WM. E. ROBINSON'S SPEECH

ON NEW-HAMPSHIRE DEMOCRACY AND CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.

Mr. ROBINSON said he had just returned from Concord, New-Hampshire, where he had examined the fountains of Democracy. He referred to the speech made by George M. Dallas, in the Museum at Philadelphia, June 7, '52, in which that gentleman said:

"The aspersion against Pierce of having favored the Catholic test, still retained in the Constitution of New-Hampshire is a weak invention of a frightened enemy. He said it was true such a provision, excluding Catholics from occupying a seat in the Legislature or becoming Governor, was engrafted on the Constitution of that State, but it was also true that Levi Woodbury and Franklin Pierce had obtained the passage of laws providing for the holding of two State Conventions to amend that Constitution. In both cases an amended Constitution was submitted to the vote of the People, but a two-third vote being requisite, it was defeated by a combination of Whigs and Abolitionists."

Mr. Robinson also quoted from the speech of Charles O'Conor, of this City, made in Tammany Hall, on the evening of June 9, and published in *The Truth-Teller* of July 3, in which he said that Franklin Pierce comes recommended

"*By all his antecedents* and all his connections. He is the son of Benjamin Pierce. * * * He (Franklin Pierce) and his political associates *brought forward* an amendment abolishing this (the Anti-Catholic) unjust—this odious distinction. * * * By means of his zealous advocacy, this benign reform was adopted by the Convention. He also advocated it at the polls. * * * When religious liberty needed a champion, he was found in Franklin Pierce."

Mr. R. also referred to the assertion of Mr. O'Conor, that his latest information was from Franklin Pierce, who expressed a strong hope that Catholic emancipation had been or would be carried in New-Hampshire, and said that these assertions of Messrs. Dallas and O'Conor were now received throughout the country, and unfortunately some Whig papers, deceived by the respectability of the authority, had joined in receiving them as acknowledged public opinion, though there was not one word of truth in either assertion.

EIGHT PROPOSITIONS.

On the contrary, Mr. Robinson laid down the following propositions, and so earnest was he in challenging an investigation, that he announced that he would deposit, in the hands of Simeon Draper, *one hundred* dollars to be forfeited and given up to any one that would prove that in any one of these propositions he misstated the facts. The decision to be left to Robert Emmet.

1. Franklin Pierce did not speak at all in favor of Catholic Emancipation during the whole time the Catholic test was before the Convention.

2. He had nothing to do with "bringing forward" the subject. The resolution abolishing the test was drawn up by Mr. Parker, of Nashua, *a Whig*, and was "brought forward" by Mr. Parker Nov. 13, when it was discussed in Convention.

3. It was known throughout New-Hampshire that Catholic Emancipation was *finally* defeated by an overwhelming vote some eight or ten weeks before Mr. O'Conor spoke in Tammany Hall.

4. When Religious Liberty needed a champion Gen. Pierce was found—wanting. Though *after* Catholic Emancipation had been carried in Convention he found time, while making a speech on the Property Qualification, to excuse and apologise for the test bigotry by saying it was a dead letter and a blank, which was simply stating that Catholics would perjure themselves to get into office, by swearing to support a Constitution which expressly shut them out.

5. That so far from all his "antecedents" being right, his father, Benjamin Pierce, voted to put the anti-Catholic clause into the Constitution, and voted for the Alien and Sedition Laws of old John Adams!

6. That so far from Catholic Emancipation falling only for want of a two-thirds vote, it had not one-sixth of the votes cast throughout the State at the same election for Governor, and did not come near a simple majority of the small vote cast on this question.

7. That in place of there being any high confidence in New-Hampshire of Catholic Emancipation being carried, the general opinion is, that unless we draw a line around New-Hampshire, saying, that while the plague-spot is on her, and the ship is unpurified, no man, capt'n nor crew, shall land, and thus, by the defeat of General Pierce, bring his bigotted party to their senses, the Catholics in that State stand no chance of being Emancipated for half a century.

8. And in a word, in fine, that the father, Benjamin Pierce, was a red hot enemy of the Catholics, and a supporter of the Alien and Sedition acts, and that Franklin Pierce, the young chicken, so learned to follow the old one that he raised not a voice in favor of abolishing his father's bigotry, during the whole time the subject was under discussion in a Convention of which he was a leading member and President.

