THE NEW YORK HERALD.

Whole No 5014. NEW YORK, FRIDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 18, 1848. Price Two Cents.

THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION AT UTICA.

Its Organization.

THE POLICY OF THE VAN BUREN WING.

Split in the Democratic Party.

THE YOUNG MAGICIAN IN THE ASCENDANCY.

The Wilmot Proviso Triumphant.

&c. &c. &c.

UTICA, Feb. 16, 1848.

The State convention of the Wilmot-proviso wing of the democratic party of this country, assembled at Utica this morning, in obedience to the resolution of the legislative caucus, for the purpose of choosing delegates to the national convention at Baltimore, or of designating the manner in which those delegates should be chosen. The resolution of the legislative caucus authorized the convention to adopt either of these modes in selecting the delegates. I arrived last night on the ground, at midnight, and was greeted with a smile from the interesting face of the young Metternich of America—John Van Buren, Esq. This young gentleman, who is the soul and the effervescence of all the political circles, though a resident of New York, represents in this convention one of the districts in the city of Albany.

A number of these young and fiery conspirators of this new fledged wing, who, you may be sure, are headed by a genius more able, and even more determined, than Guy Fawkes, were also on the ground, though the hour was past midnight. Among these energetic men we reckoned George Rathbun, of Auburn; Preston King, of St. Lawrence; A. Beckwith and William C. Crain, of Herkimer; Judge Bokee, of Dutchess, &c. &c. During the morning hour, which was very sunny, and bracing, and healthful, we overheard among the delegates some marked and decided expressions in favor of the nomination of a Presidential ticket with the names of General Zachary Taylor and General John A. Dix upon it. We also overheard some remarks favorable to the nomination of Martin Van Buren, of Lindenwald, for the Presidency. But when it was considered that the nomination of the elder V. B could not receive the assent of the entire democratic party, and when it was considered that the democratic national Baltimore convention would not nominate him upon any terms—and when it was suggested (probably with sincerity) that his present attitude towards the party and the country was very fair and very agreeable, there being nothing in it to prevent his nomination at some future and more favorable period, when his penitential sighs shall excite our pity; when all these contingencies and facts were considered, we suppose that the determination of the honorable gentlemen to support his claims for the renomination, was slightly weakened. We also overheard that the nomination of General Taylor by this convention, would be a delicate and unadvised step, inasmuch as the views of the old warrior upon the propriety of making the everlasting prohibition of slavery a condition of the annexation of Coahuila and California, and Sonora, and the rest of Mexico, to this Republic, were not positively known by any body. There is no doubt but the leaders of this wing of the party, (including John Van Buren and two or three others,) have written to General Taylor in order to ascertain his real sentiments upon this question, and there is not much doubt that a reply was received from the General. I believe, however, that this reply was not entirely satisfactory, and that it was not as explicit and as frank as some of his replies have been. But be this as it may, we look out now for the proceedings of the convention.

The usual preliminary caucus was held in a noble looking chamber at Bagg's famous hotel in this city; at the caucus, Judge A. Bokee, of Dutchess, was nominated temporary President of the convention, and Daniel H. Tompkins, of Queens, Secretary. The caucus then adjourned. The hour of 12 o'clock, meridian, was named as the hour of meeting; and at 12 o'clock precisely, the convention assembled at the court house, and was called to order by John Keyes Paige, Esq., of Albany, on whose motion the nomination of Abraham Bokee, of Dutchess, as temporary President of the convention, was unanimously confirmed. Judge Bokee, who was a member of the Senate of 1846, assumed the chair; he is an intellectual and benevolent looking old gentleman. On motion of a delegate, the nomination of Daniel H. Tompkins, as temporary Secretary, was also unanimously confirmed.

Mr. THOMAS SMITH, a delegate from Ontario county, rose and mentioned that he held in his hand a letter from the Hon. Albert Lester, of Ontario, in which he announced that he would be unable to attend the convention. Mr. Smith moved that Henry O. Chesebro, of Ontario, (the bearer of the letter,) be appointed a delegate in place of Mr. Lester.

The motion was unanimously adopted.

The PRESIDENT then desired the Secretary to call the roll of delegates, which he did as follows:—

