ADDRESS

OF THE

Democratic Republican General Committee

TO THE

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICAN ELECTORS

OF THE

City and County of New York.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—The democratic party is defeated and depressed. The city government, in all its branches and departments, with all its business and contracts, with all its employments and officers, is in the hands of the political party that has always been opposed to us. A most inefficient administration of affairs is accompanied with a stupendous and unparalleled extravagance of expenditure. The State government is yet in whig hands, although their power has almost been dislodged from the Legislature, at the first rally of the united democracy. The administration of the general government is also under the control of the party of past ideas and obsolete principles—an administration that can be contemplated with satisfaction in not a single aspect—without energy in its management of the affairs of the army and navy, without skill or dignity in its foreign relations, meddling in the concerns of the territories, and yet willing to abandon them without an organization of government, resisting reforms in the management of the postal business of the country, embarrassing commerce, and seeking to revive the exploded system of protection. A President has been installed, who was elected on the single pledge of "no proscription for party's sake," as the one and the only principle which he avowed, or professed to understand, and his exaltation to the post has been followed by the most thorough and malignant proscription that has ever been known, since the establishment of the government.

Is there anything pleasing to contemplate in this picture? Or, is there anything to gratify us as a party, in a review of the causes which have led to these disastrous results? Shall we dwell upon the errors, the dissensions, and the divisions among ourselves, that have mainly brought about the present position of affairs, for the purpose of renewing the memory of those exciting scenes, and reviving and perpetuating old animosities? Is this the way to rescue the city, the State, and the nation, from whig misrule? Is this the way to restore the ascendancy of the principles which all who bear the name of democrat hold in common? Or, shall we strive to bury the past, with all its errors, and look upon its events only as a matter of history for our instruction?

We believe that patriotism and sound practical wisdom dictate the same answer to these interrogatories, and that the great body of the democratic republican electors of the city of New York have already given that answer. We have been elected by you as your general committee for the year 1850, for the purpose of promoting the success of the established principles of the democratic party. The cause of our defeat was dissension—the only hope of our success is union—union without the sacrifice of principle—union with the largest liberty of thought and speech on all questions not articles of party faith—union upon a patriotic and national basis—the union of all who can come together upon the old democratic platform. We have been opposed by a few of our own number, who are animated by a different sentiment. They have broken away from us violently and disrespectfully, and are striving to enkindle afresh the fires of ancient discord, by fanning its smouldering embers. We deem it due to you to make a statement of the facts connected with their separation, in order to guard against any misapprehension. If we go back of the present—if we show you that these disorganizers are the very men who prevented your success in the spring and fall elections last year, it is not for the purpose of denouncing any individuals, but in order to enable you to judge of the motives which occasioned the present movement, and to perceive the consequences that will result from it if you give it any countenance.

We submit a detailed statement of the facts connected with the disorganizing movement of the minority of the committee, as prepared by a select committee of this body, whose names are attached to it. Its truth cannot be questioned.

STATEMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

At the last meeting of this committee held on the 5th instant, ten members seceded from its organization. They have since styled themselves the Democratic Republican General Committee.

A step so extraordinary, at a time when harmony of purpose and action are eminently required should be brought to your attention by an official communication. The undersigned are a committee for that purpose.

The General Committee was organized on the 3d of January last, by the appointment of officers *pro tem.* A. A. Denman was Chairman, on motion of Mr. Barr, of the Sixth Ward. Peter Parks and John S. McKibbin were Secretaries. All were chosen unanimously. It appeared, on calling the roll, that the following seats were contested—one from the Second ward; three from the Third; three from the Fourteenth; two from the Fifteenth, and three from the Seventeenth. A resolution was passed that the contested seats be taken up in their order—that the contestants be heard by the committee, in support of their respective claims, and that they retire until their case should be reached.

The seat from the Second Ward was unanimously awarded to Mr. Rynders, and the roll of the committee then stood as follows:—

First Ward.—O. Charlick, John Anderson, R. T. Mulligan.
Second Ward.—James Leonard, Isaiah Rynders, Dennis Mahon.
Fourth Ward.—William O'Donnell, George H. Purser, E. H. Flume.
Fifth Ward.—E. B. Hart, H. M. Western, H. Arcularius, Jr.
Sixth Ward.—Thomas Gilmartin, Thomas J. Barr, Charles Bailey.
Seventh Ward.—E. C. West, J. S. McKibbin, James Murphy.
Eighth Ward.—R. T. Compton, D. E. Sickles, James T. Brady.
Ninth Ward.—Charles Edwards, J. S. Brownell, J. W. Harmon.
Tenth Ward.—A. Ming, Peter Parks, William Wainright.
Eleventh Ward.—James C. Willett, Wesley Smith, Samuel Allen.
Twelfth Ward.—Fernando Wood, Thomas Spofford, John McArthur.
Thirteenth Ward.—T. K. Downing, J. Marrenner, John R. Briggs.
Sixteenth Ward.—A. A. Denman, E. H. Miller, Daniel Geary.
Eighteenth Ward.—M. W. S. Jackson, L. B. Shepard, Robert Kelly.

There were forty-two members whose seats were uncontested. Of these, two, Messrs. Charlick and Anderson, were absent from the country.

The Third ward case was then considered. The question was continued until the second meeting, when it would have been decided, had not most of those who have since receded, retired from the committee in a body, for the avowed purpose of preventing a vote. Twenty-four members, however, remained. They were a majority of the enrolled delegates, and a large majority of those who had been present. They constituted a quorum within the rule of all parliamentary bodies. Yet, it was judged better to adjourn, and save a conflict, which could result in nothing but mischief to the democratic party. At the next meeting a resolution was adopted, after severe opposition, declaring that a majority of enrolled members constituted a quorum. Then every means of delay was adopted. Petty points of order were raised, and discussed at great length by the leading seceders. Appeals were continually made from the decisions of a Chairman who was their own choice. The floor was held for hours each evening by Mr. Sickles. Mr. Brady announced his intention of discussing every rule of order of the last General Committee at length, and stated that he would only yield the floor to a motion to adjourn.

Two delegates from the Eighth ward, (Messrs. Carlin and Barmore,) produced a certificate of their election, signed by two of the three Inspectors appointed by the Ward Committee. Messrs. Sickles and Brady refused to obey the resolution of the committee, and the request of the Chair, that they should retire. Mr. Sickles insulted the Chairman, who left his seat, observing that he could not preside unless he was decorously treated. Mr. E. A. King and his associates forced their way into the room, in violation of the resolution of the committee and although informed by the chairman that their case was not decided, and that they must leave the room, they refused to do so. Three nights were thus consumed. On the fourth, a resolution was adopted, to the effect that the committee would not decide which delegation was entitled to a seat; that the matter should be referred to the people of the ward, and an election held, under the supervision of three inspectors, to be appointed by the chair. The 30th of January was fixed as the time, and the polls were to be kept open from 3 to 9 o'clock, P. M.