Mr. Robinson referred to the fact that in the Loco-Foco Baltimore Convention there were some thirteen candidates found with marks of popular favor upon them.

TWO-THIRDS DEMOCRACY.

A dog in hydrophobia could not have manifested more rage at the sight of water than these aristocratic Baltimore Delegates exhibited toward everything on which was the mark of popular favor. Nor did the "phobia" get off till every vestige of popular favor was removed from their sight, and buried beneath the aristocratic device of a two-thirds rule. And then a shout went up, not that anybody had won, but that everybody had been defeated, and that everbody's favorite was dead.

THE OLD CANT.

Mr. Robinson disclaimed any wish to use epithets, but he knew that the whole political capital of the Pierce party was bogus; and without intending to apply the epithet to any one, when he found a falsehood or a forgery he would call it so. If he did not expose falsehood and forgery, he would be false to his native and adopted countries, and false to the cause of true republicanism. He had labored through 12 years of his life in this country, with all the strength which God had given him, to tread down all sorts of bigotry, political and religious, and he would continue in the same path in despite of all the abuse and misrepresentation which he had already met and would yet have to encounter from some unprincipled presses to which he referred, but which he said he scorned—as conscious rectitude can well afford to scorn—the rusted shafts of calumny falling from impenetrable shield.

He referred to the forgery and falsehood with which naturalized citizens were appealed to against Harrison and Taylor, which history has proved to be false, as history will yet prove the charges against Gen. Scott false. He pictured the blood-hound venom with which these same pack of slanderers hunted Henry Clay into a grave which even their superhuman malignity could not rob of its transcendent glory, and around which these same blood-hounds, now changed into crocodiles, pretend to shed oceans of tears at the death of one who, while living, they tried to make naturalized citizens believe was worthy of a dog's burial in place of posthumus honors. To what lengths must our patience be abused as naturalized citizens? How long shall we be insulted by being put to draw the water with which to drown, or hew the wood with which to consume the altars reared in American hearts to a Clay and a Scott, to raise in their stead altars to the *idols* of a Polk and a Pierce? How long will it be expected that we shall palsy or break the arm that humbled the pride of England, to raise and sustain the arm which refused to move a muscle to remove the disgrace which the elder Pierce had fastened on the necks of all but one sect in New-Hampshire?

One great falsehood of this Campaign is saving that Franklin Pierce advocated Catholic Emancipation when it was before the late New-Hampshire Convention. The great forgery of the Campaign is the pretended letter of Gen. Scott to George W. Reed, on Nativism.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.

And here Mr. R gave a sketch of the Constitutional History of New-Hampshire. He said:

The first Constitution was formed in Exeter in 1776, and was called the "Temporary Constitution." I read it in manuscript, and found in it no anti-Catholic test, so that we had no bigotry *till after the Revolution*. This Temporary Constitution continued for eight years and six months.

In 1778, a Convention was called to meet at Concord, and submitted the form of a Constitution to the people in 1779, and that was rejected. Another was formed and submitted in 1781, and that also was rejected. Another was formed in 1782, and that too was rejected. A fourth form was agreed upon, and this was accepted by a two-thirds vote. It was known as the "New Constitution."

This continued in force till 1792, when another Constitution was adopted, which still continues in force, and is the one to amend which the attempt was made in 1850-52, and this is called "The Revised Constitution."

CONSTITUTION OF 1792.

And this brings us to the opening of the Pierce dynasty in New-Hampshire. We shall find, henceforth, the name of Pierce and bigotry concomitant.

The Convention to revise the New Constitution met at Concord, September 7, 1791. Among its members, I find several of the old Revolutionary names, and prominent among them Maj. Benjamin Pierce, (as he is put down) of Hillsborough, the father of Franklin Pierce. I find also, Jeremiah Smith, of Peterborough, Aaron Greeley, of Hopkinton, Major Caleb Stark, of Dunbarton and Bow, &c. Samuel Livermore, of Holderness, was chosen President, and John Calfe, of Hampstead, Secretary.

On the second day of the session, a motion was made to strike out the sixth article (as it now stands) in the Bill of Rights, providing for "the support and maintenance of the public Protestant teachers." The yeas were 14, (Greeley, Stark, Whipple, Hutchins, &c., among the yeas.) The Nays were 88, and BENJAMIN PIERCE, Franklin's father, and Charles O'Conor's respected and confided-in "antecedent," voted against Religious Liberty.