Albany—Barent S. Winne, Andrew J. Colvin, John Van Buren, John K. Paige.
Allegany—William Cobb, L. P. Wetherby.
Broome—Oliver C. Crocker.
Cattaraugus—
Cayuga—N. T. Stephens, George Rathbun, W. Smith Ingham.
Chautauque—T B Campbell.
Chemung—Green Bennitt.
Chenango—John Tracy, Samuel Medbury.
Clinton—Rufus Heaton.
Columbia—Henry Hogeboom, Seneca M. Dorr.
Cortland—Henry S. Randall.
Delaware—Johnson S. Bragg, Linus Porter.
Dutchess—Abraham Bokee, Treadwell Townsend, Daniel H. Shultz
Erie—Isaac Sherman, H. P. Darrow, Dexter Ewell.
Essex—Herman G. Powers.
Franklin—
Fulton and Hamilton—Clark S. Grinnell.
Genesse—Dan Sprague, Harry Wilbur.
Greene—Isaac Pruyn, Lewis Crandell.
Herkimer—Jefferson Tillinghast, Abijah Beckwith.
Jefferson—A. S. Green, A W. Danforth, S. Bond.
Kings—Philip S. Crooke, Samuel E. Johnson.
Lewis—Seymour Greene.
Livingston—C. P. Vary, Hector Hitchcock.
Madison—J. W. Nye, V. W. Mason.
Monroe—Jacob Gould, William Wood, Simeon B. Jewett.
Montgomery—John Nellis, M. Freeman.
New York—Stephen R. Harris, John McMahon, N. J Waterbury, Daniel W. Clark, Robert H. Maclay, Robert Getty, John E Develin, Wilson Small, Jacob Miller, Wilson G Hunt, James H. Cook, Thomas B. Tappen, Lucius Robinson, John S. Vosburgh, Henry Keyser, Thomas M. Claughey
Niagara—Charles J. Fox, J. Jay Lawyer.
Oneida—Charles A. Mann, B. B. Hyde, Truman Enos, Richard Hulburt
Onondaga—Dennis McCarthy, William Taylor, Cyrus H. Kingsley.
Ontario—Albert Lester, Thomas Smith.
Orange—Robt. Denniston, Lewis Cuddeback, Abm. C. McBurney.
Orleans—Peter Saxe
Oswego—Beman Brockway, John B Watson.
Otsego—S. S. Burnside, J. P. Sill, John C. Spafford.
Putnam—Saxton Smith.
Queens—Daniel H. Tompkins.
Rensselaer—George M. Selden, P. H. Thomas, Henry N. Wales.
Richmond—J. S. Westervelt.
Rockland—Matthew D Bogert.
St. Lawrence—Preston King, Hirum S. Johnson, Calvin T Hurlburt.
Saratoga—Abram Y. Lansing, P. H. Cowan.
Schenectady—William Cunningham.
Schoharie—John Salisbury.
Seneca—S. G. Hadley.
Steuben—Wm. M. Hawley, Otto F. Marshall, F. R E Cornell.
Suffolk—John G. Floyd.
Sullivan—
Tioga—Thomas Farrington.
Tompkins—Charles M. Turner, Harvey A. Dowe.
Ulster—James Oliver, Jonathan D. Ostrander.
Warren—William B. Farlin.
Washington—S. S. Cowen, John McLean.
Wayne—A. Merrick, Theron R. Strong.
Westchester—J. V. Peck, Jesse Ryder.
Wyoming—James R. Doolittle.
Yates—Benjamin Tuthill.

Ninety-seven of the above delegates answered to their names.

Mr. S. SMITH moved that a committee of one from each Judicial district be appointed a committee on organization

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHN VAN BUREN (in a magnificent blue wrapper, and looking as mild as a lamb)—Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN—One moment, sir. I will announce the committee on organization. And he announced them as follows, after a little hesitation:—

Messrs. Saxton Smith, of Putnam; McMahon, of New York; P. H. Thomas, of Rensselaer; R. Heaton, of Clinton; Wm. Taylor, of Onondaga; T. Campbell, of Chautauque; Thos. Farrington, of Tioga; T. Smith, of Ontario.

Mr. JOHN VAN BUREN—Mr. Chairman, I move that a like committee be appointed to prepair and report an address, for the consideration of the convention

The motion was agreed to, and the Chairman appointed the following gentlemen as such committee:—

Messrs. J. Van Buren, L. F. Robinson C. F. Hurlburt, O. C. Crocker, Isaac Sherman, Benj. Tuthill, C. A Mann, and J. G. Floyd.

Mr. DEAN—I should like to know how many counties there are represented in this convention.

Mr. THOMAS, of Rensselaer—I move that a committee be appointed to prepare and report a series of resolutions for the consideration of the convention.

The motion was agreed to, and the President appointed the following gentlemen as such committee:—

Messrs. Doolittle, Denniston, Waterbury, Storm, Medbury, Cowen, Hawley, and McCarthy.

Mr. HAWLEY rose, and reminded the temporary President that he (Mr. Hawley, of the Senate) was not a delegate to this convention.

The PRESIDENT begged the Senator's pardon, and appointed Mr. Gould in his place.

A motion was subsequently made by Mr Selden that the convention now proceed to appoint two delegates for the State at large; but it was suggested that the motion was premature, because a number of the New York delegates were not here to participate in the proceedings of this convention; those delegates would arrive in the one o'clock train from the east. The motion was then withdrawn, and at one o'clock, P. M., the convention took a recess of an hour and a half.

