in our common population, what do they think of the astounding fact lately brought forth by the investigation relative to the establishment of naval schools, namely "that out of 38,564 seamen shipped at the port of New York, last year, not 2000 were Americans!" And it is well ascertained that a very large proportion of the seamen in the United States service are foreigners, many of whom are naturalized only by those expressed and implied bonds of allegiance to the government which they voluntarily incur.

This however, is a matter of alarm only to those who view it through the medium of a nervous fancy, for who but they for a moment doubts that, in the event of a war, our navy would become as distinguished for its bravery and prowess as any in the world. Indeed it is worthy of emphatic remark that the last war, in which our navy acquired the most brilliant and imperishable renown among nations, was undertaken and waged expressly for the protection of the foreign seamen who were in American employ. In denying to Great Britain the right of searching our merchant vessels to obtain her subjects against their own consent and that of their em-

ployers, we not only asserted our own rights but also, in the language of Jefferson, before quoted, "the natural right which all men have of relinquishing the country in which birth or other accident may have placed them, and seeking subsistence and happiness wheresoever they may be able or may hope to find them." It was therefore, in reality, "a war for the rights of man," and it is to this circumstance, probably, more than any other, that we may attribute the large proportion of foreigners in our mercantile and government navies. We offered them the rights of freemen, under the guaranty of our protection and they availed themselves of the boon. In fighting therefore, for the rights of this country, they would be defending their own individual rights; and if other nations, in all ages, have not hesitated to place confidence even in mercenary and hired allies, both in their armies and navies, who fought only for pay, we surely may rely upon our gallant navy, in which every man, of whatever foreign birth, is essentially a citizen and a freeman. These considerations were vividly in the mind of Mr. Van Buren, throughout his fervent and powerful advocacy of the late war, when the Senate of this State rang with the trumpet calls of his patriotic eloquence, and the Federalists slunk away, scathed and scattered, to the craven retreats of their unnatural and selfish opposition:—

EXTRACT XVIII.—*From the Address of the Democratic Republican Members of the Legislature to their constituents, March 9, 1813, in favor of the last war, written by Mr. Van Buren.* Adverting to the pretended Right of Search and Impressment claimed by Great Britain, Mr. Van Buren said:—

"To cap the climax of her iniquity—to fill up the measure of our wrongs—she resolved to persist in another measure, surpassed by none in flagrant enormity; a measure, which, of itself, was adequate cause of war; a measure which had excited the liveliest solicitude, and received the unremitting attention of every administration of our government, from the time of Washington to the present day: the wicked, the odious, and detestable practice of impressing American seamen into her service; of entombing our sons within the walls of her ships of war; compelling them to waste their lives and spill their blood in the service of a foreign government—a practice which subjected every American tar to the violence and petty tyranny of a British midshipman, and many of them to a life of the most galling servitude—a practice which never can be submitted to by a nation professing claims to freedom; which never can be acquiesced in by government without rescinding the great article of our safety; the reciprocity of obedience and protection between the rulers and the ruled."

The "American seamen," the "American tars" here referred to, were foreigners in the service of the United States whom Great Britain claimed as her subjects. She did not claim our native seamen, although her agents and press-gangs kidnapped many of them under the pretence that they were of British birth. And the great question of the war rested upon the claim of the United States to all the seamen in their employ, and under the protection of their flag; which claim recognized, of course, the natural right of foreigners to become their citizens, and to absolute protection in their service. Mr. Van Buren proceeded to ask:—

"Under such accumulated circumstances of insult and injury, we ask again, what was your government to do?—We put the question, not "to that faction which misrepresents the government to the people, and the people to the government—trades one half of the nation to cajole the other; and, by keeping up distrust and division, wishes to become the proud arbiter of the fortune and fate of America"—not to them, but to every sound head and honest heart in the nation, it is that we put the question, What was your government to do? Was she basely and ingloriously

to abandon the rights for which you and your fathers fought and bled? Was she so early to cower to the nation which had sought to strangle us in our infancy, and which has never ceased to retard our approach to manhood? No: we will not for a moment doubt, that every man who is in truth and fact an American, will say that **WAR, AND WAR ALONE, is our only refuge from national degradation—our only course to national prosperity.**"