September 10, the fourth day of the Convention, a motion was made to strike out from section 14, under form of government (as it now stands) prescribing qualifications for members of the House of Representatives, the words "*shall be of the Protestant Religion.*" Upon this the Yeas and Nays were taken: Yeas for Religious Liberty 33, and among them Jeremiah Smith, Aaron Greeley, William Plumer, Caleb Stark, &c. Nays, for the Penal Laws and Anti-Popery, 51, and among them BENJAMIN PIERCE, Franklin's father, and Charles O'Conor's favorite antecedent. A form of a Constitution was finally agreed upon, and was ordered to be submitted to the people on the first Monday in May, 1792, and the Convention adjourned till the 30th of the same month.

On the first day of June, 1792, the votes of the people were counted, and it was found that some parts of the constitution were accepted, and some parts rejected, for want of a two-thirds vote, (that Loco-Foco two-third rule is an awful thing!) and it further appeared that some of the propositions rejected were necessary to make sense of those accepted, so that a committee, appointed to bring order out of that confusion, reported that the parts accepted and approved by the people "were inconsistent with the constitution and with each other," yet, as the people had accepted them, nobody could dare despise them.

The report of the Convention which I examined is a volume, partly in manuscript and partly in print, which is preserved with great care in the Secretary of State's office; but it does not give the precise form in which the clauses rejected were submitted to the people. It seems, however, that notwithstanding Pierce's anti-Popery penal votes, the term Protestant was omitted in the qualifications for some offices for which, it is probable, they were rejected. Be this as it may, a committee was appointed to recommend what new amendments should be adopted to please the people. That committee reported pretty much the same old dish, rehashed and additionally peppered with Protestantism and property, to suit the taste of the Pierce epicures, and was submitted again to the people on the 27th of August, 1792.

SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE.

The Convention met finally at Concord, September 5, 1792, when the votes were counted, and it was found that the whole number of votes cast was 3,100, of which 2,122 were for, and 978 against the Constitution. It was thus carried by about 55 votes more than the necessary two-thirds vote, so that if there had been only 28 additional votes against this bigoted and disgraceful Constitution, it would have been defeated.

It is remarkable that on the vote on this Constitution, excluding Catholics from office, some of the towns that are now Whig voted very decidedly against it. Thus the Whig town of Exeter gave 59 votes against it and *not one* for it. The Whig town of Dover gave 43 votes against it and only 24 for it. While the Loco Foco town of Glimanton gave 41 votes for it and *not one* against it. The Loco Foco town of New-Durham gave 14 votes for it and *not one* against it. The Loco Foco town of Hillsborough—Benjamin Pierce's adopted town, and of which he was the Representative, and Franklin Pierce's native town, and which he afterward represented in the Legislature—gave 16 for it and not one against it. Had it been necessary for some Dallas to make an excuse for the adoption of that Constitution, he would have said that it was owing to some mysterious combination of cyphers like the above that prevented the two third units from defeating themselves.

There's the record, as I found it in a carefully preserved book in the office of the Secretary of State at Concord, in New-Hampshire, and there's the commendable "antecedent" of Franklin Pierce.

WHAT IS THIS CONSTITUTION?

And thus was formed the Constitution which is now in full force in one of the States of our American Union, which claims that the American people must, by a two-thirds rule, kill off Cass, Buchanan and Douglas to make room for the son of the father who framed that bigoted instrument, and for the leader of the party which refuses to exert itself for its modification.

There are two or three points in this Constitution to which I wish to draw public attention. I copy from the official copy printed in 1852 by the State printers:

BILL OF RIGHTS.—Section 6 authorizes the towns, &c. to make provision "for the support and maintenance of public *Protestant* teachers of piety, religion and morality."

FORM OF GOVERNMENT.—Section 14. "Every member of the House of Representatives * * * shall be of the Protestant religion, and shall cease to represent such town, parish or place immediately on ceasing to be qualified as aforesaid."

Section 29. "Provided, nevertheless, that no person shall be capable of being elected a Senator who is not of the Protestant religion."

Section 42. "The Governor * * * shall be of the Protestant religion."

Section 61. "And the qualification for Counsellors shall be the same as for Senator."