The convention reassembled at the court-house at half past two o'clock, P. M. In the interim the eastern train had arrived, bringing with it a number of delegates from New York. The court room was densely packed in every part, and the President on calling the convention to order, was compelled to request a large proportion of the spectators to withdraw, in order that the delegates might have room to take their seats. The delegates having been provided with seats, so far as they could be obtained—

Mr. SAXTON SMITH, the chairman of the committee on organization, announced that the committee had unanimously agreed to report the following gentlemen as officers of the convention:

For President, JOHN TRACY, of Chenango.

For Vice Presidents.	
1st District.	HENRY KEYSER.
2d "	ROBERT DENNISTON,
3d "	JOHN KEYES PAIGE,
4th "	H S. JOHNSON,
5th "	ABIJAH BECKWITH,
6th "	HENRY S RANDALL,
7th "	GEO RATHBUN,
8th "	H. P. DARROW.

For Secretaries.

Daniel H. Tompkins	J. W. Nye,
Calvin P. Vary	James S. Whallon

This report of the committee on organization was unanimously agreed to by the convention, and the temporary president requested the gentlemen elected to come forward and take their seats. The President and the several Vice-Presidents and Secretaries, came forward and took their seats.

The Hon. JOHN TRACY, President, on assuming the chair, spoke as follows:—Gentlemen of the Convention—I tender to you my grateful acknowledgments for the honor you have conferred upon me, in electing me to preside on this occasion, and assure you I shall endeavor to discharge the duties of the chair in a satisfactory manner. Assembled as the representatives of the democratic party, in this State, it will be expected of us, in our action here, that we sustain the political principles of that party, and the men who have adopted and will faithfully adhere to those principles. This convention has been organised according to the invariable usages of the democracy of the State; usages so uniform and universally adhered to, that no attempt has ever been made, except in a recent instance, to organize a State convention in any other manner. Upon this foundation—a regular organization and a firm and vigorous support of democratic principles—let us hope that all who desire the predominance of those principles—all sections of the democratic party—may cordially unite to secure the triumph of our cause in the State and nation, and the greatest good to our country.

Mr. Tracy, it will be remembered, was the highly esteemed president of the constitutional convention of 1846.

The Secretary of the convention then called the roll of the delegates a second time. One hundred and eighteen delegates answered to their names.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, of Wyoming, chairman of the committee appointed to prepare and report resolutions for the consideration of the convention, announced that the committee were prepared to make their report in part, and desired to have leave to sit again. Mr. D. then read the two following resolutions:—

Resolved, That the delegates from this State to the democratic republican national convention, for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President should be selected by general ticket, in accordance with the usage of the democracy of the State of New York, established and heretofore adhered to upon full and deliberate examination, as well as with the general practice of the democracy of other States.

Resolved, That a committee consisting of one member from each congressional district, be appointed to report the names of thirty-six delegates to the national convention, and also of an alternate to each district.

Upon these resolutions there occurred a discussion of a slightly turbulent character. I was astounded to find the proceedings of this convention were not strictly harmonious.

Mr. JEWETT, of Monroe, moved to amend the first resolution, so that this convention should merely appoint two delegates for the State at large, to represent the Senatorial districts, and that the remaining thirty-four delegates to Baltimore be elected by the democracy of the Congressional districts. He did not suppose that a majority of the delegates here concurred with his constituents in this view of the question, but he had been instructed to make this motion, and he felt bound to obey his instructions. He demanded the ayes and noes on the motion.

Mr. GOULD said the motion of Mr. Jewett involved the question whether the delegates should be appointed by the general ticket or the district system.

Mr. WALES denied that the motion of Mr. Jewett involved any such question.

Mr. JEWETT explained his motion.

Mr. WALES having heard the explanation, observed that he should most assuredly oppose it.

Mr. JEWETT said he should be most happy to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. BOKEE submitted a compromise proposition, but he subsequently withdrew it.

The ayes and noes were then taken on the motion to amend. The ayes were 5, and the noes were 99. The delegates who voted for the amendment were Messrs. Philip S. Crook, Simeon B Jewett, Jacob Gould, William Wood and Robert Getty. So the motion to amend was lost.

The question was then upon the adoption of the first resolution, and it was adopted.

The question being then upon the adoption of the second resolution,

Mr. JEWETT moved to amend the same, by inserting the words "by the Chair" after the word "appointed." The motion to amend was lost.

Some half dozen amendments were now offered to the second resolution, and a scene of horrible and inexplicable confusion ensued. One grand difficulty was, that the room was not capable of containing half the persons who had assembled there to witness the proceedings of the convention. All sorts of motions were made, and amendments to amendments were piled upon each other, and upon the resolution, in great profusion. One amendment was, to allow the delegates from each Congressional district, to nominate a delegate to Baltimore, subject to the approval of the convention. Another was, a motion by Mr. Rathbun, to allow the delegates from each Congressional district (except the four in New York city) to appoint a delegate to Baltimore. The delegates representing the four Congressional districts in New York, to name their four delegates to Baltimore.