The Chair appointed Messrs. Western and McKibbin from the minority of the committee, and Mr. Willett from the majority, to hold the election. The majority might have found fault with this division, but they made no objection. The Inspectors were all present. No hint was given that any one of them would not discharge his duties, or assume to overrule the decision of the general committee, and to prevent the people of the Third ward from voting at an election held by inspectors appointed from a disinterested body.

At the next meeting, Mr. Denman was absent, and Alderman Jackson was called to the chair, by the unanimous vote of more than a quorum of the committee. It was then past the hour of half-past seven. Neither Mr. Sickles, Western, nor Arcularius, was present. They came in afterwards, so also did Mr. McKibbin, who took his seat as Secretary, at the left hand of the Chairman. The Third ward case was the first business in order. Mr. Willett reported that he had held an election, at which Richard M. Harrington, John Fay and James Donnelly were chosen by a very large vote; that notice was given, by printed handbills, of the election; that it was orderly; that a poll list was kept; and that the ballot of every democratic voter who appeared was deposited. Mr. Western then presented a report from himself and Mr. McKibbin. He addressed Alderman Jackson as Chairman. He read his report to the committee. It was to the effect that they had decided not to hold any election, as they had been ordered and undertaken to do—they could not find any ward committee to pay the expenses of room hire, &c., and they could not think of incurring it themselves. They admitted that Mr. Harrington and his associates had offered to pay half, that Mr. King and his associates refused. That Mr. Harrington and his associates then offered to pay the whole; but they could not permit it. In conclusion, they stated that they returned to the committee to find out what to do.

Thereupon—without any censure upon this manifest dereliction—a motion was made that Harrington, Fay, and Donnelly, should be admitted, and the previous question was called. Mr. Sickles addressed Alderman Jackson, as Chairman, upon a point of order. He was requested to take his seat until the call of the roll was completed. He refused, and continued speaking at the top of his voice, using language highly insulting to the Chair and the Secretary, who was taking the yeas and nays. Eighteen members sustained the call for the main question. Mr. Western voted in the negative, and nine members refused to vote. The question was then put, and Harrington, Fay, and Donnelly, were admitted by the same vote.

Up to this time, no one had thought of questioning the right of Alderman Jackson to the chair. He had sat there without objection while two reports were made. Mr. Sickles, however, now discovered, for the first time, that he was not entitled to preside. He moved that Mr. Western take the chair. Finding this extraordinary proposition treated with silent contempt, he himself called for the "ayes" on his motion, but from excess of caution, omitted to put the negative. He declared the motion carried, and Mr. Western, armed with this authority, proceeded to the other end of the table, accompanied by nine persons.

We shall not pause to argue that ten members of the Democratic Republican General Committee are not a quorum for any purpose, nor that the seceders acted in the most wanton violation of right, when they assumed to decide contested elections—to expel members—to adopt rules of order, and elect permanent officers of the Committee. This is too plain to require proof.

It is apparent, beyond question, that not one quarter of the members of the General Committee can be found to sanction the course of Mr. Sickles. If there be more, we invite them to sign a card to that effect.

It is known that the seceders attempt to sustain themselves by reviving the recent differences in the democratic party, and exciting prejudices against that section which was in a decided minority in this city. But it will be observed in the Third ward case, that Messrs. Harrington, Fay, and Donnelly were supporters of Cass and Butler. So were the undersigned. Some of them were opposed to the union agreed upon last fall. That union, however, was duly consummated by the authorized agents of both sections. It is due to good faith that it should be maintained. The committee was elected upon that understanding, and should steadfastly adhere to it. We cannot believe that the democracy of New York desire them to be otherwise. We are not aware that the seceders offer any other excuses for their course than those alleged in a manifesto issued upon the eve of the last election, by a self styled 'Executive Committee,' whose object was to divide and defeat the democratic party.

The democracy have branded that act with merited condemnation. We are confident they will not regard the present attempt to renew it, with greater favor. On the contrary, we know they will hold fast to the union of the democracy as indispensable to success—to the success of our party—certainly essential to the welfare of the country, and perhaps necessary to the maintenance of the American Union.

PETER PARKS,
CHAS. EDWARDS,
FERNANDO WOOD, } Committee.
JAMES LEONARD,
L. B. SHEPARD.

February 9th, 1850.

There never was a more flagrant case of spurious organization, than that recorded above, in the usurpation, by a small minority, of the powers and the title of the Democratic Republican General Committee. The ten seceders soon filled up their roll, by settling all the disputed wards, without the troublesome formality of examining a paper or hearing a statement. They were disposed of by acclamation. All this was done while the committee were in the room, remaining organized, and proceeding with their business as well as they could under such circumstances. The progress of the minority was rapid. They declared Henry M. Western to be chairman for the year, and two other persons to be secretaries, also, by acclamation, and dispensing with the trouble of counting the votes to ascertain whether the election was regular. Their next action was that of expelling certain members of the General Committee, whom they chose to declare not to have voted for Cass and Butler at the last Presidential election. The democracy of the wards which elected these gentlemen to the General Committee will appreciate the disrespect to them which this outrage involved. Their whole course of procedure, while in the committee, and their behavior since, evinced a settled design to dissolve, as far as they may have power, the union of the democracy.

We do no injustice to the disorganizers, in attributing this purpose to them, and we suppose they will not disavow it. Their whole conduct in the committee indicated a determined purpose, which was to be accomplished at all hazards. They staved off, night after night, as appears at length in the detailed statement, by tumult, by most vexatious discussions, points of order, speeches against time, and other expedients, the settlement of the disputed delegation from the Third ward. The case was sent back to the democracy of the ward, with a resolution, as stringent as they could desire, precluding all chance of the election of any one who did not vote for Cass and Butler at the last Presidential election, and with two out of the three inspectors of their own side; but they did not dare to meet the question at that ordeal. They resorted to disruption and spurious organization. If they had succeeded in wearying out the majority of the committee, and had admitted the delegates from the Third ward whom they wished to introduce, in virtue of forty-nine magic ballots that found their way through the narrow aperture of the ballot box in their original bundles, the whole power of the committee would have been brought to bear, to break up the union of the democracy.

We know that these men, in their scheme to break up the union of the democratic party, do not represent the wishes of the democracy of this city. We hope they do not represent the views of the democratic electors of the wards from which they were delegated, or claim to be delegated. The democracy of this city have expressed, too plainly to be mistaken, their desire of union. They manifested this desire very decidedly at the first election which occurred after the Presidential election—the charter election, in April, 1849. If by disunion or treachery they had been defeated once, it could not be remedied by being defeated again. Success was better than revenge, especially when that revenge would fall chiefly on themselves. Because the whig party was in power at Washington, was no good reason to those attached to democratic principles, that the whig party should be in power in New York. If their friends were proscribed and expelled from all offices under the general government, they could perceive no compensation or gratification in the consideration that their friends should also be removed or excluded from all places under the city government. The election was regarded as an important one. The elevation of any particular individual to a station of honor, was a matter of little moment to the people; but the success of the democratic ticket generally involved most important consequences to many of them individually, and to the democratic cause. The organization of the city government under the new charter, the appointment of a large number of officers, and, as some believed at the time, the political control of the city for several years, were at stake upon that election, in connection with the one that followed. In consequence of the pressure of the popular will, rather than by the guidance of political leaders, the project of uniting the strength of the democratic party for the purpose of carrying the election, was formed.