SEC. 99. It shall be the duty of the Selectmen and Assessors of the several towns and places in this State, in warning the first annual meetings for the choice of Senators, after the expiration of seven years from the adoption of this Constitution, as amended, to insert expressly in the warrant this purpose, among the others, for the meeting, to wit: to take the sense of the qualified voters on the subject of a revision of the Constitution: and the meeting being warned accordingly, and not otherwise, the moderator shall take the sense of the qualified voters present as to the necessity of a revision; and a return of the number of votes for and against such necessity shall be made by the Clerk, sealed up and directed to the General Court at their then next session; and if it shall appear to the General Court by such return, that the sense of the people of the State has been taken, and that in the opinion of the majority of the qualified voters in the State, present and voting at said meetings, there is a necessity for a revision of the Constitution, it shall be the duty of the General Court to call a Convention for that purpose; otherwise the General Court shall direct the sense of the people to be taken and then proceed in the manner before-mentioned. The delegates to be chosen in the same manner, and proportioned as the Representatives to the General Court; provided, that no alterations shall be made in this Constitution before the same shall be laid before the towns and unincorporated places, and approved by two-thirds of the qualified voters present and voting on the subject.

SEC. 100. And the same method of taking the sense of the people as to a revision of the Constitution, and calling a Convention for that purpose, shall be observed afterwards, at the expiration of every seven years.

HONEST OPINIONS ON IT.

Now, then, here is the Constitution of the State of New-Hampshire, fostering in its bigotry in religion and aristocracy in property, under the blaze of the noon of the 19th century, and unchanged, and without attempt to change it, from 1792 to 1850; and yet for over half a century—during which time Benj. Pierce was member of the Legislature, Counsellor and Governor, and Franklin Pierce, for a period of over twenty years, was the leading man of the party in power, member of the Legislature, (the same year his father was Governor,) and Speaker of the House of Representatives the two succeeding years—for over a dreary half century of penal laws, no member of the Pierce family made one single speech urging the justice of Catholic emancipation. Nay, more, it will be seen that a bare majority of the people could have ordered the Constitution amended every seventh year by a simple majority, and *were bound* to vote every seventh year whether the Constitution should be amended. Four times did these seven year trials occur since Franklin Pierce was elected a member and Speaker of the House of Representatives, yet dumb as an oyster and dark as a dungeon did he keep himself. Thus did he champion the cause of Religious Liberty. Well may every Catholic say to Mr. Pierce in the language of Israel's inspired Proverbist—"Because I have called and ye refused * * * I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh."

Let us see what this New-Hampshire enormity is. It is an enormity in the eyes of all men, not only Catholics, but liberal Republicans of all sects. It is the penal and test idea of the House of Brunswick and Guelph. It is the enormity which the British Tory Administration of Peel and Wellington abolished for Irish Catholics in 1829, when Franklin Pierce first took his seat in the New-Hampshire Legislature. New-Hampshire Loco-Focoism remains to-day more bigoted and besotted than British Toryism was 23 years ago, and Lord Roden, Tresham Gregg or Lord John Russell has stronger claims than Franklin Pierce has to true Republican votes, for their parties (Tories though they be) opened the door of the British Parliament to Catholics, while New-Hampshire refuses to open her Legislature. If Thomas Francis Meagher should get naturalized there, if Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, the last living signer of our Declaration of Independence had chosen to reside there, or if our present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Hon. Roger B. Taney, should choose to live there, one and all would be excluded from the right to a seat in the New-Hampshire two-penny Legislature, unless they perjured themselves, or foreswore their creed—and this is the kind of Democracy which every man endorses who votes for Franklin Pierce, the leader of that Democracy in New-Hampshire whom the Loco-Foco Press informs us it was intended to compliment by his nomination. Well might Judge Woodbury say, as he did in the New-Hampshire Constitutional Convention, that this New-Hampshire enormity branded the Catholic, "though educated, and talented, and virtuous, with infamy and disgrace, and sent him and his family through our streets and social circles, marked like Cain, as a sort of degraded outcast or helot, not fit to be intrusted with either legislative or executive rights, though bestowed fully on the most ignorant and reprobate."

PIERCE'S OPINION OF IT.