Certainly, for to have succumbed to the claims of Great Britain to the persons and allegiance of those of her born subjects who had entered the maritime service of this republic, would have established her still pretended, though practically obsolete claim to the allegiance of every person born upon her soil who might settle and become naturalized upon our own. It would have virtually conceded to her the right of sending an army into any part of our republican domain, to hunt up her stray subjects and bear them back in bonds to her monarchical fold. It would have been an abandonment of our constitutional prerogative to naturalize citizens, and a dastardly denial of our freedom even to its most ardent worshippers—to the highest, worthiest, and most oppressed spirits of mankind who might confidently seek it at our hands. In short, it would have been an utter denationalization, and our shores would have presented the hideously anomalous spectacle of foreign fleets and armies cooperating with our own to close the avenue of liberty to the human race, to confirm the preposterous pretensions of monarchs to the absolute mastery of men, and to ratify all the various usurpations that have been predicted upon the assumed merits and obligations of birth. Mr. Van Buren said:

"But to crown this picture of folly and mischief, they approach you under a garb which at once evinces their contempt for your understanding, and their total want of confidence in your patriotism—under a garb which should receive the most distinct marks of your detestation; they are **"THE FRIENDS OF PEACE!"** While our enemy are waging against us a cruel and bloody war, they cry "Peace."—While our western wilds are whitening with the bones of our murdered women and children—while their blood is yet trickling down the walls of their former habitations—while the Indian war whoop and the British drum, are in unison saluting the ear, and the British dagger and the Indian tomahawk suspended over the heads of citizens—at such a time, when the soul of every man who has sensibility to feel his country's wrong, and spirit to defend her rights, should be in arms—it is that they cry **PEACE!** While the brave American tar, the intrepid defender of our rights, and redeemer of our national character, the present boast and future honor of our land—is impressed by force into a service he detests, which compels a brother to imbue his hands in a brother's blood—while he is yet "tossing upon the surface of the ocean, and mingling his groans with those tempests less savage than his persecutors; that waft him to a returnless distance from his family and his home,"—it is at such a period, when there is no peace, when there can be no peace, without sacrificing every thing valuable—that our feelings are insulted, the public arm paralyzed, and the public ear stunned, by the dastardly and incessant cry of **PEACE!** What, fellow-citizens, must be the opinion which they entertain of you, who thus assail you? Can any man be so stupid as not to perceive that it is an appeal to your fears, to your avarice, and to all the baser passions which actuate the human heart? That it is approaching you in the manner in which alone those puny politicians who buzz about you, and thicken the political atmosphere, say you are accessible through your fears and your pockets? Can any American citizen be so profligate as not to spurn indignantly the base libel upon his character?"

"Suffer yourselves not to be deceived by the pretence, that because Great Britain has been forced by her subjects to make a qualified repeal of her orders, our government ought to abandon her ground. That ground was taken to resist two great and crying grievances, the *destruction of our commerce*, and **THE IMPRESSMENT OF OUR SEAMEN.** The latter is the most important, in proportion as we prefer the liberty and lives of our citizens to their property. Distrust, therefore, the man who could advise your government at any time, and more especially at this time—when your brave sailors are exciting the admiration, and forcing the

respect of an astonished world, when their deeds of heroic valor make old Ocean smile at the humiliation of her ancient tyrant—at such a time, we say again, mark the man who would countenance government in **COMMUTING OUR SAILOR'S RIGHTS FOR THE SAFETY OF OUR MERCHANTS' GOODS.**"

And it may be here incidentally suggested whether these last three extracts may not be received as an ample answer to the brazen-faced Federal slander that Mr. Van Buren was opposed to the last war—a slander rendered unutterably more disgusting by the notorious truth that these Federalists themselves were the only persons within the vast boundaries of the republic that confederated with British emissaries in *decrying, denouncing, and betraying* that war.—Did our naturalized citizens unite in this anti-American howl? This inquiry conducts us to a too generally plausible argument, or I should rather say, most ungenerous if not unquestionably hypocritical prejudice against our voluntary citizens which occupies a prominent position in Mr. Russell's famous report before quoted, and in most other publications of the Federal party that are concocted with the same pernicious and illiberal views:—

EXTRACT XIX. The fallacy of the main Federal argument against voluntary citizens.

