L. D. Leakle

The Cambridge Chronicle.

"UNCOMPROMISING HOSTILITY TO THE RE-ELECTION OF MARTIN VAN BUREN."

NEW SERIES—VOL. 2. CAMBRIDGE, MD.—SATURDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 28, 1839. NUMBER 51.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY

E. RICHARDSON HOOPER.

TERMS.

THE CAMBRIDGE CHRONICLE is published every *Saturday Morning*, at TWO DOLLARS & FIFTY CENTS per annum payable half yearly, *in advance*. Subscriptions will not be taken for less than six months. No paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid, unless at the option of the publisher; and the failure to order a discontinuance previously to the expiration of the time already subscribed for, will be considered a new engagement.

Single papers can be had at this Office, for six and a quarter cents, each.

☞ *Advertisements not exceeding Fourteen Lines* will be inserted three times for one dollar: and twenty five cents for every subsequent insertion. Larger ones in proportion.

In cases where the number of insertions is not limited, advertisements will be continued until direction to omit them is received, and charged accordingly.

☞ *All letters addressed to the Editor, must be post paid.*

POETRY.

"The reigning eagle of Parnassian skies,
Now soaring 'midst the tracks of light and air
And now the monarch of the woods and lair."

From the Token and Atlantic Souvenir.

"Show us the Father."*

BY MRS. SIGOURNEY.

Have ye not *seen* Him, when through parted snows
Wake the first kindlings of the vernal green?
When 'neath its modest veil the arbulus blows,
And the blue violet bursts its mossy screen?
When the wild rose, that asks no florist's care,
Unfoldeth its rich leaves, have ye not seen Him there?

Have ye not *seen* Him, when the infant's eye.
Through its bright sapphire window, shows the mind?
When in the trembling of the tear or sigh
Floats forth that essence, trembling and refined?
Saw ye not Him—the Author of our trust,
Who breathed the breath of life into a frame of dust?

Have ye not *heard* Him, when the tuneful rill
Casts off its icy chains and leaps away
In thunders echoing loud from hill to hill?
In song of birds, at break of summer's day?
Or in the Ocean's everlasting roar,
Battling the old, grey rocks, that sternly guard his shore?

When in the stillness of the Sabbath morn,
The week's dread cares in tranquil slumber rest,
When in the heart the holy thought is born,
And Heaven's high impulse warms the waiting breast,
Have ye not *felt* Him, when your voiceless prayer
Swelled out in tones of praise, announcing God was there?

Show us the Father! If ye fail to trace
His chariot, when the stars majestic roll,
His pencil, 'mid earth's loveliness and grace,
His presence, in the sabbath of the soul,
How can you see him till the day of dread,
When to assembled worlds, the Book of Doom is read.

*See St John xiv. 8.

POLITICAL.

From the National Intelligencer.

We transfer to our columns the subjoined article, because we heartily concur in every sentiment it expresses, as all our elder readers very well know, because on proper occasions heretofore we have freely expressed the same. Undoubtedly the intention of the framers of the machinery of this Government, in their organization of the Senatorial branch of the Legislature, was to constitute it a balance-wheel to counteract undue velocity in the motion of that body which is more immediately subject to the popular impulses that set and keep the whole in motion.—That intention will be wholly defeated should it ever become the settled practice for Senators to resign their trusts whenever they believe that the people of their State differ from them in opinion upon any question or course of public policy. We respect the feelings of the Senator who is said to have avowed the purpose of resigning, but, should he execute that purpose, he will act under an impression of the duty of Senators (of the United States) very different from ours. We would have them maintain their posts, most firmly when most assailed: discharging their trust conscientiously, and, as regards any other than a constitutional force attempted to be exercised over them, looking upon all such demonstrations

"With hearts as calm as lakes that sleep
"In frosty moonlight glistening."

From the New York Gazette.