Such was the opinion of Judge Woodbury, such is the opinion of every honest republican of every sect. Now what has been Franklin Pierce's denunciation of the enormity? Did he concur with Judge Woodbury in denouncing it as a disgrace?

Truly, no. We are told that old Benjamin Pierce got Franklin Pierce to write his messages, as he could not even spell the word "but." This is quite likely. Well, Franklin Pierce was a member of the Legislature in 1829. In June, 1829 Benjamin Pierce, being Governor of the State, sent in his annual message to the House of Representatives, of which this Franklin Pierce was a leading member. Well, this Franklin Pierce, in that annual message of his father, said, just after swearing to a constitution which excludes Catholics from the four principal offices of the State:

"To look abroad and behold every citizen, without *distinction of sect or rank, exercising the full and equal rights of civil and religious liberty* (!) are alone sufficient to excite emotions of gratitude too strong ever to be obliterated."

Here Franklin Pierce put it into the mouth of his father, the Governor, to insult deliberately every lover of truth, equal rights and Republican liberality, by saying that his emotions of gratitude were too strong ever to be obliterated in glorying in that bogus system of equal rights which marked the most numerous Christian sect in Christendom with the disgrace of the helot and the mark of Cain. Why should the people of New-Hampshire change their Constitution when the leader of the Democracy of that State then, and the leader of the Democracy of the United States now, saw the Catholics branded as outcasts and helots, and excluded from offices open to the negroes, with feelings of gratitude "too strong ever to be obliterated."

There is Franklin Pierce's idea of championing Religious Liberty—that a State where a Catholic cannot hold an office, even should the whole people of the State vote for him, is such a political Paradise that admiration burns it so deeply into his affections that time cannot obliterate the record.

This Constitution has been in existence sixty years. Eight times since, has it been submitted to the People, whether it should be reformed, and never has the dominant party in the State made it a test of principle. Never has Franklin Pierce called a meeting to denounce the bigotry. The mote in the eye of the Rhode Island Constitution they viewed through a magnifying glass, in the Dorr Rebellion. They reversed the instrument when examining the beam in their own

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION OF 1850-52.

I now beg your attention to the history of the effort made for Catholic Emancipation in New-Hampshire in 1850-52. In the March election of 1850, the question was submitted to the people of the State, whether a Convention to reform the Constitution should be called. It was carried by a majority of the votes cast, but if it had depended on Pierce's party, it would have failed. Two or three Whig towns, compared with a few Loco-Foco towns, will suffice to show this. I give the votes for and against calling the Convention, and the vote for the Whig and Loco-Foco candidates, at the general election the same year, (1850:)

WHIG TOWNS.	ON CONVENTION.		ON GOVERNOR.	
Towns.	Yeas.	Nays.	Whig.	Loco.
Dover	447	98	619	504
Somersworth	201	59	361	186
Keene	281	64	319	199
LOCO-FOCO TOWNS.				
Northwood	64	132	30	157
Nottingham	54	132	17	134
Albany	7	84	16	57
Brookfield	16	80	9	58
Strafford	3	183	147	271
Warner	67	168	26	320
Ellsworth	7	60	6	49

COMPARISON OF VOTES.

Here Whig Dover gives nearly five to one for the Convention; Loco-Foco Albany twelve to one against it; Whig Somersworth gives nearly four to one for it; Loco-Foco Strafford sixty-one to one against it; Whig Keene gives over four to one for it; Loco-Foco Ellsworth eight to one against it! Yet *Hon.* Geo. M. Dallas says the Whigs and Free-Soilers combined to defeat the benevolent intentions of the Pierce party!

In the Whig town of Keene it will be seen there were but 199 votes for the Pierce Governor, but there were 281 votes for Constitutional reform; while in the town of Ellsworth, where there were only six Whig votes, all told, there were sixty votes against Constitutional Reform—that is, ten times as many votes against it as there are Whig votes in the whole town. But what use in summoning up a storm of argument or a wave of testimony to waft a feather or to drown a—*lie?* In the town of Ellsworth the figures indicate that the whole Whig vote with one Free Soiler, went for Constitutional Reform, and the entire Loco-Foco vote with the remainder of the Free-Soilers, went for keeping the mark of Cain upon the Catholics.

CONVENTION MEETS.