The following may be considered a cardinal principle of Federal faith and philosophy with regard to voluntary citizenship, for it is insisted upon in all their publications, and reiterated at all corners:

"Foreigners, indeed, may change their domicile, but their principles in regard to the institutions of civil government are identified with those of the country which gave them birth. Man is as incapable of disregarding these impulses as he is wanting in disposition to do so."

If this maxim be true, then Montgomery, and McKean, and Gates, and Lee, and De Kalb, and Steuben, and Pulaski, and Kosciusko, and Lafayette, and Patrick Henry and the immortal host of other foreigners who have distinguished themselves in camp and in council as the most devoted champions of American liberty, were base hypocrites and recreants. If that notoriously false and most insolent allegation were true, then all our naturalized citizens are perjured traitors at heart, and unworthy of a blessing they enjoy.

Yet who but a Federalist, himself a stranger to the very principles of liberty upon which the institutions of his country are founded, would for a moment give place to so ungenerous and absurd a prejudice as the one upon which this erroneous slander is founded? So far from its being true that the principles of foreigners "in regard to the institutions of civil government are identified with those of the country that gave them birth," that a very large proportion of the emigrants who arrive in this country are far better republicans, and actually know and feel more in behalf of the free genius of our constitution even before they arrive here, than the Federal party does who thus traduces them. This, in fact, is the latent secret of the slander with which they are assailed.—They are too republican to unite with a party whose doctrines and tendencies are like those of the aristocratical classes which controlled and impoverished them in their native land. The theory and scope of the American republic are now familiarly known and admired by the industrious classes of all the civilized world, and have become the terror of despotism on this very account. And what naturalized foreigner in this country has ever displayed any hostility to its institutions at all comparable to that which is often and openly avowed by members of the Federal party? What voluntary citizen ever insulted this republican community with doctrines and sentiments like the following:

EXTRACT XX.—*Federal predilections more foreign than those of naturalized foreigners :*

The following paragraphs are extracted from a communication which appeared in the New York Commercial Advertiser, Nov. 20, 1837 under the signature of "SIDNEY," and highly commended by the editor in an introductory article entitled "The Voice of Wisdom.":

"These opinions are not the visions of theory; they are substantial truths; absolute facts; and such facts have induced nations to abandon the practice of electing their chief magistrates; preferring to receive that officer by HEREDITARY SUCCESSION. Men have found that the chances of having a good chief magistrate by BIRTH, are about equal to the chances of obtaining one by popular election. And hoast as we will that the superior intelligence of our citizens may render this government an exception, time will show that THIS IS A MISTAKE. No nation can be an exception, till the Almighty shall change the whole character of man.

"Then what is our remedy? It is to be found only in a mode of election which shall preclude the possibility of intriguing for the office, and in placing the chief magistrate in such a STATE OF INDEPENDENCE that he need not resort to any species of favoritism to secure himself in his place."

Here we have an open, an unreserved recommendation addressed to the American people to change their form of government from an elective republic to an hereditary monarchy, after the example of foreign nations! And the whole communication, which is an elaborate plea for their purpose, abounds with passages treating our republican system with contempt and scorn; and subversive of its most fundamental elements—declaring our constitution to be radically defective, and a burlesque on the reason and intelligence of men." Did any naturalized citizen commit an outrage of this kind? No, and it may be doubted whether any foreigner, naturalized or not, could be induced so to insult the opinions and feelings of the republican portion of the community, even for the sake of currying favor with the party which these anti-republican sentiments are congenial. That they are agreeable to those of the federal or modern whig party, is not an allegation of mine, but an express admission of the federal editor in whose journal they were published and praised. His remarks were as follows:—

"Chancellor Kent did not write the Essay of Sidney.—But we venture to affirm that its wholesome spirit and tenor found a welcome response in his patriotic bosom. If it did not, then, as far as we can learn, that distinguished gentleman stands alone among the intelligent whigs of this city, for we have never published an article which has been more cordially welcomed by those whose opinions are entitled to regard in the city of New York—we mean—that self same article of Sidney."