It is mortifying to learn that Mr. Foster, one of the Senators from Tennessee in the Congress of the United States, has intimated his intention to resign his seat, or rather that he had previously intimated that intention in the event of a return of a majority of Administration members to the Legislature of his State. We say it is mortifying, because it is really mortifying to the friends of our system of government to see some of its best friends yielding as they do occasionally to dogmas destructive, as we believe, to its stability. The Constitution is good enough guide for us, and we would to Heaven that it might be deemed good enough for others. That the framers of that sabred instrument were intent upon the object of making the Senate a stable body, and of placing it beyond the fluctuations of temporary party conflicts, is clear as light to every one who has read the history of our Government with any degree of attention or intelligence. Why have we a Senate at all, and why is the tenor of membership extended beyond that of the Representatives elected immediately by the popular voice, but for the purpose of giving permanency and solidity to the system? The wise men who framed the provisions of our Constitution foresaw, with a forecast of thought which distinguished all their deliberations, that the popular branch of the National Legislature would, of necessity, be in some measure made up of members elected under political excitement, and who would take their seats occasionally from local or temporary exercises of popular caprices. To hold this popular effervescence in check, and to keep the system steady and stable in its action, our forefathers established a branch of the representative machinery upon a more solid basis. They formed a Senate for the express purpose of counteracting the less staid and less deliberate purposes of the populace. How wretchedly is the wisdom of the great and good men who formed the national charter thwarted by the practice under it! Have the friends of the Republic duly considered this matter in all its bearings? Do they really believe that they do right in lending themselves to doctrines utterly subversive of the true principles of the Constitution?

When a senator of the United States is actually instructed to a particular course by the Legislature of his State, the case assumes another aspect. The responsibility is shifted from his own shoulders to those of the legislators who are weak and thoughtless enough to give such instructions. The Senator can obey, disobey, or resign, as he chooses; but for a Senator to resign whenever the people of his State have gone against him on a question not involving their wish for or against his retention of the station he holds, we have no allowance. How does Mr. Senator Foster, for instance, know that the people of Tennessee wish him to resign his seat in the United States Senate? The question has not been submitted to them. They have elected Mr. Polk their Governor, to be sure, and a majority of Administration men to the State Legislature, but those facts prove nothing as to their wishes with regard to him. If the Legislature choose to request him to resign, very well. We only hope, even in that case, that he will do no such thing as to comply with it. The Constitution of the United States is of paramount consideration to that of a heated election, carried by the united exertions of a cohort of Government office-holders, and the stump oratory of demagogues.

THE GROUND OF THE OPPOSITION.

We adopt, from the New York Courier, the remarks which follow, and although they are particularly addressed to the voters of New York, yet the truths they enforce are not the less interesting to those of our own state who are just about choosing persons to represent them in Congress. The Courier, in proceeding to review the grounds of opposition to the present Federal Administration, asks—Is there any good and sufficient reason for striving to overthrow the dominant dynasty in the Union? Is the contest now waging between two great parties a mere struggle between the Ins and the Outs? Does it involve important principles; or is it a battle for the places and preferments of Power? We have been contending for years with various success against a faction in possession of the Government. We have battled with zeal, with devotion, with unwearied perseverance.—We have thus far acheived much good, and prevented much evil, but the enemy are still strong and confident. In some sections of the country we have met with unexpected, but not irretrievable reverses. Local issues, and divisions of opinion among our friends, and the boundless resources of influence and patronage enjoyed by the Government, have impaired the strength of the popular party, and reinvigorated the scattered fortunes of the Court. In this condition of things, the timid, the vacillating, the time-serving, the waiters on Providence, the men of loose principles, and the men of no principles, will naturally lose sight of the country, the party, the great cause of civil and constitutional liberty, and will consult their own selfish interests and personal advantage. This party we believe to be small. Their adhesion or their hostility is a matter of indifference.—The great mass of the People come to the consideration of public matters in a different spirit; and act under different convictions of duty. They are honest, intelligent, patriotic, and will judge their rulers without fear or favor by their PUBLIC ACTS. To the People, therefore, we address ourselves.