These amendments, together with half a dozen more, were offered, when, as a *dernier* resort, the convention laid the resolution, and all the amendments, upon the table.

The following resolution was then offered by Andrew J. Colvin, of Albany:

Resolved, That the chair appoint a committee of one from each congressional district, to report to this convention thirty-six delegates to the national convention, and also, an alternate to each delegate.

This resolution, after a smart struggle, was adopted. It will be seen that it is precisely similar to the second resolution reported by the committee, except as to the mode of appointment of the committee, whether it should be done by the chair or by the convention.

The President necessarily required some time to appoint these committees, and in order that he might avail himself of all needful facilities, the convention took a recess till seven o'clock P. M.

The convention re-assembled at 7 o'clock P. M., and on motion of Mr Rathbun, Jonathan Brown and Wm Glover, who had just arrived in town, were appointed delegates to fill up the delegation from Cayuga county.

The President then announced the committee of one from each judicial district, whose duty it was to report to this convention 36 delegates to the Baltimore nominating convention. The names of these congressional committees are as follows:—

Dist.	Counties.	Committees.
1st,	Suffolk and Queens	Daniel H. Tompkins.
2d,	Richmond and Kings	Philip L Cook.
3d,	New York	S. K. Harris.
4th,	do	Wilson Small
5th,	do	John E. Develin.
6th,	do	J. S. Vosburgh.
7th,	Westchester and Rockland	M. D. Bogert.
8th,	Putnam and Dutchess	Abraham Bockee.
9th,	Orange and Sullivan	L. Cuddeback.
10th,	Ulster and Delaware	James Oliver.
11th,	Columbia and Greene	L. Crandall.
12th,	Rensselaer	Geo. M. Selden.
13th,	Albany	J. K. Paige.
14th,	Washington and Essex	Jno McLean.
15th,	Warren, Franklin and Clinton	R Heaton.
16th,	Saratoga, Schenectady, Fulton	P. H. Cowen.
17th,	Herkimer and Montgomery	Jno. Nellis.
18th,	St. Lawrence and Lewis	Seymour Green.
19th,	Jefferson	A Danforth.
20th,	Oneida	B. B Hyde.
21st,	Otsego and Schoharie	S. S. Burnside.
22d,	Chenango, Broome, Tioga	Thos. Farrington.
23d,	Madison and Oswego	B. Brookway.
24th,	Onondaga	C. H. Kingsley.
25th,	Cayuga and Cortland	Geo. Rathbun.
26th,	Tompkins, Chemung, Yates	G. Bennitt.
27th,	Seneca and Wayne	S. G. Hadley.
28th,	Monroe	S. B Jewett.
29th,	Ontario and Livingston	H Hitchcock.
30th,	Steuben and Allegany	O F. Marshall.
31st,	Cattaraugus and Chautauque	T. B. Campbell.
32d,	Erie	Dexter Ewell.
33d,	Wyoming and Genesee	J. R. Doolittle.
34th,	Orleans and Niagara	Peter A. Saxe.

These committees having been announced by the president, Mr. John Van Buren, the chairman of the committee appointed to prepare and report an address for the consideration of the convention, made his appearance in front of the audience. He was received with cordial applause.

Mr VAN BUREN remarked that the committee had unanimously instructed him to report the address which he held in his hand; it was intended to submit it at the close of the proceedings of the convention, because it contained an account of the proceedings of this convention, as well as an exposition of the principles of the democratic party. Mr. Van Buren then proceeded to read the address. [I have made copious extracts from it, which I have the honor to submit, in advance of any other source under heaven.]

To the Democratic Republican Electors of the State of New York:—

FELLOW CITIZENS—This Convention, composed of delegates chosen from the several Assembly districts of this State, called together in pursuance of the uniform usage of the democratic party, having discharged the duty assigned to them by you, deem it appropriate to accompany a report of their proceedings with a simple and candid exposition of their views in regard to some of the great questions which now agitate the country, and of the condition and prosperity of the republican party of the State and nation.

This convention was called by a joint caucus of the democratic members of the Senate and Assembly, for the purpose of determining how delegates should be selected to represent the democracy of this State in the next national convention to nominate candidates to be supported by the democracy of the Union for the offices of President and Vice President; and power was given to this convention, in case it determined that such delegates should be chosen by a State convention, then to choose such delegates. The authority under which we are acting is, then, one which you will readily recognize as your legitimate and time-honored agency.