That it might not meet the views of every individual in that party is quite probable, but such persons are not allowed by their editor to rank among those "intelligent whigs" of the city "whose opinions are entitled to regard." The accusation, therefore, brought by such a party, against our voluntary citizens, that their principles are hostile to our institutions, and necessarily identified with those of the country which gave them birth, is demonstrated to be false by the confession and example of the accusers themselves. Their principles not being identified with the country which gave them birth, their allegation fails with regard to persons of foreign birth. Born in an elective republic, they, like their old party founders, are nevertheless attached to a monarchical form of government—an hereditary succession instead of a popular election. Consequently, those born under a monarchy may never-

theless be a devotedly attached to the principles of this republic. And when we reflect that the lives of many of them, for a series of generations, have been spent in struggling against the misrule and oppression of their native land, and for those equal rights which they can only hope to obtain here, it is not remarkable that when they arrive here they should become more attached to the party that favors the system of government which they have sought, instead of the one which they have abandoned.

And as I have said before, this is the whole secret of the antipathy of the federal party to the great and truly republican body of our naturalized citizens. It is a fact, however, which ought to endear them, in precisely the same ratio to that party which makes the equal rights of man without distinction of name or nation, the character of their political faith.

To prove that even the distant kindred of our Irish population, before they leave their native soil, and when surrounded by authorities and institutions to which they have been accustomed from infancy, are glowingly attached to ours; to show that they both understand and feel the value of the principles of republicanism, and all but worship the sacred splendor which hallows the name of its primeval patriarchs, it is only necessary to present the following very touching incident which lately occurred at the city of Dublin:

EXTRACT XXI. *Irish Americanism exhibited spontaneously—the natural rays of the Emerald!*

The incidental illustration of this caption, is given on the authority of Mr. Hackett himself, and has appeared in most of the foreign and American prints. There is no city nor village of the Emerald Isle in which it would not have occurred under similar circumstances:

"The first night of 'Rip Van Winkle,' when in the midst of the scene where he finds himself lost in amazement at the change of his native village as well as himself and every body he meets, a person of whom he is making inquiry mentions the name of Washington. Rip asks—'Who is he?' The other replies—'What! did you never hear of the immortal GEORGE WASHINGTON, the Father of his Country?' The whole audience, from pit to gallery, seemed to rise, and with shouting, huzzaing, clapping of hands and stamping of feet, made the very building shake! These deafening plaudits continued some time, and wound up with three rounds. To attempt to describe to you my feelings during such an unexpected thunder-gust of national enthusiasm is utterly impossible. I choked—the tears gushed from my eyes; and I can assure you it was by a great effort that I restrained myself from destroying all the illusion of the scene by breaking the fetters with which the age and character of Rip had invested me, and exclaiming, in the fullness of my heart 'God bless old Ireland!'"

If our native American prejudicists, (for they are not deserving of a better name) could but see the unreported evidence of foreign cordiality towards our country, which meets the eye and the ear of every American traveller in Europe, among the working classes of the population, much of that federal prejudice would be smitten down by conscience, and a worthier feeling prevail. Let us, however, take the contrast as it exists:—

EXTRACT XXII.—*Gen. Harrison's avowed contempt of those who become Americans from choice.*

When we reflect upon the fact that no foreigner is bound to become a citizen of the United States, and that it is fairly to be presumed that those who do so are actuated either by a sense of social obligation, or a decided preference for our form of government—because they thereby immediately incur

many duties from which they would otherwise be dishonorably, and therefore scorn to be exempted—I cannot but think unfavorably of that set of politicians, and of any person pretending to republican liberality, who could speak of them in the following despicably invidious and contemptuous manner. It is the language, and therefore, undoubtedly the latent sentiment of no less an individual than General Harrison, who stands, at this moment, the federal candidate for the supreme official station of the republic!—for the presidency of a free people, whose constitution expressly provides for, and consequently invites the suffrages of the very citizens who are thus especially selected and insulted by him and his party. It was uttered by General Harrison, a short time since, at Cleaveland, Ohio, at a great Whig celebration :

“I rely upon the good opinion of my countrymen; I care nothing for the opinion of those who come hither 3000 miles across the water.”

