THE THREE GREAT PARTIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

We have for some time been looking in the American papers for some plain statement of the "platform" of the several candidates for the Presidency, which wonld give outsiders a clear view of party objects in the United States. We confess, with all humility our ignorance of many of the grounds of the coming struggle for the Presidency; and though we have tried hard to master the mysteries of "Doughfaces," and "Radical Democrats," "Locofocos," and sundry other euphonious appellations, we own with shame our utter inability to penetrate the undoubtedly sublime mysteriousness of these terms. We preferred, therefore, to wait the advent of some reasonable being in the United States, who would condescend to remember that, there are those outside the Union who desire to know something of the candidates for the Presidency, and what these gentlemen are expected by their supporters to do when the prize is gained. The *Boston Journal* comes to our relief, and in a sensible way tells us of the "Three Platforms." or the Three Political Parties, who are contesting the field to secure the administration of the United States Government, and to shape the policy of that country for the next four years. The *Journal* says:—

"Although a rigid adherence to a particular line of policy, as enunciated by a political convention, ought not to be expected of a chief magistrate, yet whoever is elected President may be expected to adopt the general principles of the platform of his party as a guide to the general policy of his administration. In the case of Mr. Buchanan, it is well known that he has gone so far as to sink his own individuality in the platform of his party. Col. Fremont has expressed his hearty approval of the main principles of the Republican platform, and Mr. Fillmore has, without solicitation, endorsed the leading principles of the American platform.

"The three platforms, therefore, challenge comparison, and it is proper that they should be widely circulated and carefully examined. The most striking point of difference in these three platforms is, of course, to be found, upon the question of slavery, that great and absorbing question which is second in importance to no other, except perhaps, the more general one of establishing a radical reform in the administration of the government. Upon this great issue, the position of the three parties may be brieffy contrasted as follows:— The Republican platform maintains that Kansas should be immediately admitted as a State into the Union; that Congress has the power. and should prohibit slavery in the territories; that slavery cannot exist under the Federal Constitution; and that citizens of Kansas should be protected in their lives, liberty and property. The Democratic platform, on the other hand, maintains that Congress should not interfere with slavery in State or territory, or in the District of Columbia, and that the territories should be admitted as States 'with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect.' The American platform takes the same grouud. It affirms the 'right of the native-born and naturalized citizens of the United States, permanently residing in any territory thereof, to frame their constitution and laws, and to regulate their domestic and social affairs in their own mode.'

"There are other points of difference of a very important character in the three platforms. The Republican platform denounces in indignant terms that filbustering spirit which has found an official exponent in the noted Ostend manifesto. The resolution containing this denunciation may be regarded as a rebuke to all those schemes for the acquisition of Cuba, Central America, Mexico, the Sandwich Islands, &c., the indirect encouragement of which by the present administration has caused complaint, and aroused the jealousy of foreign nations. The Democratic platform, on the other hand, directly sympathizes with the filbuster proceedings of Walker in Nicaragua, and declares in favor of 'every proper effort to insure our ascendency in the Gulf of Mexico,' or in other words, to add to our territory in and about that Gulf. The American platform is silent upon 'the filbustering question,' which, involving as it does, the national honor and good faith, and even the issue of peace or war, is certainly of momentous importance to the interests of the country.

"The Republican platform declares in favor of immediate and effective government aid for a railroad to the Pacific. The Democratic platform embraces a very noncommittal plank, which may or may not have reference to a Pacific railroad. It declares it to be the duty of the federal government, as far as the constitution will permit, to aid in the construction of a safe overland route between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The American platform is silent, also, upon this subject. The establishment of a railroad to the Pacific is alleged to be necessary for the developement of the resources and trade of the country; for its defence against foreign enemies and to prevent that separation and discordance of interests which may lead at some future time to the succession of the Pacific States and the establishment of a rival Republic on the western border. It is therefore, a great practical qusstion.

"The Republican platform boldly grasps the question of polygamy in Utah. The past and present administrations have temporized with this foul iniquity, and with the demoralizing practice of the Mormons. By the doctrine of non-interference with the local government of the territories—the doctrine of popular sovereignty—the Democratic party are pledged to admit Utah into the Union with all her anti-Republican demoralizing, uncivilized and anti-christian institutions. If Congress has no right to refuse admission to a territory which harbors slavery, it certainly, by the same process of reasoning, has no right to close the door of the Union against a territory which tolerates polygamy. The ground is distinctly assumed in the American platform, which declares that the citizens of the territories have the right to regulate their domestic *and social* affairs in their own mode, subject only to the provisions of the federal Constitution, with the privilege of admission into the Union whenever they have the requisite population for one ,representative in Congress."

The *Journal* very rightly adds, that "the monstrous iniquity of polygamy, is even more disgraceful to the nation than the toleration of domestic slavery."