But notwithstanding Locofoco opposition, the Convention was called, and met in Concord, on the 6th day of November, 1850. Franklin Pierce was elected from Concord, and was chosen President of the Convention. In his speech on taking the Chair, in place of speaking a kind word in favor of Catholic Emancipation, he passed a glowing eulogy on the wisdom, enlightenment, purity, and patriotism, of those who, in 1792, fastened the stigma on the Catholics. Thus, when religious liberty needed a champion, Franklin Pierce, from the Chair of a Convention called to reform the abuse, had not one word to say against the iniquity but honeyed phrases for those who made it. (*See Concord Patriot, Nov. 7.*)

The *Patriot*, Pierce's organ, then and now, (and hereafter, should he be elected,) had a leading editorial on the Convention the day it met, but not one word in favor of Catholic Emancipation. On the contrary, it warned the Convention to "be careful to do no more than the people require." The people showed that they did not require Catholic Emancipation, as not one-sixth of the voters afterward voted for it.

November 11, 1850, Judge Woodbury made a motion to strike out the word "Protestant" from the Bill of Rights. On the same day, Franklin Pierce made a speech in favor of retaining the word *subject*, instead of *citizen* or *inhabitant*, in the Constitution, but this "zealous champion" had not a word to say in favor of Judge Woodbury's motion.

ANTI-CATHOLIC TEST.

Mr. Bell, of Gilford, moved to strike out the whole of the sixth clause, except the proviso, which reads as follows:

"As morality and piety, rightly grounded on evangelical principles, will give the best and greatest security to Government, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to due subjection; and as the knowledge of these is most likely to be propagated through a society by the institution of the public worship of the Deity, and of public instruction in morality and religion, therefore, to promote these important purposes, the people of this State have a right to empower and do hereby fully empower the Legislature to authorize from time to time the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies within this State, to make adequate provision, at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality."

Franklin Pierce, of Concord, warmly opposed this, in a speech of which the following is a brief report, given officially in *The Concord Patriot* of November 12:

"Mr. Pierce, of Concord, said he would be sorry to have the question taken upon the motion of the gentleman from Gilford, (Mr. Bell,) to strike out all the sixth article but the last clause of the proviso. He was sure the mover would, upon reflection, desire to retain the first part of that article, on every ground, and especially as the deliberate expression of opinion of wise and patriotic men of a past generation, (his father, &c.,) upon the question as to what "will give the best and greatest security to Government." He believed that what was so forcibly expressed in the Constitution of '92 *would be solemnly reaffirmed as the deliberative, unanimous judgment of this Convention.*"

Now, here is the only speech he made on the test, and if *that* is not indorsing the Anti-Catholic clauses, framed by his father, I do not know what language means.

Nov. 12, *The Patriot* again had an article, warning the Convention not to make any amendments but such as are clearly indicated by the people.

PIERCE AGAINST REFORM.

In Convention, Nov. 12, the Committee on Religious and Property Tests, reported in favor of their repeal. The sixth article, as above, was taken up. Franklin Pierce said: "*It was his earnest desire to retain not only ALL the principles, but, as far as practicable, the language of this section.*" He spoke in favor of retaining the word "Evangelical," which is generally applied to the church which he attends in Concord. He spoke several times during the day, but not one single argument did he produce or hint at in favor of Catholic emancipation.

The same day, Franklin Pierce spoke upon the Judiciary. Indeed he seemed anxious to "spread himself" upon almost every subject but upon his father's Anti-Catholic policy.

THE DECISIVE DISCUSSION.

The great and decisive discussion on the Anti-Catholic Test came off on Nov. 13. I might remark here, that the fulsome nonsense going the rounds of the Loco-Foco papers that Mr. Pierce descended from the President's chair, &c., is nothing but nonsense and nonsense of a very ridiculous stripe. The discussion took place in Committee of the Whole, and the President was not in the chair at all! The Chair on this day (Nov. 13) was occupied by Mr. Sawyer, of Nashua. The first resolution was to strike out all religious tests, and Judge Woodbury made a long speech upon it. He contended that, in the Bill of Rights, all were made equal, and yet all but Protestants are made unequal: "You hold out the husk, but withhold the kernel; you allow fire-arms, but neither gunpowder nor lead to load them."