Myndert Van Schaick was nominated for mayor by both of the former sections of the party, and it was hoped that he would be elected. The nomination was regularly ratified at the county meeting at Tammany Hall, at which Francis B. Cutting presided. Perhaps, it was too much to expect so soon entire cordiality. Mutual suspicions of bad faith would naturally arise in the minds of extreme men of both the late sections; and the disappointments and the bitterness of the preceding contest were yet fresh in the memory of the principal actors.

But the hopes of the great body of the party were destined to meet with disappointment. There were men who were determined to defeat the election of Myndert Van Schaick, no matter what the consequences might be to their friends and the party. The means they adopted was that of distracting the democracy by the issue of an inflammatory circular. We give below the substance and chief portion of this manifesto, and ask the democratic electors of this city to read the names of the signers.

Manifesto issued for the purpose of defeating the election of the democratic ticket, in April, 1849. It begins with a grand exordium in style of the Declaration of Independence.

It is, at all times, no matter what may be the cause or provocation, extremely disagreeable to differ from those whom we have regarded as brothers and co-laborers in any great struggle for the success of principles equally dear to both. But this is a time, and an occasion, when silence on our part may legitimately leave us subject to the charge of timidity, if not cowardice, provided we do not distinctly and emphatically reiterate our previously expressed determination to sustain with energy and firmness—even at the risk of widening or prolonging the division of the democratic party, (a division we may deplore, but did not create)—the position held by our party during the late Presidential contest, on all questions affecting the constitutional rights of the States, and the stability of the Union.

It then goes back to the commencement of the dissensions of the party, attributing the origin of the division to the disappointed ambition of Martin Van Buren, and applying to him the familiar illustration of the "adder in the fable." It proceeds with a sketch of the history of the division, bringing it down to its disastrous climax at the Presidential election in November, 1848. The attack upon the nomination of Myndert Van Schaick follows:

Mercy and forgiveness are the highest attributes of man; but rewards should never be given, until reformation is complete. Against the rank and file of those who left us, we wage no war. Our arms and our hearts are open to receive them; but for him who returns, like a thief, through the back door, the "fatted calf" shall not be killed. To Mr. Van Shaick we accord all the praise due to an upright citizen—a man of character and integrity. But even his friends must acknowledge our right to speak freely of his claims to our suffrages, which we desire to do honestly and impartially. Our enemies, who assembled at Utica and Buffalo, have kept alive their organization up to the present moment; they have defeated us in two state elections and one Presidential election; they have now in the field candidates for the judicial offices to be filled at the coming election. Their Mayoralty Convention nominated Mr. Van Shaick and afterwards he was nominated by a convention, in Tammany Hall, that was elected for the purpose of selecting a candidate from our own party.—And here it is proper to express, in the most explicit and emphatic terms, our disapprobation of the twenty-eight members of the nominating convention, who have insulted the whole democratic party, by leaving our own ranks to select a candidate. What moved the barnburners to select that gentleman? It could not be a desire for harmony, as is evident from the fact that they still have individual candidates in the field, and keep up their local organizations in our wards, in most of which they have candidates for charter offices. It was because they knew he contributed money towards the election of Van Buren and Adams, and voted for them last November? He acknowledged to a sub-committee of the nominating convention of Tammany Hall, that he did vote for these men, but pleaded, in defence, that he owed a "debt of gratitude" to Mr. V. B. But did he owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Adams? Treason cancels all debts of gratitude due to traitors; and the man whose personal friendship seduces him from the paths of principle is not fit to be the candidate of any party, and especially of ours, in which devotion to principle is only excelled by respect for our religion. This is the first time that the democratic party has selected a candidate from an opposing faction—and may we not hope that it is the last time it will select one fresh from the councils of an enemy? The last Presidential contest was one that "tried men's souls," and he who opposed us then, if he comes into our camp now, need only hope to be a private—he cannot be trusted as a general. We have twenty thousand good men and true, while those who urge upon us their candidate, number but a few hundreds. The laws of nature have been violated in the nomination made by our convention—the strong have surrendered to the weak, and small bodies have attracted large ones. It must be understood that we oppose Mr Van S.'s nomination not on personal grounds, but because he was against us last fall, and because we have as little faith in a sudden political conversion as we would in that of an atheist after he had been made a bishop. The election of a Mayor by a base surrender of our principles, will be but a poor recompense for the loss of our honor, self-respect, and the prostration of the democracy of the Union. It is not yet too late to rescue our periled laurels; brave and determined men never halt, or hesitate what to do, when the path of duty is open to them. The purity and sincerity of our motives must be vindicated. Enemies shall not sneer at our weakness—friends shall not treat us with scorn and contempt. The pretended ratification, at Tammany Hall, on the night of Saturday, April 7, 1849, of the nomination of Mr. Van Schaick for the Mayoralty, deserves no consideration whatever, for many reasons—amongst which we may specify, that the county meeting was only called by an announcement which appeared on the morning of Saturday, in but one paper, without any handbills being posted, or other usual means adopted to insure such an attendance of the democracy as would furnish any test of the popular sentiment in reference to the nominations to be submitted to the meeting. The consequence was, that at about eight P. M., half an hour after the time appointed for the meeting, it was said to be organized, by the gathering of some one hundred and fifty men around the chair, to which F. B. Cutting, Esq., was called—much against his wishes, as we have every reason to believe. Of that number, a majority were persons incontestibly proved to have attended for no reason connected with the advancement of any principle, or the promotion of any interest but their own. There was no address read, there were no resolutions adopted; and it soon became obvious that the meeting, unparalleled in the paucity of its numbers, and the absence of all apparent interest in principle, had been packed by those who were willing to sacrifice the best interests of our country and the people, for any temporary success in which their personal advantages might be promoted. The meeting was addressed by but one speaker, and of him nothing can be said which would redound to his advantage as connected with this nomination. It adjourned in less than an hour after it had been organized, and after the so-called majority had refused even to hear Mr. Edward Strahan, who presented himself to oppose the nomination, but was gagged before he had announced his intention. We cannot, therefore, recognise that meeting as imposing any obligation on the democratic republican party to support the nomination of Mr. Van Schaick. It remains now for the democracy of this city to testify to their brethren in this and other States, that their previous declarations and votes were made and given with honesty and sincerity. The night of defeat is dark and dreary, but if bold and honest hearts beat in the bosoms of the vanquished, a day will surely come when the field of their disaster will be made classic by the recollection of the virtues of those who fought against hope, and only to avoid the eternal disgrace of cowardice.