"Another point in the Republican creed which is peculiar to that platform is its assertion of the Whig doctrine of the constitutionality and expediency of appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors. Against this power the Democratic party is expressly committed by its platform and past action ; and upon this subject, which has attracted a large share of attention of late years, the American platform is silent."

There is one point, however, in which all parties or "platforms" agree, and that is the preservation of the Union. Each sees a different way of accomplishing this patriotic object, and each party urges its views with a strength and uncompromising vigor, which seems to those who are looking on, to be more like a disruption than a preservation of Unity.

Without any violent prejudices against the South on account of the "peculiar institution," our sympathies are with the party which determines to prevent the extension of slavery, which we look upon as an institution cursed in itself and calculated to weaken the love of liberty in the white population.—*New Brunswick Courier*.

———o———

Occupation is the safest thing for man. Those who work hard are less open to temptation, and likely to be overcome by trouble than others.

A wretched creature has been arrested for declaring that the kiss of a printer's devil would be very likely to prove a night-mare ; that is, an Inky-bus.—Did you ever !

A young lady was accosted by a clergyman in a lane when going to the church, who asked her, why she did not go across the fields : which she replied, "They are too stile-ish for me."

Why is marriage like truth? Because tis a certain-tie.

HASZARD'S GAZETTE.

Saturday, August 9, 1856.

The making, of laws and their interpretation when made, are by some people supposed to be among the things easiest of acquisition. Experienced Judges and well-trained lawyers find great difficulty sometimes in ascertaining the precise meaning of the words of an Act of Parliament; not so the Editor of a Newspaper, or a Justice of the Peace : they,however little their previous studies may have qualified them for the task, pronounce at once and without doubt or hesitation, that such and so is the clear and obvious intention of the legislator. It most commonly happens, that those who pronounce judgment so off-handedly and so positively, are found on more deliberate views of the case by skilful and cautious minds, to be greatly in the wrong. It does seem strange, that a sentence carefully drawn up and intended to express the precise intentions of those framing the law, should prescribe to the mind of one man who reads it one line of action as necessary to be followed, and to that of another a materially different one ; yet, such is the case in the ninth clause of the "Act to incorporate the Town of Charlottetown." We may premise that in the engrossing of an Act of Parliament, no stop or punctuation of any kind is allowed ; every one, therefore, divides the sentence according to his own idea of the grammatical construction proper to be followed. The clause is as follows :

IX. The Mayor and Councillors of the said City of Charlottetown, at the periods hereinafter appointed, shall be chosen by the majority of votes of such persons only as shall be qualified in the terms of this Act, as hereinbefore prescribed. Provided always, that when and so soon as any rate or rates, assessment or assessments, shall be made by and under the authority of this Act, no inhabitant of the said City shall be entitled to vote at the election of Mayor or Councillors as aforesaid, unless he shall have been rated to, and in respect of, the rates or assessments laid as aforesaid ; and shall have paid all his rates and assessments which fall due one month before the time of such election, of which payment the evidence shall be the receipt of the City Treasurer, produced at the time of voting, and then lodged with the Returning Officer at any such election.

The first period of the clause is sufficiently plain, and refers to the preceding fifth clause, the provisions of which we will pass by for the present. We then come to the proviso, which is also, we confess, sufficiently precise as to one point, viz., that the voter must have *paid all his rates and assessments* previously to the time of of the election, but when? at any time previously, or *one month* previously to such election? Now, part of the proviso may be read in two different ways, as will be seen by the different adaptations of the punctuation :—"And shall "have paid all his rates and assessments which "fall due, one month before the time of such "election." If read with the comma after the word "due," the sense is, that the rates must be paid one month before the time of the election. "And shall have paid all his rates and "assessments, which fall due one month before "the time of such election," placing the comma after "assessments," the sentence is made to import, that if the rates, &c., which *are due* one month before the election are paid, it will be sufficient, no matter what the date of the receipt might be. Nor are these lawyers' quibbles. The Recorder gave his opinion of the law according to the first of these readings, and no objection was taken to it,although made public until the evening before the election. It had appeared to him, that the intention of the law was to enforce the payment of the rates and assessments at a certain day, so that there should be no hurry or running to the Treasurer when the day of the election approached, which would be productive at any rate of inconvenience, and perhaps fraud. It in fact, struck him to be the obvious reason of the law, and he sought no further. When, however, it was stated, that the words were susceptible of another interpretation, he conceived it his duty, late as it was, to give it due consideration, and the result was, the abandonment of his former opinion, not because it was erroneous in principle, but for the reason, that as the proviso was restrictive of the right of the citizen as respected his elective franchise, the words of restraint should have a strict interpretation, and where in practice, one mode of construction might deprive a number of citizens of the power of exerting their privilege of voting, and the other allow them the exercise of it, he conceived it to be his duty, and the safest plan, to adopt, that which would best promote that freedom of election which is the constitutional right of the subject and citizen. But the difficulties in the construction of this particular clause do not end here. It alludes, as may be seen, to certain qualifications of voters which are described in sec. 5 :