No regular democratic delegated convention ever assembled in this State under any other authority. Prior to the year 1826, democratic nominations for the State at large were made by legislative caucuses; in these the counties in which the democrats were in a minority, were unrepresented, and improper influences were often brought to bear to control selections made by those who thus mingled legislative schemes with party nominations, and whose long absence from their constituents had exposed them to the danger of forgetting or misrepresenting their wishes. To obviate these difficulties, and at the same time to secure the co-operation of democratic members of the legislature who were chosen by their friends as their representatives, by reason of their integrity and ability, and who acted under the responsibility of an official position thus acquired, it was deemed wise, with the general concurrence of the party, that State nominations subsequently to the year alluded to, should be made by State conventions, composed of delegates from every county in the State; but that such conventions should be called by the democratic members of the legislature. In pursuance of this determination, nominations were first made in 1826, by a State convention, convened in this manner, with the universal concurrence of the party, and the usage then established has been adhered to unvaryingly to the present day. You will readily remember that every State officer, and every Presidential elector whom you have ever supported since 1826, except the electors chosen by district in 1828, was put in nomination in this mode. The electors of President and Vice-President in this State, prior to the election of 1824, were chosen by the legislature. They were subsequently chosen by the people, in congressional districts; a single election, however, (that of 1828) served to show how entirely the power of New York in a Presidential contest might be prostrated by this mode of choosing Presidential electors. Under it Andrew Jackson obtained twenty electoral votes, and John Quincy Adams sixteen—the effective power of the State thus amounting to four votes, and just equalling that of Rhode Island.

In 1829, the system was therefore abandoned to the system of choosing Presidential electors by general ticket, adopted almost unanimously by the Legislature. It is honorable to the citizens of this State, of both political parties, that they united in this measure, and suffered no hope of petty or temporary advantage to stand in the way of their noble determination to preserve unbroken the commanding influence of New York. Whilst the electors were chosen by districts, they were nominated by district conventions, but ever since they have been chosen by the State at large, they have uniformly been nominated by a State convention, and by the same State convention which nominated the democratic candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, to be supported at the same election. The delegates to the national nominating convention, however, have always been selected by a State convention, called by the democratic members of the Legislature for the single and express purpose (with two exceptions, to which we shall allude) of choosing such delegates.

Prior to 1832, the democratic candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President were selected by a congressional caucus. The first national convention for this purpose assembled in 1832. It nominated Andrew Jackson for President, and Martin Van Buren for Vice President. It consisted of delegates chosen by the democracy of each State, in conformity to its own usages, who gave in the convention a vote equal in number to the electoral vote of each State. Some States—Virginia, for instance—sent one hundred or more delegates to give twenty-four votes—the like was true of others. New York, however, sent a number of delegates corresponding with the number of her electoral votes. Those delegate were selected by a State convention assembled at Albany, and called by the democratic members of the Senate and Assembly. The mode of selecting these delegates then established, has been pursued uninterruptedly till now. Martin Van Buren was thus nominated for President in 1836, and again in 1840, and James K. Polk in 1844. So firmly was this mode of calling State conventions established, as early as 1832, that the *Albany Argus*, a newspaper of position and influence at that time in the republican party, in alluding to the adjourned caucus of the republican members of the Legislature, held on the 19th April, 1832, by which a State convention at Herkimer had been called, the democratic address and resolutions adopted, said:—"The customary recommendation of a State convention for the nomination of the republican candidates for Governor and Lieut. Governor, and electors of President and Vice President, is in accordance with an established and salutary usage, and will receive the universal and cordial acquiescence of all the sincere friends of the national and State administrations.—As the deliberations of the Herkimer convention, from the various candidates for high and responsible stations which it will be required to present for the suffrages of the electors, will be regarded with great interest, so any attempts to forestall the proceedings, *or by partial movements to interrupt the regular action of the republican usages, will assuredly defeat themselves, and bring odium upon their authors.*"

We have stated that conventions have been heretofore called for the express purpose, with two exceptions, of choosing delegates to the national convention. The exceptions to which we allude, are the present convention and that of the year 1843. The nomination for the Presidency, in the year 1844, excited intense interest. It was known that the State of New York presented a citizen of her own as a candidate, and the controlling influence of her delegation in a national convention was dreaded by the friends of the other candidates—A vigorous effort was made to persuade the democracy of New York to depart from their settled usage, and to select their delegates to a national convention by allowing each congressional district to send one representative. To take the sense of the democratic party in regard to this question, the republican members of the legislature, in April, 1843, called a State convention to assemble in September, 1843, with power to choose delegates to a national convention, or to determine the manner in which they should be chosen. It was wise and magnanimous thus to refer this question to the democracy of the State, and to allow abundant time between the call of the convention and its assembling to discuss it. The convention assembled, and declared by a vote of 103 to 19 in favor of the State system.