We start with the assumption that the present condition of the country furnishes abundant evidence of incapacity in the administration. The convulsions of trade, the prevailing popular discontents, the distrust, the divisions, the disorders of the community, make out the strongest presumptive case against the government. "The ruin or prosperity of a state"—says a celebrated champion of liberal opinions and popular rights—"depends so much upon the administration of its government, that to be acquainted with the merit of a ministry, we need only observe the condition of the people. If we see them obedient to the laws, prosperous in their industry, united at home and respected abroad, we may reasonably presume that their affairs are conducted by men of experience, abilities and virtue. If on the contrary, we see an universal spirit of distrust and dissatisfaction, a rapid decay of trade, dissensions in all parts of the empire, and a total loss of respect in the eyes of foreign powers, we may pronounce without hesitation that the government of that country is weak, distracted and corrupt. The multitude in all countries are patient to a certain point. Ill usage may rouse their indignation, and hurry them into excesses, but the original fault is in government."

In the very condition of the country, then, at the present time, we find the strongest inducements to a change of administration. But this may prove only incompetency in our rulers, and not bad faith or corruption, and we must look at their public measures to find sufficient grounds for their condemnation. If they have kept their faith with the People, if they have fulfilled their promises, redeemed their pledges, and pursued the policy which the people had the right to expect, they may still stand forth and claim the protection which a liberal constituency will always give to integrity of purpose, and purity of motives, however little they may be sustained by wise, provident, or successful administration.

If we follow the course of the ascendant dynasty, from the moment of its establishment to the present day, we find that its whole history is written in falsehood and fraud. There is not a promise which it has not broken. There is not a pledge which it has not violated. There is not a truth to which it has not given the lie. Pledged to diminish public expenditures, it has multiplied them threefold. Pledged to appoint no members of Congress to office, it has appointed more members than all the preceding administrations put together. Pledged to withdraw Executive influence from popular elections, it has converted every local as well as national election throughout the country into a direct trial of strength between the People and the Executive. Pledged to reform our public offices, it has filled them with a host of speculators and public robbers. Pledged to give us a better currency, it has involved the country in a series of the most ruinous experiments, which have been designed to destroy the only currency of commerce and civilization, and reduce us to the exclusive use of the currency of despotism. Thus in all things it has deceived, defrauded and abused the People. Its economy is extravagance.—Its reform is corruption. Its Democracy is absolutism.

But the catalogue is not yet complete. Under the name of a Sub-Treasury, it would introduce a system which is designed to place all the revenue of the Government in the hands of the President. The audacious claim of the protest, that the Executive is the constitutional guardian of the People's money, a claim that was never set up, until it was ventured in that extraordinary manifesto of servility and usurpation, it is now proposed to establish and perpetuate by law. The "inherent" executive prerogatives, growing out of the "nature" of Executive Power, and sustained by the Executive precedents of Russia and Turkey, and imperial Rome, are to be legitimatized and republicanized, and incorporated with the institutions of our American Democracy. The commander of our army and navy is to become the head keeper and depository of the People's Money; and this ever formidable, ever fatal union of the military and monied powers of a country, is to be ratified by the representatives of the People!

We apprehend then, that no honest and disinterested man, no true believer in republican institutions, no true lover of constitutional liberty, can look at the present condition of the country, and reflect upon the leading measures of the Government, without the conviction that a change of rulers is indispensable to the welfare and prosperity of the Union. He must be persuaded that there are bad men to be displaced; bad measures to be defeated; bad principles to be eradicated.—In comparison with this great end of reform and restoration, how insignificant are all the local divisions, and individual preferences, or prejudices of the Opposition! How unworthy, how unjust, how unpardonable are all the idle competitions—the vain jealousies, the narrow intrigues of mere personal politics! How disgraceful will it be to the Opposition, and how disastrous to the country, if the old policy of tyrants—corruption and division—should be successful in disarming distracting and defeating the cause of the People!