"All the male inhabitants of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, who shall have resided in the said City for at least one year then next preceding, and being British subjects, and each of whom shall actually and within the Ward for which he shall vote, then be, and for Two months previously shall have been, actually and in his own right the bona fide owner of the freehold of one whole Town Lot, Common Lot, Water Lot ; or the bona fide owner of a piece of ground of the yearly value of five pounds ; or the bona fide owner of the freehold of a Dwelling House, part of a Dwelling House, Store, Warehouse, Office; or Shop, of the yearly value of five pounds ; or who shall be in the tenancy, or occupancy of a Town Lot, Common Lot, Water Lot, or piece of ground, Dwelling House, part of a Dwelling House, Shop, or Warehouse of the annual rent of five pounds, payable quarterly, half yearly, or yearly, and no other person shall be entitled to vote at said Elections for such Mayor and Councilmen in the said Wards respectively.

Sec. 14 is as follows :—

"Persons entitled to vote at the election of a Mayor or Councillors as aforesaid, shall and may vote in any and every Ward in which they may be respectively qualified."

The Recorder stated to the Council, that a difficulty might arise at the polling as to "the production of the receipt," that it might and would happen, that a person duly qualified in every Ward of the City, might wish to exercise his franchise in every Ward, but that, after having deposited his receipt for the payment of the taxes at the place where he was first polled, it would be impossible for him to exercise the right given to him by law, if every other Returning officer had the power of refusing his vote upon non-presentation of the receipt already lodged, and suggested, that the Returning Officer with whom the receipt was first lodged, should give a short receipt to that effect. This was vehemently opposed by Councillors Davies, Barnard and McIsaac, on the ground that the Actintended that none but those who paid property rates and assessments in the different Wards, were entitled to vote in these Wards, for instance—

A, residing in ward 1 and of course paying his assessment there, owns a freehold estate in wards 2 and 3 tenanted by voters who pay rates and assessment by virtue of their occupations there for which they obtain receipts also. A has voted in ward 1 and wishes to vote in ward 2. On coming to the hustings he states his name and qualification as the *bona fide* owner of the freehold of a dwelling house, which he is willing to swear to ; he is then asked whether he has paid his rates and assessments due one month previous to the election? which question he answers in the affirmative, and that he has in compliance with the law lodged the receipt with the returning officer in ward 1, now comes the question,thas A a right to vote in ward 2? The Recorder says he has, and gives the following among other reasons for his decision ; when a statute gives a right or privilege in express terms such as is given by the 14th section above quoted, it gives every facility for the exercise of such right, nor can it be curbed or restrained except by terms to the full, as express as those by which it is given. The 14th section says "that persons entitled to vote" ; now one of the titles to vote is "being the *bona fide* owner of the freehold of a dwelling house"; so of that there can be no dispute. Before however he can be admitted to vote, he must be rated and assessed, and must have paid all *his* rates and assessments.

It was the Recorder's opinion that the words of the clause have a decided relation to the *person* of the voter and not to the property which is the subject matter of his qualification "Unless *he* shall have been rated, and shall have paid *his* rates" are the words of the statute, the personal pronoun alone being used without any qualification. Had the framers of the statute intended, that the receipt should be for the payment of the rates imposed upon the freehold, it would have so stated it, either in the 9th or the 14th section.

It was in the power of the City Council to have rated and assessed the owners as well as the occupants, and in such case the owner would have had a receipt to produce but it has not done so, and therefore as it was impossible for the owner to produce a receipt for the payment of a tax which was never imposed, it would be the extreme of injustice to deprive him of the right of voting given him by the 14th section of the act. It was also in the power of the City Council to have levied the assessments on personal estate only ; then every man would have had but one receipt, and ownership or occupancy of land or houses would have been of none avail to enable the owner or occupant to a receipt, and in such case would the owner of the freehold be deposed of his franchise because real property was not taxed?

The true meaning of the Act, said the Recorder was that none but those who had paid their rates should vote, and the evidence of that payment should be the production of the receipt, and that, once produced and left with the returning officer satisfied the exigency of the act which is, that the proper documentary evidence of the payment of rates &c., should be left in a place from whence in the event of a scrutiny or a question it might be produced. The law compels no man to perform an impossibility and he could no more produce and lodge the same receipt at five different polling places than he could have appeared and voted at the same places at the same instant. The Recorder therefore, in the instructions to the returning officers, directed them when such a case occurred, to take the vote, and mark it on the poll