ALEXR. P. VACHE,	JAS. T. BRADY,
THOMAS GILMARTIN,	MIKE WALSH,
CORNELIUS S. WALLACE,	H. BOLTON,
EDWARD STRAHAN,	E. A. KING,
AUG. SCHELL,	THOS. C. FIELDS,
E. R. CARPENTIER,	D. A. BRODERICK,
DANIEL E. SICKLES,	THOS. MURPHY,
WM. E. DENNIS,	ROBT. J. DILLON,

Dem. Rep. Executive Com.

Who are the men who issue this document? Where did they obtain the right to use this tone of command? Who constituted them the special exponents of the sentiments of the democratic party of New York, and the guardians of its purity? Did they gain the position simply because of the peculiar immaculacy of their own political character, or by reason of some appointment? Who created the new and extraordinary organization of a Democratic Republican Executive Committee, and who elected these sixteen persons as its members? There are gentlemen signing this document, and arrogating this title of power and authority, who were not even members of the Democratic General Committee. The designation assumed was one calculated to deceive. If a title had been sought for expressly, one better adapted to that purpose could hardly have been found.

This address made its appearance in the New York *Herald*, Monday morning, April 9, the day immediately preceding the election. It was too late to be answered. There was not time to expose the unofficial character of the document. The whigs eagerly seized the burning missile, and cast it into the midst of the democratic masses. They read in every line of it aid and comfort to their cause, and the auguries of their success; and they were not disappointed. It was an appeal to passion; and before there was time to weigh the subject carefully in all its consequences, the election was over, and it was lost. The democracy received another painful lesson of the fatal results of disunion.

The same disposition to unite the broken power of the party which was exhibited here, manifested itself throughout the State. As soon as the Presidential election was over, the question was, how the two halves of the party should come together again. The propriety and necessity of a reunion were generally acknowledged. This sentiment found its first utterance in the addresses issued by the members of the Legislature of both the late sections of the democracy, at the close of the last session. But it was more distinctly expressed in the proposition emanating from the Democratic State Committee, at Albany, that State conventions should be called by both sections, to meet at the same time and place, for the purpose of considering a plan of union. In accordance with this proposition, the two conventions assembled at Rome in August last. But their conferences did not result in consummating the union at that time.

A State democratic convention met at Syracuse, September 6th, for the purpose of nominating State officers to be supported at the ensuing election. The spirit of union and conciliation prevailed in the convention, and another effort was made to unite the party. The results of the deliberations and action of the convention were embodied in the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That a conciliatory course should be pursued by this convention, and one which, if properly met by the convention to assemble at Utica, on the 12th inst., would be instrumental in uniting the democratic masses in this State—in putting an end to whig misrule, and of electing an entire democratic ticket this fall; and with a view to accomplish this result, be it

Resolved, That the Democratic State Committee be authorized to withdraw any of the nominees presented by this convention, except those for Comptroller, Attorney General, Canal Commissioner, and State Prison Inspector; provided the Utica Convention ratify those names, and complete the ticket by nominating well known and acknowledged democrats as candidates for Judge of the Court of Appeals, Secretary of State, Treasurer, and State Engineer; and shall impose no principle or test upon said candidates inconsistent with the resolutions adopted by the Democratic Convention held in the Presbyterian Church at Rome, and that the ticket thus nominated receive the united support of both divisions of the democratic party.

The proposition, tendered in the spirit of harmony, conveyed in these resolutions, was met in the same spirit by the Utica Convention, and the re-union was effected. They adopted, in answer to the proposition, the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That in common with the democratic convention recently assembled at Rome on the 15th of August last, "We are satisfied that there is such an agreement in favor of the principles of human freedom, as not only authorizes but demands the re-union of the democratic party of New York, and that we look to such re-union to preserve all the great principles of civil liberty from the hands of a whig President, who differs with us in regard to all principles, as far as we know, and to lodge them where they have been heretofore predominant and secure," and that we believe such re-union can now be accomplished by the nomination of John A. Lott, for Comptroller; Levi S. Chatfield, for Attorney General; Darius Clark, for State Prison Inspector; and Frederick Follet, for Canal Commissioner; and that we, therefore, nominate the said gentlemen to the offices severally before named.

Resolved, That to complete the democratic State ticket, we hereby nominate Freeborn G. Jewett, of Onondaga, for the office of Judge of the Court of Appeals; Henry S. Randall, of Cortland, for the office of Secretary of State; Benjamin Welch, Jr., of Erie, for the office of Treasurer; and Alexander Campbell, of Albany, for the office of State Engineer and Surveyor; and that we pledge to the entire ticket thus nominated our cordial and unanimous support.

Resolved, That the President be requested to acknowledge the receipt of the communication of John V. L. Pruyn, Esq., under date of the 11th of September inst., and to transmit to him a duly authorised account of the proceedings of this convention in reply thereto.

The union of the democratic party, thus consummated, was hailed with enthusiasm by the great body of the democracy in this city. Union meetings were held in the various wards, and a spirit was awakened that seemed to promise a triumph like those of former times. Nothing more was heard of the distinctive epithets of hunker and barnburner; but all distinctions were merged in the honorable name of democrat. The election at hand was one of great magnitude, embracing State officers, senate, assembly, aldermen for two years, assistant aldermen, heads of departments, judges, and other important law officers. Delegates, fresh from the people, met in various conventions, and nominated the city and county officers to be elected. The men who had signed the arrogant missive of April 9th, were busy about the conventions, some seeking office for themselves, others for their friends. At the county ratification meeting at Tammany Hall, the address and resolutions, breathing harmony and union, endorsing the State and county nominations, and pledging the party to their support, were presented by Daniel E. Sickles. Now, surely every thing would run smoothly, and the people would not be disappointed of their hopes. Here, if ever, were regular nominations. But the bolt was prepared in secret, ready to be launched at the most effective moment. At the appointed time, the day immediately preceding the election, as before, there appeared in the columns of the *Herald* another manifesto, that should scatter dismay among the democracy, and give the State and city to the whigs. Here it is, at full length, italics and capitals, as they appeared in the *Herald*:—

MANIFESTO ISSUED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEFEATING THE ELECTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC TICKET, IN NOVEMBER, 1849.

