

charged with holding civil allegiance to a foreign ecclesiastic, who is also a foreign prince or potentate. You would not name the class of men whom you or some of you know to be thus falsely charged, because you were not all ignorant, unlettered men, and entirely unacquainted with the history of both ancient and modern times, but you repeated the false charge itself, which had been made, and left the previous denunciation, this charge and prejudice, ignorance and bigotry, to make the particular application. You meant and intended to point out, and did point out the members of the Catholic religion, that whole class of citizens as the persons who were to be proscribed and excluded from office, though you would not and did not say so in words.

There were several motives for this; the Know-nothing oaths and obligations boldly and directly proscribed them. Enough must be said by you in this article, to fulfil these oaths, and satisfy these your constituents. The quoted clauses of this article were sufficiently distinct for these purposes. The purpose to proscribe a class of citizens on account of their religious faith, caution suggested should not be plainly and positively avowed if possible to be avoided, because it was and is violative of the Constitution, and would on that account be resisted by all its true friends and real supporters; and such an open avowal, moreover, would have precluded evasion or denial which might be useful and necessary to the success of the party in some quarters. You sought by the mode adopted to accomplish all these ends, but you attempted too much—you overreached yourselves, and failure is the consequence. You may now, and probably will soon erase the article from your Platform—blot it from the paper; but it is too late. It caused you many and rapid successes at first; the tide is now reflux, and wherever the flux of tide is great and most rapid, there also is the reflux swifter and more violent. Sowers of the “wind shall reap the whirlwind.” Enough.

This minority, then, can perceive no greater difference between the purposes and injunctions contained in and put forth by this 8th Article of the Philadelphia Platform, of June, 1855, and the proscriptive clauses of the Know-nothing oaths cited in the earlier part of this report, than there is in the obligation never to vote for nor support any man for any political office if he be a Roman Catholic, and the injunction to advance to political office those only who are not of the Roman Catholic; which is just no difference at all in sense, but some in sound. The language used is different—one is affirmative, the other negative in form. One is plain, direct and explicit; this declares its purpose and intention plainly, boldly. The other, afraid and ashamed to speak out, uses terms so arranged as to convey but not to express their purpose, by talking of charges of which they know the accused to