Consequently, he is magnanimously indifferent to the good opinion and vote of our naturalized citizens throughout the country, and it might be a question even of respectful consideration towards him whether he ought to be burthened with their civilities at the election which approaches.

Was this the language, the tone of feeling, expressed by Mr. Van Buren, the present democratic candidate for the same office, not to say *before*, but *after* his election to the office of Vice President of the United States? No! he said this :

EXTRACT XXIII.—*Another contrast—Mr. Van Buren's estimation of our voluntary citizens.*

In a speech which he made at a great meeting of the Democracy at Tammany Hall, in November, 1832, he bore the following soundly merited, and most rational testimony to the political character of our voluntary citizens :

“If we were to measure the republicanism of the general body of our naturalized citizens by the invidious course of policy which our opponents have adopted towards them, we should unjustly suspect them of a frail regard for our institutions and a faint devotion to our cause. But so apparently instinctive is their love of liberty and its popular securities that they rise superior to that odious stigma of *caste*, and social inferiority, which anti-democratic minds would inflict upon them, and proudly assert that equality of freedom to which they are here entitled, and of which it is to be hoped they will never supinely consent to be deprived. This has been the elevated character of their republicanism, in peace and in war, through all the successive years of our history : and it cannot be honestly doubted that the unsophisticated enthusiasm for freedom which they have continually infused into our common weal, has restrained many tendencies to selfishness and national centralism which are always liable to prevail in a peculiarly distinguished and remote community, and which, of all others, are the most inimical to the grand designs of our theory of government. But although they have displayed a magnanimity superior even to unmerited disparagement, it may be adopted as a safe and just political rule that the naturalized classes of our citizens will remain attached to our institutions in proportion as they enjoy them upon equal terms, and without humiliating distinctions.”

It is surely unnecessary to contrast the broad and statesman like views such as these, with the wretched tirades of slander and contumely that have been poured forth upon our voluntary citizens, by Aaron Clark, Gen. Harrison, David Russell, and other Federal partizans of the like little calibre. For I cannot suppose that they are either forgotten or forgiven by any one preserving his self-respect. Yet to show the climax of prejudice and folly to which Federalists have arrived, it may not be unamusing to quote the following from the New York

Almshouse Commissioners, under the Federal magistracy of Mayor Clark, which was not only sagely referred to by that great functionary, in his renowned annual message, but gravely cited by Mr. Russell, in his scarcely less eminent Congressional Report :—

EXTRACT XXIV. *A new Federal scruple, concerning natural born citizens who are born too soon.*

The old Federal objection to our naturalized citizens has been that they are not born in this country at all; But it seems that there is now a new scruple arising in regard to those who are born too soon. In Russell's Report, page 7, it said that

“In giving these items, the commissioners subjoin the following :—

“This exhibit, it is believed, justifies the demand for increased commutation fees, and points to the necessity of enforcing all laws touching the emigration of foreign emigrants. It is noticed also that a considerable portion of the children classed as natives, are born of foreign parents shortly after their arrival here.”

If these juvenile equivocals had been born in this country shortly *before* the arrival of their parents, every Federal scruple would possibly have been obviated by the miracle. As it is, however, a very serious question arises as to whether Gen. Jackson did not get into the presidency under the awful responsibility of the new Federal doubt, for it is generally understood that he was born here shortly *after* the arrival of his parents and not *before*, in anywise. It is thus a great reflection upon his character, that his daring ambition to become the absolute monarch of this country commenced even before he was born, and may therefore continue after his death. It will be absolutely necessary, hereafter, to require the maternal conception of the future citizen should commence here, in order that he may not become one of our exclusive “Native Americans” too soon.

If General Harrison should become President of the United States, this interesting matronly question may become a subject of his particular recommendation to Congress in his inaugural message. But the object of the most enlightened Democratic statesmen of this republic is to place all its citizens both native and naturalized as nearly as possible upon the same equal terms of freedom, and upon this the latter as well as the former should insist. In the last session of Congress, that sterling and able democrat, the Hon. Augustus C. Hand, from Essex county, this state, presented a bill for enabling alien residents to become citizens on application, after a residence of two years, and for otherwise improving our naturalization laws, which are in many respects objectionable. The bill, however, having been referred to a committee composed of five federalists and four democrats, it was not reported on, and therefore crushed.