To the Democratic Republican Electors of the City of New York:

Fellow Democrats!—The brief period which has intervened since the last democratic convention met at Syracuse, is marked by events that demand your serious consideration, in view of the election to day. Already it is apparent that the union, from which so much advancement was promised to the democratic cause, is, in truth, to be employed only as a means of engrafting upon our time-honored principles a set of abolition doctrines hostile to the peace and welfare of the republic, and repugnant to the sympathies and intelligence of the democratic party. The union upon a State ticket, agreed to by the Syracuse and Utica conventions, was based upon a solemn pledge of the good faith of each, that, at this election, and hereafter no test should be imposed upon any candidate in reference to his opinions upon the powers of the action of Congress upon the subject of negro slavery. How has that union been carried out? How has the pledge of good faith been maintained? By the democratic party proper, the constituents of the Syracuse Convention, the union was upheld, and cordially and generously promoted, by the most liberal concessions to the Van Buren faction. In this county, was conceded to them a large and undeserved share of the nominations. Throughout the State, a similar magnanimity was practiced, and especially in the selection of candidates for the Senate, of whom three-fourths consist of members of the late free soil party. How has this honorable course on our part been reciprocated? We find that now, in advance of the election, the only democratic representative of the State of New York in Congress, is marked for proscription. War, war to the knife, is declared against Senator Dickinson, for the avowed reason that his opinions on the negro question do not suit the free soil abolition party. This crusade, begun during the last month, by obscure country newspapers, is now daily reinforced by assaults from the leading Van Buren organs, in the principal cities in the State. Will the spirit which invokes such hostility be appeased by the sacrifice of Mr. Dickinson? Will one victim satisfy so many executioners? As well might it have been predicted that the reign of terror would end so soon as one head had fallen in the streets of Paris.

No! it is clear that the same policy which prompts the advocacy now, of only such candidates for the Senate as will proscribe an able and faithful Senator because he is not an abolitionist, will also pursue every candidate now and hereafter, who professes the opinions of the national democracy, and refuses to join in the fanatical crew enlisted under the black flag carried by Martin Van Buren. If proof is demanded of this, we point to the letter addressed by the Lockport committee to all the candidates on the State ticket on the subject of slavery. The answers of five of these candidates have been published, all of whom agree to swallow the test thus imposed, in violation of all honor and decency, after all controversies had been buried in the Utica and Syracuse Conventions. Messrs. Randall, Clark, Welch, Campbell and Chatfield, by recognising the course pursued towards them by allowing themselves to be catechised on a subject which has no more legitimate relation to the present election than the wrongs and sufferings of the white men in the republic of Liberia, who are deprived of the right of suffrage, have stigmatized with attempted censure, and impugned by a presumptuous effort at rebuke, the conventions from which their nominations were received and a vast majority of the electors to whom they appealed for support. Why have not the answers of the other candidates been also published? Is it because Mr. Lott, the candidate for Comptroller, and Mr. Follet, the candidate for Canal Commissioner, returned such replies as would, by their publication, defeat the malicious intent of the inquisitors? The omission is strange and significant; but its meaning cannot be misunderstood, for the imposition of this test is expressly devised to realise the threatening prediction ventured by John Van Buren, in the Utica Convention, where he declared that "if the candidates did not rightly respond to queries on the slavery subject, they would be

This threat was deemed, at the time, nothing more than the expiring malediction of a baffled conspirator; than the expiring malediction of a baffled conspirator; no man supposed, that with all his conceded authority over the passions and purposes of his party, it was ever intended by that party to make the denunciation pronounced by their leader the great end and object of their exertions in the election. This confidence on the part of the democratic masses was created by the subsequent passage in the Utica Convention, of a resolution accepting the offer of union made by the Syracuse Convention, on the sole condition—avowed and accepted as clearly and unequivocally as the English language could express it—that no pro-slavery or anti-slavery test should be propounded or enforced against the candidates nominated. What was then a generous and honorable belief in the good faith of the free soil party, would be now, if any of us could by possibility entertain it, a false, foolish, and fatal credulity. *No democrat can now be so blind as not to see that it is the settled purpose of the free soil party to vote to-day only for such candidates as have "rightly responded to queries on the slavery subject!"* Else why impose the test? If such be not the design, why did the interrogatories of the Lockport Convention so quickly follow Mr. Van Buren's avowal of the consequences of an unsatisfactory answer? Information as to their opinions is sought from candidates for no other purpose than to influence the determination of those who are asked to vote for them; and the inference cannot be resisted, that the free soil party, as a body, intend to defeat every candidate who, by disdaining the test, places himself upon the platform of the Syracuse and Utica Union.

What, then, shall we do? Fortunately, fellow democrats, the path of duty at this crisis is free from doubt and unobstructed by difficulties. The Syracuse Convention was not invested with any authority to allow one-half of our State tickets to be nominated either by the free soil or whig party. That convention was not authorized to form either a union or coalition with any hostile organization. It had no power to commit the constituency it represented to any change or surrender of principle, or to pledge their support for candidates it did not nominate. The union, therefore, which it assumed the responsibility of proposing, and which was accepted by the free soilers, rested solely for a basis upon the voluntary adhesion of the democratic party to its terms; it was a union which could only exist as long as both parties remained faithful to the terms and spirit of the compact; never reposing upon the action of an authorized body, a violation of all the usages of the democratic party, and only tolerated by a spirit of self sacrifice too often indulged by those we now address, this so-called union having been treacherously violated in its entire scope and meaning of the free soil party, no longer deserves even a passing recognition from you. Nay, even more—it is the duty of every democrat now to denounce it, to repudiate it, to defeat the pernicious objects it is intended to subserve from the action of the adherents to the Utica Convention.

The question then again recurs—What shall the democracy do? Will you vote for candidates whom you did not nominate?—for candidates who have insulted the Syracuse Convention, by accepting a test which that convention denounced? Can it be expected that you will stand by, with your arms folded, and witness the proscription and degradation of your candidates on the State ticket?—see them defeated on an anti-slavery test, and do no act on your part to protect yourselves, and have the honor of your party? We think not. The democracy of this city and the State are yet too mindful of their duty to the national democratic party, to permit a sectional and fanatical brand to be placed on their forehead. The Union of the States, with its unnumbered blessings, is more dear to us than a coalition with traitors. *Let us, therefore, at the polls to-day, vote only for such candidates on the State ticket as have remained faithful to the cause they represent, and the compact from which their positions emanated. If you and your friends are to be proscribed,* THEN MUST YOU PROSCRIBE ALSO. Let this be done, and hereafter men will learn that a chivalrous fidelity to the terms and spirit of a treaty can never be disregarded with impunity, by those who seek the advantages of an alliance.

DANIEL E. SICKLES,	THOMAS P. KETTELL,
JAMES LEE,	ALEXANDER F. VACHE,
JAMES T. BRADY,	GEO. J. GALLAGHER,
AUGUSTUS SCHELL,	MIKE WALSH,
JOSEPH T. SWEET,	JOHN M. BLOODGOOD,
ALEX'R STEWART,	ALEX'R M. ALLING.

Democratic Repub. Executive Committee.