In October, 1846, a State convention assembled under the call of the democratic members of the legislature, and nominated Silas Wright for Governor, Addison Gardiner for Lieutenant Governor, and other officers; they also appointed a State central committee to serve for two years, and until another should be chosen. In the spring of 1847, a State convention was called and held in like manner, for the nomination of judicial officers; and another in October, 1847, to nominate candidates for the various State offices to be filled at the ensuing November election. These were a lieutenant governor, comptroller, secretary of state, attorney general, treasurer, State engineer and surveyor, three State prison inspectors, and three canal commissioners. A warm and active canvass took place for seats in the last convention. But so far as we have been able to learn, no complaint was then or ever made of the conduct of the State central committee, appointed in 1846, for the ensuing two years, nor was a suggestion made that the convention should in any way interfere with the question of the Presidency of the United States. The public expectation, so far as we know it, awaited at the hands of the convention an avowal of democratic principles, and a nomination of candidates who should be the honest choice of the democratic party for the various State offices we have named. How far their wishes in these respects were met, we do not now stop to inquire; but of their action upon subjects not confided to them, it becomes our principal duty to speak. Without authority, and without complaint, they removed the State central committee, whose term was unexpired, and appointed another in its stead. To the entire surprise of those whom they claimed to represent, they clothed the usurping State committee with authority to call State conventions; an authority which, as we have already seen, had been vested in the democratic members of the Legislature for more than twenty years, and ever since the existence of State conventions, and never in a committee; and they assumed to recommend the different congressional districts to send delegates to a national convention, and to deprive the members of the legislature of the power to call a State convention for this purpose, without, so far as we know, the slightest intimation from their constituents that a change in this respect was desired or expected, and in defiance of the well-considered, and mature, and almost unanimous decision of a recent State convention on this very point, called and assembled for the express purpose of determining it. Conduct so unwarranted produced its natural fruits. The republicans of the State were aroused by usurpations so glaring, and violations of their wishes so unqualified. A mass convention of democrats assembled at Herkimer, on the 26th October, 1847, and after declaring the views of those who composed it in regard to great questions of principle, it repudiated the action of the Syracuse convention, declared its proceedings not binding on the democratic party, and called a State convention to assemble at Herkimer, on the 22d February, 1848, to choose thirty-six delegates to represent the democracy of the State in the national nominating convention. We do not stop to discuss the propriety of the action of the Herkimer convention; but it is just to those who participated in it to state their action correctly.

[The address then adverts to the proceedings of the Herkimer convention, and also to the proceedings of the legislative caucus by which this Utica convention was called. The address then resumes]:—

The present legislature assembled at Albany on the first Monday of January last, and as no action has been taken by the democratic members in regard to this subject, it is fair to infer that they approved of the conduct of their predecessors. The call of this convention was acquiesced in by those who advocated the Herkimer convention of the 22d, and that convention has been formally and publicly abandoned. We have, therefore, every reason to believe, and do believe, know and declare, that this convention, called in pursuance of established usage, with a view to conciliation and consultation, truly represents no section, clique, or personal interest, but the "mass of prudent, impartial, intelligent and disinterested democrats of New York." We have been thus particular in calling to your attention the usages of the democratic party, and thus minute in explaining the authority under which we act, because we can conceive of no audacity more shameless, or counterfeiting more base, than that of those who would, without warrant, and self constituted, assume to speak to or for you, in your representatives.

In proceeding to the discharge of the trust confided to us, of determining how the delegates to represent you in a national convention ought to be selected, we have referred, in the first instance, to the previous usages of the party. These usages, in subordination to principles, constitute the express law of the party, and an adherence to them has well been termed the sheet-anchor of its safety. They have carried the democracy through the fiercest conflicts, often in victory, and always with honor. We have, therefore, supposed that you would not, without good cause, depart from them. We find, then, that your invariable usage has been to select delegates to a national convention, by a State convention. This has been done from the first national convention, in 1832, to the last, in 1844; and the State convention called in 1843, for the purpose of settling this question, under the full and mature deliberation of which we have spoken, embodying the first ability to be found in your ranks, and the most devoted zeal, and presided over by the Hon. Wm. L Marcy, came, by a vote of 103 to 19, to the conclusions embodied in the following resolutions:

[Here are inserted resolutions adopted at the convention of 1843, strongly in favor of a general and united ticket system for the appointment of delegates.]

