

as he refers in his letter, by way of exposition of his meaning, to the 8th Article, we have quoted above, he is to be understood as speaking of persons belonging to the Roman Catholic church who acknowledge a *civil* allegiance to a foreign power, since that is the qualification which the Governor was aware the party he alludes to, attached to its refusal to vote in the case of Roman Catholics.

Such unlawful combinations the Governor professes himself powerless to suppress, but impliedly commends that endeavor to the Legislature, which he infers has the power.

His warring against "a war of races and sects," has no point but in its reference to the danger of limiting the privileges of foreigners, and withholding political trusts from those of the Catholic faith, who acknowledge a foreign civil allegiance.

These, therefore, are the questions which the Governor's message was intended to bring to the consideration of the Legislature, as the unconstitutional meditations of unlawful societies, the proper subject for Legislative suppression. The Committee must presume that they again misunderstand the Governor, when they suppose him really to believe that there is any thing of an unlawful character in the freest discussion, whether secret or public, of the policy of the naturalization laws, or that these laws may not without violation of any principle of the Constitution, be modified or absolutely repealed at the pleasure of the Congress of the United States, or that any State in the Union may not restrict the privilege of voting and holding office to native born citizens, whenever such State shall find it useful to the common weal to do so. We are unwilling to believe that the Governor intended to assert a doctrine so extravagant as this, and rather interpret his language as meaning to rebuke those who have resolved in the absence of any change or repeal of the naturalization laws; to vote for none but native American citizens for places of trust in the government, and yet it would seem to be scarcely less extravagant to suppose that he regarded such a resolution, made by any citizen or number of citizens, as inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the Constitution of the United States, or of that of any State or of any law of either. It is a dangerous assault upon the privilege of the ballot, which we have been accustomed to venerate as one of the safeguards of constitutional liberty, when the