Fellow citizens! I trust that ample evidence has been presented to you, that while the federal party, with Gen. Harrison at its head, is inherently and implacably opposed to your equal rights and privileges in this country, and therefore disposed to mark you out, and forever compel you to stand as a separate and degraded class; the democratic party, on the other hand, with Mr. Van Buren at its head, is anxious to heal the ranking wound of injustice so that not even a trace of it shall remain.—

Do you not owe it to your children as well as to

yourselves, that they shall not find it a degradation and disadvantage to be your children? You well know that so virulent is federal prejudice against you, that to be the son of a voluntary citizen, amounts in their eyes to a disqualification for public station and confidence. You are bound to rescue them, at least, from this intolerable thralldom by supporting that political party which would obliterate it at once and forever. You owe it to the memory of your brave countrymen, who have emptied forth their hearts blood in the cause of American freedom, not that you should be treated as an inferior body of its citizens, but in every respect the equals of all who partake of it with you. You owe it to the bright banners which you have brought from all lands as tributes to the American altar and

which you wave around it on all public occasions. Did you bring these time honored flags in acknowledgement of your servility, or as voluntary proofs that while you are not ashamed of the land of your birth you are cordially, and faithfully devoted to the one of your choice? And finally, you owe it to the cause of liberty, in its broadest and noblest expansion, to support the policy of the democratic party which is consecrated to the greatest good of the greatest number of the people. The choice of good or evil, of social dignity or degradation, of generous philanthropy or narrow-minded exclusiveness is before you, and I cannot doubt the preference which your suffrages will soon demonstrate that you have given.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS.	2	inhabit this country as its natives.	10
EXTRACT I.—Federal (or Whig) Petitions for the repeal of the Naturalization Laws.	4	EXTRACT XIV.—The Pauper (or poor!) argument of the Federalists against the admission of Foreign Emigrants	10
EXTRACT II.—Democratic resolution of the late Baltimore Convention, concerning the naturalization of foreigners	5	EXTRACT XV.—William Leggett on the alleged Pauperism of Foreign Emigrants.	11
EXTRACT III.—President Van Buren on the Alien and Sedition laws.	5	EXTRACT XVI.—Ten Millions of Dollars in Specie annually brought into this country by Emigrants from Great Britain alone.	11
EXTRACT IV.—The new Sedition Law of the Federal Party in the year 1839.	6	EXTRACT XVII.—Foreign pauperism and the American Navy.	12
EXTRACT V.—Vice President Johnson on the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798.	6	EXTRACT XVIII.—From the Address of the Democratic Republican Members of the Legislature to their constituents, March 9, 1813, in favor of the last war, written by Mr. Van Buren.	12
EXTRACT VI.—Something worse than the Alien Law, and a Great Mystery explained.	6	EXTRACT XIX.—The fallacy of the main Federal argument against voluntary citizens.	13
EXTRACT VII.—Address to the People of Ireland from the Continental Congress.	7	EXTRACT XX.—Federal predilections more foreign than those of naturalized foreigners.	14
EXTRACT VIII.—Vice President Johnson, a New York "Whig," and our naturalized citizens at the City Hall.	7	EXTRACT XXI.—Irish Americanism exhibited spontaneously—the natural rays of the Emerald.	14
EXTRACT IX.—Senator Root's Federal Opinion of our Irish Citizens and the Catholic Faith.	7	EXTRACT XXII.—Gen. Harrison's avowed contempt of those who become Americans from choice.	14
EXTRACT X.—President Washington's Letter to the Roman Catholics of the United States	8	EXTRACT XXIII.—Another contrast—Mr. Van Buren's estimation of our voluntary citizens.	15
EXTRACT XI.—The Magnanimous Americanism of the "Native American Democratic (!!!) Association of New York."	8	EXTRACT XXIV.—A new Federal scruple, concerning natural born citizens who are born too soon.	15
EXTRACT XII.—The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions on the dangerous tendency of the Alien and Sedition Laws	9		
EXTRACT XIII.—The late William Leggett's declaration that foreigners have as much right to			