It gives us great pleasure (says the address, in continuation) to concur in the conclusions to which the able and patriotic body that adopted the foregoing resolutions arrived. * * * One of the arguments urged in favor of adopting the congressional district system of choosing delegates, is, that it has been adopted by other States. This suggestion we believe to be unwarranted by facts. Delegates have already been selected by the States of Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas and Michigan, and State conventions to choose delegates have been called in Virginia on the 23th of this month, in Pennsylvania on the 4th of next month, and also in Alabama. It will be seen that 72, or, including Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Alabama, and excluding New York, 124 delegates out of 250, may already be deemed chosen by State conventions. Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont choose a number equal to the delegation in Congress, by Congressional districts; but delegates for the State at large, by state authority. [The address refers to the example of other States to sustain this position, and concludes with the remark—"So far from finding in the action of other States a reason for departing from previous usage, we see in it additional reason for adhering to our ancient custom." The address is somewhat elaborate in its defence of the "State system." It leaves this question with the following remarks]:—A reference to the proceedings of the democratic electors by whom we were chosen, will show that a vast majority of the conventions which delegated us to carry out their wishes, have expressed their preferences, if not instructed their delegates, in favor of the State system; and believing as we do, that representative fidelity is the life of our political system, and that the highest obligations of duty and honor require the delegate to obey the expressed wishes of his constituents, we have had no hesitation in proceeding to the choice of 36 delegates to represent you in the national convention at Baltimore—The individuals selected are believed to be, one and all, eminently trust-worthy; we have not felt at liberty to hamper them with instructions, but entertain the hope that they will carefully ascertain and faithfully carry out your wishes in their conduct. In so doing, they will consult the honor of the State, and the true and permanent interests of the republican party of the State and of the Union, and thus best promote the prosperity and happiness of the American people.

We might here pause; but feeling that we are authorized, under the circumstances, to speak in your behalf, and that a declaration of your views and wishes may not be without service to you and to our brethren of the Union, we proceed, as briefly as possible, to express what we believe to be your principles of action—the condition of the republican party—and the extent and causes of the difficulties that now surround it. New York has no candidate of her own for the Presidency to present to the democratic national convention.—In the number of her democratic citizens who would do honor to the station, we have not found one who desires to be supported for that high office. Were it otherwise, we are well assured, that not one of them could be designated, who possesses or desires the confidence of his party, who would permit his success to be accomplished by a suppression, change or qualification of his own, or the opinions of his friends, in regard to public measures, or by indirections of any character.

With these remarks, we render the responsibilities of the trusts reposed in us, and with ample opportunity of information upon the subject, in a spirit of entire candor, declare the following to be a just and faithful exposition of the feelings and opinions of the democracy of New York, upon the subjects which it embraces.

First. Their convictions of the justness of the war, and their determination to sustain the government in an energetic prosecution of it, until a just and honorable peace, the only legitimate object of war, can be obtained, have been sufficiently avowed; and what is of more importance, have been confirmed by their acts at all times and upon all occasions. Having no sinister or selfish objects to be accomplished by it, they will not enter into a competition with others in regard to the vehemence of their asseverations upon the subject of the war. Better justice could not be done to the feelings and dispositions of the democratic masses of this State, than by referring our own government, as well as all concerned, to the late war meeting of the lion-hearted democracy of the city of New York. The spirit and character of that assemblage are well known to the United States senators, by whom it was addressed. Fervent and impressive, indeed, must have been those proofs of high resolve and ardent patriotism, in view of which the veteran soldier and Senator, Houston, could not refrain from describing it as "the most numerous, the most cheering, and most emboldening meeting which he had ever seen, ever heard of, or ever speculated upon seeing." For the sincerity of ninety-nine hundredths of that vast assemblage, this convention can safely vouch, for they are emphatically our brethren in feeling and in principle. Could the true-hearted democracy of the Empire State have been brought together under like circumstances, they would have presented the same appearances, displayed the same feelings, and have pronounced the same noble resolution to defend the rights and honor of the country, at all hazards, and at any sacrifice. Nor would such an exhibition have been more than a renewal of the patriotic feelings and firm resolves with which New York, then a frontier State, and compelled for a season to bear the brunt of the contest, met the foe in the war of 1812—feelings which she will never fail to exhibit on all occasions which are of sufficient magnitude to rouse the potent, though quiet, energies of her democracy.

Second. Thus advising the government to an energetic prosecution of the war, until just and honorable terms of peace can be obtained, the democracy of New York deem it due, as well to the administration as to themselves, to state more distinctly than is usual, what those terms ought, in their judgment, to be. To withdraw our troops before indemnity is either made or secured for our just claims against Mexico, and reasonable safeguards established against future aggression, would be unwise and dishonorable to our country. For the sake of harmony among ourselves, and the better to protect the character of our government against the accustomed reproaches of those who envy, whilst they dread, the force and spread of our institutions, we would prefer to have such indemnity made in some other form than by the cession to the United States of Mexican territory. But we owe it to candor to say, that in the present condition of Mexico it is not possible to expect that this desire can be realized. Viewing the matter in this light, and believing that there are portions of her territory which she can spare without materially weakening her condition, and which would, in commercial and other points of view, be important that the United States should own, we approve of the efforts of our government to obtain satisfaction for our just claims through that channel, trusting that if such cessions are obtained, they will be acquired upon terms consistent with the character for justice and humanity which we have sustained since our admission into the family of nations. We are opposed to the acquisition by the United States of any considerable extent of territory for any purpose other than its ultimate admission into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the present members of the confederacy, regarding the colonial system, as we do, to be inconsistent with the genius of our government and dangerous, if adopted, to the perpetuity of our free institutions. Whatever effects upon the population of Mexico, may in the process of time be produced by the increased emigration from the United States, to which the present war will inevitably lead, we are at this time wholly unwilling to commit the destinies of this great and flourishing republic to an union with a population like that of which six out of eight millions of the present inhabitants of Mexico are composed.