DEMOCRACY.—Robert W. Bowie, Esq., one of the Whig candidates for the Legislature in Prince George's county, has published an address to the voters of the county, from which we take the following. *He* draws a just comparison between the Democracy of the olden time and the newfangled Democracy of the present day:

Thirty years ago, at the age of 21, I was elected to represent this, my native county, in the popular branch of the State Legislature. Associated with me in the contests of that day, was my old and much valued friend Col. Joseph Cross, of the Vansville District—of him it is not two much, or out of place to say, that a better man or more devoted Patriot never lived. I found my country when I entered upon the public stage engaged in a fearful controversy with the most powerful nation upon earth, respecting the free trade and personal rights of our citizens, and the obligations of our Government to protect them—a controversy which afterwards resulted in war, elevated the national character and acquired for it the applause and admiration of the world. I saw at once that my country was right—but right or wrong, I should have supported her in the last resort.—We were then, as now, a divided people—we were Federalists and Democrats—an honest division, growing out of the nature of our Government, then something "new under the sun." It was an untried experiment, and the best men and wisest heads differed about its practicability. I sided with the Democratic party—I then understood, as all intelligent men did, what Democracy here, under our System meant. We thought the tendency of the Government was to concentrate too much power in the hands of the Executive, and we took ground to prevent it. We were fearful of encroachments on the Legislative branches, and we scrupulously resisted all attempts at dictation. We regarded the money power of the Government with apprehension, and we restricted its exercise to the purposes for which it was intended. We were uneasy least the sovereignty of the States should be endangered by the absorbing powers of the General Government, and we permitted no interference whatever, with our local Legislation—but above all, we were alarmed least the "patronage of the Federal Government should be brought into conflict with the freedom of Elections"—and the moral sense of the country at that time protected us.

But who can define the *new style Democracy* of the present day? Its old friends and patrons cannot recognize in the outre, mishapen monstrosity which has now assumed that name, the slightest resemblance to the genuine ware. IT IS NOW a contraband article. IT goes for Executive power. IT strikes at the independence of the States, by destroying the tenure of the Senatorial office, and making it dependent on the will of demagogues, deriving power, not from the Constitution, but from political affinity with accidental majorities in the States, elected without reference to the Senatorial appointment, and having no relation whatever to the Senatorial term. IT subsidises the press, by rewarding its partizan Editors from the public crib. IT destroys the freedom of elections, by bringing to bear upon the elective franchise the whole power and patronage of the Government. It disorganises the country, by new theories and dogmas, violates its own most sacred pledges, disregards the obligation of contracts, makes the constitution anything or nothing as the PRESIDENT may understand it—LEADS, but never FOLLOWS public opinion, and upsets the whole business operations of the country, to wreak its vengeance upon a monied institution which refused to lend its aid to its dangerous and ill-directed power. Against this sort of Democracy, fellow citizens, let us all set our faces:—Let us go back to the Conservative principles of former days, and taking Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and Monroe, as our guides, we shall yet be enabled to save the Constitution, and carry our noble little State, and good old County, through the contest unscathed by the hands of the spoiler.

From the Providence Journal.

The True Principles of Modern Democracy.

An article in the New Era, rather the most respectable of the Loco foco papers in New York, contains so full and fair and candid an exposition of the real doctrine of modern democracy, that we take occasion to present it to our readers. This article attributes the recent triumph of the Whigs in Rhode Island to the influence of the landed qualification, and distinctly states that so long as this exists the Whigs can never be beaten. The same article then calls upon the People of Rhode Island to destroy this qualification, and to adopt the New York system of free suffrage, in which event the Loco-focos might hope to gain the ascendancy. The New Era goes so far as to call upon all the People of Rhode Island, freeholders or not freeholders, to meet in convention and form a new government, which shall be based upon the great Loco foco doctrine of unlimited suffrage!—This, we have long contended and have repeatedly told the freemen of this State, is one of the cardinal doctrines of Loco focoism; and this very measure is one which the Locofocos will attempt, if they should ever become firmly and securely seated in power here. Here, the leaders of the party deny it and evade it, but abroad, where the same reasons for deception do not exist, they openly avow it. We are glad of this opportunity to confirm our statements from their own declarations. We trust the great landholding interest of Rhode Island, which has flourished under this system for two centuries, and which now looks upon the landed qualification as its dearest political right & its prondest inheritance, will awake to these designs of Locofocoism, and deeply consider what support should be given to a party which has such objects in view, and takes such means to accomplish them.