No wonder that such a document was seized by the whigs as a potent instrument of mischief. It appeared suddenly and simultaneously, in all parts of the State, on the very morning that it was issued here, and was read by multitudes, at the most distant and diverse points, before half of our citizens knew that such a paper was in existence. If the scheme had been concocted as an electioneering trick by the whigs themselves, and they had arranged the whole plan beforehand, to have the document printed and ready to be distributed at the same moment, all over the State, at the very crisis of the election, when no answer or explanation could accompany it, they could not have managed the business more successfully. It was regarded by democrats generally, in the interior of the State, as a whig device, and failed to do there, the mischief it was designed. In this city it was more successful. Many honest democrats were deceived by it, and withheld their votes. We lost every thing save honor, and were hurled from nearly every place in the city government, great and small. It is the general opinion of democrats, that, but for the appearance of this circular, we should have carried the city, and secured a handsome majority in both branches of the Legislature.

We ask the democratic electors of the city of New York, to look at the names of the signers of this message. The twelve persons arrogate to themselves the same designation that the sixteen had assumed in April; but it will be noticed that in the interval, there have been some changes in the "DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE!" It is difficult to speak of this most extraordinary assumption, in the terms it merits, and yet with respectful language towards the signers. There are, attached to this paper, and branded with this false title, the names of gentlemen of character and standing in the community. Some of them, it is said, have privately disowned and regretted the use of this title, but not one of them has felt the propriety of doing so publicly. We would fain hope that some one more unscrupulous than the rest, appended the title without their knowledge, and that they did not knowingly lend themselves to this BASE POLITICAL FRAUD. We would also be glad to believe that the same individual affixed the designation to both the circulars, and that the gentlemen who signed the last, had not noticed or heard of the designation assumed in the first manifesto. But the mischief lay in the authority assumed by them, as the heads and representatives of the democracy, rather than in the sentiments of the few individuals who linked their names together, and the weight of their influence and character, in support of the common declaration.

The reasons assigned in the circular, for the mandate which it conveys to the democratic republican electors of the city of New York, are, that a volunteer committee from Lockport, had addressed inquiries to the candidates on the State ticket, upon the subject of the extension of slavery, and that the Utica organization were guilty of bad faith, had broken the compact of union, and designed treachery towards a portion of the candidates. If these reasons suggested themselves with such force on the 5th November to the minds of the signers, why did they not occur to them before? There had been no new facts brought to light since some time previous to the ratification meeting at Tammany Hall, and no evidences of bad faith exhibited, that did not exist at the time when Daniel E. Sickles presented his report and resolutions, confirming the nominations, and recommending their cordial and unanimous support. But the result has shown that the signers of the circular were mistaken in their imputations of treachery. The nominations were supported in perfect good faith throughout the State, by democrats of all shades of opinion on the subject of slavery, and Mr. Lott, who did not respond to the self-nominated committee of Lockport, received the entire democratic vote. The terms of the compact were not violated in the letter or in the spirit.

The union of the democratic party in the State, was the result of the determination of the people to come together, and to allow their leaders no longer to keep them divided. That determination remains unchanged, and those who stand in the way, or resist it, will be trampled down. There is no difference of principle that should keep them disunited, and they have a common enemy whose principles are wide as the poles asunder from theirs. Their business is the plain business of an opposition—to overthrow the party in power. Their policy is perfectly evident. It is to repel no one who is now or is willing to become a democrat; to call out and to cast together in the ballot box, the 114,000 votes that were given for Cass, and the 120,000 votes that were given for Van Buren, and the votes of the many thousands of democrats who, in the years of division, have staid away from the polls, and the votes of all others that can be gained in support of the democratic ticket. It is in this way only, that the ascendancy of democratic principles, and, as we believe, of sound principles of government, are to be secured.

We have presented a sketch of the political history of the party during the past year, in order to show the position which we occupy as your Democratic General Committee, and to corroborate the charge of a purpose of disunion on the part of the authors of the present disorganizing movement. We are sorry to perceive among their abettors the names of gentlemen who were candidates at the recent election, and felt deeply at the time the injury done them by those scrupulous guardians of democratic orthodoxy. We hope they will do no more injury to the democratic party. We only ask you to compel them, by the potent exercise of your influence, to cease their efforts. If they should display the same zeal in battling with the common enemy that they have in accomplishing the defeat of their friends, they will render great service to the democratic cause. Their seats have been declared vacated.

It is not necessary to dwell upon what has transpired since the secession of the minority. Although the Council of Sachems, of the Tammany Society, have distinctly refused to recognize their spurious organization, they have persisted in maintaining it, and usurping the authority of this committee, and have presumed to call general meetings of the democracy in its name. We can never consent to this usurpation, nor recognise their right to call meetings of the democracy, for any object, however patriotic or in unison with the sentiments of the party, in the name of the Democratic General Committee.

Unjustifiable attempts have been made to excite prejudice against the General Committee, in the minds of some democrats, by calling us barnburners, or representing us as sympathizing with the friends of the Wilmot proviso. If the regularity of this committee were to be decided by a reference to the zeal of its members in promoting the election of Cass and Butler, it would easily be settled in their favor. You have only to refer to the list of members composing the committee, to perceive that, with few exceptions, they are well known as advocates of the election of Cass and Butler, and have not changed their convictions as to the duty of democrats in that contest. But this has nothing to do with our regularity as the General Committee. Our authority is derived from you alone. You have elected us, and we ask you to support us; for it is your own cause. If you have chosen to elect delegates who did not vote for Cass and Butler, you had a perfect right to do so, and no man is authorized to resist your wishes. There are many counties in this State where the exercise of the same liberality of sentiment will not be unwelcome. We have been elected by the democracy in our various wards, for the purpose of promoting the union and success of the party, and are not disposed to renew the dissensions of the past.

With the Wilmot proviso, we, as a committee, have nothing to do. We occupy no narrow or exclusive platform, and shall resist the introduction of any test upon the question of slavery, as a part of the democratic creed. Our course is plainly marked out by the expressed sentiments of democratic conventions, as the basis on which the union of the party in the State was consummated. The democratic convention at Rome, adopted the following liberal and catholic resolutions:—

Resolved, That we are opposed to the extension of slavery to the free territories of the United States; but we do not regard the slavery question, in any form of its agitation, or any opinion in relation thereto, as a test of political faith, or as a rule of party action.

Resolved, That the power of Congress over slavery in the territories and the particular modes of legislation thereon, are, among democrats, controverted questions, and that we concede to every one in relation thereto, the undisputed right of opinion, not regarding any particular mode of constitutional construction on this question a part of the democratic creed, or as essential to fellowship with our democratic brethren in this State, or in any section of the Union.