Having had no proof of the insincerity of the opinions advanced by the President in his annual message, or any sufficient reason to believe that he has changed his views in regard to it—

Thirdly. The democracy of New York do now, and have always heretofore, believed in the wisdom, humanity and constitutionality of the policy of endeavoring to limit the evils of slavery, by protecting the unsettled territories of the United States, against its introduction, whilst they are under the government. So believing, they will when any such governments are established by Congress, either for the territories we now possess, or for such as we may acquire from Mexico, insist as far as we have the right and the means to do so, that this ancient, successful, and time honored policy shall be applied to them. And why should we not do so? What is it that has caused the dissatisfaction and denunciation which have been so unsparingly poured out upon the democracy of New York, for steadily pursuing the path which not only they, but, until very recently, the great and good of all parties, have uniterruptly and happily pursued? Apprehensive of the heart burnings and discord, which might, in the progress of time, from the then great and most probably permanent disparity of the conditions, in respect to slavery, of the States which had by their joint efforts established their national independence, the patriots of the revolution took early measures to guard, as far as they could, the union of the States against the evils with which they foresaw it would be threatened from this source.

Southern men, whose names are synonymous with all virtues which can adorn the human character, such as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and a host of other patriots, lent their aid and the influence of their great names to the promotion of this object; when the federal constitution was framed and adopted, Mr. Jefferson was not in the United States—but before he left them, he introduced into Congress the principle which was embodied in the ordinance of 1787 for the government of the Northwestern territory, by which that body, with the declared purpose of *extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty which form the basis on which these republics, their laws and constitutions were erected;*" provided that there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been first duly convicted." This ordinance, be it remembered, embraced in its provisions, *all the territory which the United States then possessed*, and in the principal part, if not the whole of which, *slavery was then permitted* by law. This great charter of freedom passed in Congress by the all but unanimous vote of all the States. The representatives of every Southern State cordially united, and among the great and good men then prominent in the public service, there was not, that we know of, either from the North or the South, the East or the West, but a single dissentient. A slave State made the principle cession of the territory upon which the ordinance was to operate, and Southern statesmen deemed it wise to take the lead in all the measures for the amelioration and limitation of slavery.

Congress having thus, as they hoped, closed forever the door to the extension of slavery beyond the limits of the original States, all that remained to be done, was to prevent its increase by foreign importation. The ground work for the accomplishment of this great object was laid by another body, of still higher authority. The convention to frame the present federal constitution, was in session when the Jeffersonian ordinance was passed; and it completed the work in which Congress had made so much progress, by two important provisions, viz: one conferring authority on Congress to prohibit the introduction of slaves into the United States from abroad, and the other, in full view of what it had just been doing on the subject of slavery, authorising it to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory, or other property, belonging to the United States. And among the first acts of the first Congress under the new constitution, composed, in part, of the persons who had framed it, was an act to confirm the ordinance of 1787. This uniform and harmonious system of action upon the subject of slavery, on the part of the southern statesmen of those days, was not only dictated by the firmest and most devoted principles of philanthropy and patriotism, but was really calculated to subserve a policy which they did not attempt to conceal or disguise. They regarded the existence of slavery in the United States as a misfortune, in any aspect in which it could be viewed, of the first magnitude; a misfortune which could not fail to prove disastrous to the welfare of the whole country, and destined to bear with the greatest severity upon the States of the south, where it prevailed to the greatest extent, and was most likely to be permanent. They justly claimed that neither its introduction nor present existence was attributable to their fault—that the blame in this respect rested upon the mother country; and so strongly were the leading minds of the South in civil affairs, impressed upon this point, that the promotion of the slave trade with the colonies, was one of the charges against Great Britain, prefered in the original draft of the declaration of independence—They contended that, as it could not now be removed by any known means, it must be tolerated until, in the providence of God, some mode of deliverance was presented, which could not then be devised.

They foresaw, as we have already said, that its existence, when, as was likely to be soon the case, became confined to one section of the country, might give rise to heartburnings and contention. They met this danger promptly, reasonably and justly, by showing their willingness to adopt any practicable measure to prevent the increase of an evil, the removal of which was beyond their present power. It mattered not to minds, and hearts like theirs, that the territories in respect to which they legislated, were at the time parts of slave States, and subject to the introduction of slavery, so that it had not actually obtained a footing there.

Having thus shown their disposition to do all they could upon the subject, and having effected so much, they felt that they could rely upon the justice, the patriot