But to the article from the New Era:

RHODE ISLAND.

"The election in this State is over, and the candidates of the Democratic party are defeated. We are surprised, however, that the Federalists have not a much larger majority than they have obtained, and feel but little regret that they are elected. With a population of over one hundred thousand, there are but about six thousand voters in Rhode Island. This arises from the fact that this State is the only one in the Union which has not a written Constitution for its government, being governed by an old English Charter bestowed upon it in 1663 by King Charles II. That Charter, if we are rightly informed, prohibits those who are not possessed of a certain amount of property from exercising the right of suffrage; in other words, PROPERTY, not the PEOPLE, is represented.

"*So long as this anti democratic principle is allowed to exist in Rhode Island, it is idle to hope to obtain a permanent democratic ascendency there.* And, for ourselves, we would feel no pleasurable emotions if we had carried the State while that feature is engrafted in its government—a feature recognising a prohibition unjust, annatural, and disgraceful—a feature so diametically opposite to the principles, policy, and professions of the Democratic party—unless a reform in this particular were made the test of the strength of parties."

Here then is a distinct declaration from a leading organ of the Administration that a landed qualification is "diametrically opposite to the principles, policy, and professions of the Democratic party," & that "so long as this ANTI-DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE is allowed to exist in Rhode Island it is idle to hope to obtain a permanent democratic ascendency;" and recommends that a reform in this particular—that is, the abolishment of the landed qualification, and the adoption of unlimited suffrage—be made "the test of the strength of parties." This, freemen of Rhode Island, this is from a leading and influential Loco foco paper in the city of New York, a paper which speaks the sentiments of the party, and is regarded as an organ of the Administration. Such, in a word, are the doctrines of modern democracy. Said we not truly that the Administration had abandoned the old principles of democracy, and adopted those of locofocoism?—And will the Democrats of Rhode Island, those who have long been accustomed to uphold the Administration, submit to this? Will they, too, become Locofocos, and join in the hurrah for unlimited suffrage?

The article from the New Era continues:

"All men are created equal" is our motto, and it would be a wretched compliment to the holy cause in which we are engaged, and a strange anomaly, had we announced that the People—the Democracy—had been victorious, when the mass was debarred an exercise of the elective franchise. Under such a system Federalists will always be successful, *and until the People of that State wipe from its escutcheon the disgrace of being centuries behind the age in political improvement,* they are welcome to all they can make from such success. But, inasmuch as there is in that State a large party who claim to be Democrats, *we feel no hesitation in informing them that we conceive it to be their duty, laying aside every motive of policy or expediency, to commence immediately the agitation of reform.* Their character for integrity demands it.—To the hardy tillers of the soil, the industrious artisans, the weather beaten seamen, who by their poverty are prohibited from that inalienable right of freemen to choose their rulers, we urge an immediate popular movement. Let them demand a Convention of the whole People, to alter their form of Government—they have a natural right to do so. Let this be made the test question, and we fear not the result. Truth is mighty."

Here then are the orders issued from headquarters; doubtless they were before sent secretly to the leaders here, for they have been already partially executed. The Locofoco party has already attacked the system, and they will doubtless persevere. The next thing is to be a Convention, not of the freeholders, but of the whole people, of every kind, to assemble and form a new government, based upon unlimited suffrage; and which, when formed, will be the law of the land, whether the freemen at present qualified to vote shall approve or reject it. The Irismen at work on the railroads, the loafers who sleep in the streets, are all to have the same voice in the formation of this government as the man who cultivates his own soil, who has lived on it from childhood, and expects to be buried there with his ancestors.