These sentiments were re-affirmed at Syracuse. To use the eloquent language of Francis B. Cutting, on taking the chair as president of that convention,

"At Rome, the great principle that the party maintained was toleration. The assembled people of the North are opposed to slavery. We may lay that down as a cardinal proposition. It was not opposition to slavery that divided the New York democracy; but the division resulted from an attempt to make that opposition a part of the democratic creed, and a test of party fidelity. We repudiate such a test. All such tests as this, harnessing or restricting the free opinions of men, are but relics of the dark ages. Those days have passed. We live in an age of free thought, free opinion and free speech. We leave men to their free opinions on the subject of slavery; we only declare that opposition to slavery cannot, with our consent, be made a test of democracy."

We abjure all sympathy with that fanaticism which would trample upon the rights of any portion of the American people, that would needlessly irritate their feelings, or lay its hands upon the compromises of the constitution. We would rebuke, at the same time, all threats of disunion. We yield to no body of men in our attachment to this glorious Union. It is infinitely above all considerations of party. We hope that the day will never come that the spirit of fraternity, of compromise, and of sacrifice—if sacrifices be necessary to preserve the Union—shall be extinct. The perpetuity of this Union is the prayer of every true patriot, and of every lover of liberty throughout the world.

We have presented a picture of the position of the democratic party. It depends upon the people whether this condition of affairs shall remain, with all its injurious consequences to the interests and welfare of the country. If you prefer dissensions to success—if you are disposed to wrangle forever over past issues—so be it. But if you choose, you can, with united efforts, and with the aid of your democratic brethren in other parts of the State, change every feature in this gloomy picture of whig ascendancy, and restore the party of the people to power in the management of our municipal affairs, in the control of the legislation and policy of the State, and in the administration of the general government.

FERNANDO WOOD, Chairman
of the Democratic General Committee.
GARRET DYCKMAN,
RICHARD M. HARRINGTON, } Secretaries.

FIRE AT ROCHESTER, N. Y.—The Cataract Woollen Mills, belonging to Mr. E. B. Coe, were destroyed by fire yesterday morning. The mill, machinery and stock on hand were entirely destroyed. The entire loss is estimated at from 12 to $15,000, upon which there was an insurance of $7,000; $4,500 in the Columbus and Lexington, and $2,500 in the Genesee Mutual. None of the books of the establishment were saved. The mill contained 13 looms, and turned out annually about 70,000 yards of woollen cloths.—*Rochester Democrat, March 7.*

Superior Court.

Before Judges Oakley and Paine.

MARCH 9.—*Alfred Le Grand et al. vs. Anthony Heguet.*—Appeal dismissed, and order at chambers affirmed, with $10 costs.

Wm. C. Tallmadge vs. Thos. W. P. Y. Mercereau.—Like rule.

Robert Hogan ads. Jas. C. Vandervoort et als.—Re-argument ordered.

Gov. Dana, of Maine, has appointed the 4th day of April as a day of fasting and prayer.

University of New York—Annual Commencement.

The regular annual commencement of the medical department of the New York University, was held on Friday evening in the Chapel of the University. The room was filled to overflowing by the friends of the graduates, a great portion of the audience being ladies, the sisters, mothers and cousins of the young gentlemen who were about to receive their diplomas, the reward of their study and diligence.

At half-past seven o'clock, Professors Mott, Paterson, Dickson, Paine, Draper and Bedford, in their robes, took their seats on a platform erected for the occasion, and soon afterwards the ceremonies commenced. An orchestra, in the gallery, performed some airs, and after a prayer was delivered, the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, Chancellor of the University, rose and announced the names of the graduates, the total number of whom is one hundred and eleven. It will be perceived, that almost every State in the Union is represented by them, as well as Canada, Nova Scotia, and even the Sandwich Islands; showing conclusively, that the well merited fame of this great institution is not confined to our own country, but has been wafted across the continent to the islands of the Pacific. The following is a list of the graduates, and we must say, that we never have seen a more intelligent or intellectual assemblage of young men:—

Alexander, C., Me.	Kerley, L. D., N. Y.
Bogan, M. B., Ga.	Kellogg, W. L., Mich.
Bradford, B. W., Fla.	Kitchell, W., N. J.
Battle, H. L., Ga.	Low, James, N. Y.
Bridges, L. B., N. Y.	Lomax, W., Ia.
Brown, G., Mass.	Lawrence, C. M., N. Y.
Bickford, A., N. Y.	McKim, M. D. L., Mich.
Brown, S. H., Conn.	Moore, W. H., N. C.
Browne, P. B., N. H.	McRae, D. J., N. C.
Beauchamp, E. N., Ky.	Mauzy, R. D., Ia.
Bowron, W. A., N. Y.	Moore, J., Ia.
Bartlett, E. G., Vt.	Miller, R., Ga.
Brooks, J. W., N. Y.	Nichols, T. L., N. Y.
Backus, C., N. Y.	Neil, J., Va.
Brown, H. W., N. Y.	O. Bannon, J. D., S. C.
Cunningham, W. H., Ky.	Ostrom, H. H.
Crawford, E. D., Pa.	O'Brien, T., N. Y.
Clark, D. D., N. Y.	Page, C., Va.
Clement, D. C., N. C.	Putnam, C., N. Y.
Card, D. C., R. I.	Pierson, W. H., N. Y.
Charlton, S. F., Pa.	Parr, J., N. Y.
Clussman, W. H., N. Y.	Pitts, A. M., Ga.
Dickson, J. A., N. C.	Parker, D. S., N. C.
Doneghy, J. F., Ky.	Pope, E. W., N. S.
Denman, J. C., N. Y.	Potter, C. D., N. Y.
Evans, J. Y., N. Y.	Rathbone, S. H., N. Y.
Ely, W. A., N. J.	Rhodes, R. R., N. Y.
Everett, S. W., Ill.	Spence, B., N. Y.
Everett, C. W., N. Y.	Snyder, J. W., Tenn.
Elliott, N. J.	Shearer, H., Ala.
English, J. Y. H., N. J.	Safford, A. H., Ga.
Fry, L., Pa.	Saltonstall, G., N. Y.
Ford, H. A., N. Y.	Suttle, J. W., Va.
Forbes, S. F., N. Y.	Smith, F. B., Vt.
Griswold, S., N. Y.	Turnbull, J. W., N. Y.
Glenn, J. A., Pa.	Tunison, J. W., Ca.
Grimes, E. W., Ga.	Todd, J. N., Mich.
Gore, J. R., N. Y.	Townsend, J. K., N. Y.
Gulick, L. H., Sandwich Islands.	Voorhis, Van H., N. Y.
Holmes, T., N. Y.	W[illegible] H. K., Pa.
Hyslop, G. L., N. Y.	Whittlesey, S., N. J.
Haring, L., N. Y.	Walker, E. S., N. Y.
Henry, J. H., Ala.	Westlake, H. G., Conn.
Hendrick, E. F., N. Y.	Ward, J. H., N. Y.
Howarth, J., Mass.	Winans, H. D., N. Y.
Hewit, E. E., Conn.	Wilson, J. H., N. J.
Husted, J. N., Conn.	Wade, J. L., N. J.
Harlow, C. E., N. Y.	Woodward, G. F., N. J.
Husted, N. C., Conn.	Wootton, W. H., Va.
Huggins, E. D., Conn.	Worrall, J. G., N. Y.
Hamilton, H. R., N. Y.	Walsh, T., N. Y.
Johnson, M., Ala.	Weger, E. L., Va.
Jones, T. C., N. C.	Woodcock, J. W., N. Y.
Johnson, A. E., N. Y.	Wigton, J. T., N. Y.
Ironmonger, F. W., N. Y.	Whitaker, N., N. C.
Iverson, R., Ga.	Total, 111.

The graduates were then requested to ascend the platform as their names were called and receive their diplomas—the evidence of their having passed their examination successfully, and their authority to heal the sick. This was decidedly the most interesting feature of the evening, and one which was particularly observed by the many handsome and beautiful ladies who were present. The diplomas were conferred by the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, Chancellor of the University.

When the diplomas were all conferred, the orchestra played a beautiful air. After which—

Professor Dickson rose and addressed the graduates. He congratulated them on their being endowed with the rights and privileges of physicians, and proceeded to explain the duties and responsibilities which they were about to incur. The duties of the physician are various—to himself, to his patient, to society, and to his brethren of the same profession. The Professor expatiated at length on each of these topics or heads, and his remarks were listened to with the greatest attention. One of the duties which the medical man owes to himself is to become acquainted with the classical and modern languages, for without a knowledge of them, his reading will indeed be circumscribed.—A medical man, too, must be thoroughly acquainted with optics, acoustics, chemistry—in fact, he must ransack air, earth, and sea, for knowledge and information, to enable him to practice his profession successfully. The evils of defective education were pointed out by the Professor, and he recommended the graduates to patronize medical periodicals, and other works of instruction, in order to improve themselves. They should contribute to them, also, and add their share to the general stock of knowledge and experience. The field of research is wide and ample, and the young physician should explore it with industry and energy. But no man should make his profession his vocation. He should make it only his avocation and be guided by the principles of virtue, honor, and morality. As to their duties to their patients, the speaker remarked on the sacred confidence which should exist between the physician and the rich person. This confidence must be as strict and as holy as that which exists between the pious Catholic and his confessor, or the criminal and his counsel. The Professor impressed eloquently on the young physician their duty to alleviate physical pain and torture, and when all hope is gone of preserving life, to smooth the path to the grave as much as possible. The profession of medicine is the noblest and most philanthropic of all, and this is the only civilized nation in which there are no special laws for the protection of the physician. The consequence is, that charlatanism is rampant in the land. The physician should seek the society of his professional brethren as much as possible. The duty of the physician to society at large, was the last topic touched upon. From his position and education, the physician is entitled to a high rank, and he possesses an influence which cannot be destroyed. It is, therefore, incumbent on the physician to be conversant with every topic of national or local importance. He did not think it necessary for him to become a leader of caucuses, but he ought to participate in all the intelligent movements of the day. It is his duty to foster and encourage education among the masses, and to discountenance quackery and charlatanism of every kind. He impressed on them the necessity of remembering and being guided by the topics which he had spoken upon and drew a beautiful picture of the career of the physician who acts according to them. Medicine is the most liberal of all professions, and the physician should answer all calls unhesitatingly and without inquiry. He must attend upon the calls of justice—upon the calls of the poor and disabled—upon all calls, those of the poor and wretched as well as those of the wealthy. Such beneficence will sooner or later bring its reward. No one can deny the right of the physician to a fair reward, but the actual value of the service, and the nature of the case, are to be taken into consideration. Wherever there is a standard of charges, it should be adopted and followed; where none exist one should be formed. In conclusion, he spoke eloquently to the graduates on the necessity of upholding the honor of the profession.

After the delivery of the address, of which the above is a meagre sketch, benediction was pronounced, and the ceremonies concluded.

We are happy to learn that this institution is very prosperous. It is advancing with rapid strides, to the highest point of medical celebrity, and distributing throughout the States, men of scientific knowledge, who are every way qualified to arrest the progress of disease and pestilence, and by whose efforts the total demolition of quackery will, ere long, be completely effected. Over four hundred students commenced their studies last year, one hundred and eleven of whom have graduated this session.

FLORIDA AND THE NASHVILLE CONVENTION.—Some time since the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Florida addressed a letter to Governor Brown, of that State, calling upon him, in view of the aggression of the North upon the South, to make the necessary arrangements for the representation of that State in the Nashville Convention. In reply, Governor Brown says, that he has no power or authority to take any official steps to cause the appointment or election of delegates to attend the Convention of the Southern States, to meet at Nashville; and that to procure the election of delegates to such convention would be a usurpation dangerous and censurable. He considers such a convention revolutionary in its tendency, and directly against the spirit and letter of the constitution of the United States. The expression of an opinion or determination of the States, in their sovereign capacity, would be calculated to carry more weight, and command more respect, than the acts and proceedings of an irresponsible convention of delegates, from a portion of the States, without any prescribed powers or duties, and subject to no control. The States have acted by reports, resolutions, and addresses. But it has been said, that the South were not in earnest, and do not mean what they say but what more can the convention do than re resolve, and re affirm, unless to propose violent and extra constitutional remedies? If it is called for that end, he most solemnly protests against it; for the time has not arrived for such measures. He says there are restless spirits at the South who have calculated the value of the Union, and who would, perhaps, sell it for a mess of pottage. Since the Southern Convention has been projected, a Southern confederation has been more than dreamed of. When the convention meets, who can tell what its members may not attempt to accomplish? A majority of wild, visionary, and reckless men, may get into the convention, which would cause him to tremble at the idea of placing the rights and interests of the South, and the safety of the Union, upon its deliberations. It is very certain that delegates from a vast extent of country representing every shade of Southern opinion on the subject, will not see eye to eye on all these points. Will delegates from some of the river States, he asks, who so unanimously declare for the Union, to the last extremity, harmonize with delegates from States alleged to be indifferent to the Union? If a small body of Southern Congressmen, assembled under the pressure of great excitement, and a sense of immediate danger, could not agree upon the terms of an address to the people of the South, there can be no certainty of unanimity in a body so numerous, and embracing so wide a range and contrariety of opinion, as this proposed convention; and should they fail to agree, so far from fortifying, it will have a direct tendency to weaken the position of the South. There is nothing new in the aspect of this agitating question, which should call forth, at this time, such extraordinary and revolutionary measures. Though a black cloud of thick darkness is impending over the Union, casting a deep gloom over the prospects of the future, he believes the Union will firmly and safely weather the storm.

U. S. Commissioners' Court.

Before Richard E. Stilwell, Esq.

MARCH 9.—*The U. States vs. Jas. Miller and Alexander White, for a Revolt.*—The evidence in this case having concluded, the counsel for the prosecution reviewed the evidence, and the Commissioner decided on committing the defendants for trial.