Such are the principles of modern Democracy, or Locofocoism, as expounded by its own organs. Had the Administration carried this State at the late election, it would have been claimed as a triumph of free suffrage, and the party, emboldened with success, would have taken still another step in the work to which the New Era so strongly urges it on. Again, says the New Era:

"We already anticipate the howling of the Federal press at this experiment upon ancient folly and injustice; for those who are possessed of exorbitant power, who pant for its extension, and tremble at the apprehension of losing it, are always sufficiently artful to dwell with emphasis on the evils of *licentiousness*, the name with which they always stigmatize popular freedom. They will describe the horrors of anarchy and confusion in the blackest colors; and then impudently and unjustly declare that they are the necessary consequences of entrusting the people with equal political rights!

We believe that the People of that State are as intelligent as the People of any other State, and equally as capable of self-government, and we are therefore the more surprised at their apparent indifference to their political condition. Can it be contemptible submission, or blind reverence for antiquated folly? We think not, if history speaks correctly of their patriotism in the days of '76. Can it be that the powerful capitalists, the owners of manufactories, have, by their contaminating influence, instilled in the People that peculiar love of order, and peace, and tranquility which actuates the serfs of Russia to passive submission to a most intolerable despotism? If it be, then do we look upon such peace, such order, such tranquility, as the curse and bane of liberty. Rather than this, we would gladly extend a welcome to all the feuds and revolutions attributed to a state of freedom, for they are evidences of vitality and robust health—the drowsy slumber of despotism is the symptom of physical and intellectual inanimation. Give us, say we, life—active, energetic life, with all its tumult, anxiety, and disappointment, in preference to the silence of death, the solitude of desolation. We cannot, however, realize the fact that the People of Rhode Island are actuated by such dread of the aristocracy."

The "powerful capitalists," the "owners of manufactories," are not the men who hold the political power under our system; it is the farmers—the owners of the soil. All the bank stock in the State cannot make a voter; all the ships owned by every merchant in Providence will not qualify a single voter; all the cotton machinery that ever was built—for machinery is personal property—cannot give a single man a freehold; he must own the land, or he cannot vote. The New Era wants more action, more life; doubtless it would like to see another flour store sacked, or some similar specimen of Locofoco activity. We want nothing of the kind here. We are satisfied with our own Government—the oldest constitutional form of government now valid in the world, and, all things considered, although imperfect in some respects, the best. It is no more the charter of King Charles, because it was granted in his reign, than the Bible is the Bible of King James, because it was translated in his reign.

It is the charter of Roger Williams and John Clarke, and the other noblemen who were to the puritans of Massachusetts what they were to the ecclesiastics of England. At the time of its adoption by the People of this State, it was the only instrument in existence which guarantied perfect religious & civil liberty, and had the territory of Rhode Island been commensurate with the mighty principles which she established and proved, her history would be more interesting than that of any other country on the globe. The enlightened part of the world has come up, or is fast coming up, to its standard of religious liberty, but in too many instances its equally perfect standard of civil liberty is passed by, and liberty runs into licentiousness; the tyranny of a monarch is only exchanged for the tyranny of a mob. The true design of those who framed this Government was, to admit none to the right of suffrage except real bona fide citizens of the State, and who had some visible, tangible stake in the country. Any standard of this kind must necessarily be imperfect: no where can the line be drawn but it will exclude some who ought to have the privilege, and include some who ought not to have it. The best standard that has yet been devised is a landed property qualification; until a better one be proposed, we have no desire to change, certainly not for the one adopted by Locofocoism, that the candidate shall merely belong to the human family, and be in the place where he offers to vote. Such is our charter. Venerable, time-hallowed instrument! long may it guard the rights and protect the liberties of a free and happy People!

After this exposition of the doctrines of Locofocoism, from one of their own chief organs, we ask the men who have been accustomed to support the democratic party, if they will still cling to their old principles, or if they will follow the party into the very depths of Locofocsism? If they are yet prepared to