He contended that "all other than Protestant sects are virtually deprived of representation as they are made ineligible to the Legislature. Their opinions and wishes are unheard there from themselves. *They are branded, they are driven forth as with the mark of Cain, for servitude and ignominy.*" He continued, "indeed this test debars man from what we allow *to the degraded African*, as he is eligible here to hold office as well as to vote. While the present test continues," said he, "it is with an ill grace we can call other countries bigoted, who like England, have emancipated the Catholics."

Mr. Parker, of Nashua, followed, and contended that there was no opposition to striking out the test.

Mr. Robinson, of Salisbury, followed in favor of abolishing the test, and it passed in Committee of the Whole without opposition, *and without one single remark from Franklin Pierce in its favor.*

What then shall we say of the speech, now going the rounds of the papers, attributed to Franklin Pierce, which, we are told, he left the chair, (which he did not occupy,) to make? I am sorry that I am compelled to expose here one of the meanest tricks ever resorted to, to defraud and deceive the people.

A CUNNING DODGE.

As soon as it was known that Franklin Pierce was nominated at Baltimore, the liberal minded men of all sects, and particularly the naturalized citizens, declared that unless it could be proved that Franklin Pierce had advocated or favored the repeal of the Catholic disability, they would not vote for him. When Mr. Dallas spoke in Philadelphia, the very next week day evening after the nomination of Mr. Pierce, he could not have seen any public charge made against Mr. Pierce, for neglect of duty in this respect. But as the inspired Proverbist informs us, "The wicked flee when no man pursueth," he stated that Franklin Pierce had advocated the repeal of the Anti-Catholic test. On searching the records, no speech from Mr. Pierce could be found, but it was decided on, that something in the shape of a speech should be, *ex post facto*, put into his mouth. Some dodge must be resorted to, and the leaders seemed to say any dodge, however despicable, will be good enough for the Catholics, who won't know the difference. The telegraph soon informed us that *The Washington Union* would, the next morning, contain the speech of Franklin Pierce on this subject, which he condescended to make, and even descended from the chair to deliver.

Though the speech was first published in *The Washington Union* and copied into *The Ohio Statesman* of June 16, yet the dodge, I believe, was concocted in Concord, and, I cannot help thinking, by the assistance of Franklin Pierce himself. Accordingly *The Concord Patriot*, of June 17, 1852, contains the speech which was to gull and deceive every liberal-minded naturalized citizen, and so far the forgery has succeeded admirably. On referring to the official report of the proceedings in *The Concord Patriot*, I found that Franklin Pierce *had not spoken at all upon the subject*; but on looking further I found *that after the Religious test had been abolished without opposition*, and laid aside as completed, and the *Property test* coming up, Franklin Pierce made a speech in favor of striking out the property test, and in that speech the only reference he made to the religious test, was that it had been a "dead letter." And though it had been a "stigma" upon the State, he referred to other parts of the Constitution to *excuse* their fathers' bigotry. Indeed, he contended that the great question of religious toleration was settled; which, if it meant anything, meant that there was no necessity to bother the Convention about making any alterations on that subject.

When these remarks were made, the Religious test *was not* before the Convention. That subject had been *definitively* acted on. (See official report in *The Concord (N. H.) Patriot*, of Nov. 14, 1850, and compare it with June 17, 1852, to see the juggle and trick of a reckless set of partizans.)

PLAUSIBLE DECEPTION.

But to give plausibility to the forgery, for forgery it is, at the conclusion of Woodbury's speech on the Religious tests, six stars are printed. Now, when stars are introduced, it always means that a part of the speech is omitted of no importance. But in this case, those six stars, which are printed in Woodbury's speech, now going the rounds of the Loco-Foco papers, come in between the conclusion of Woodbury's speech on the Religious tests and the closing sentence of his speech on the property qualification. Those six stars are all we have for the speeches of Messrs. Parker and Robinson, *the decisive votes on the Religious tests*, the taking up of *another subject*, and Judge Woodbury's speech, of nearly a whole column, on that other subject; and thus, by the magic influence of those stars, joining the duodecimo speech of Pierce on property qualification to the folio speech of Woodbury on the Religious test. These tricksters hope to leave the impression on the public mind that *both* were made upon the *same* subject, and that it was *after* Pierce's "powerful" speech that the vote was carried! The enemy, however, was conquered, and had capitulated to the artillery of Woodbury, before Pierce discharged his pop-gun. And yet, by this shallow device, these forgers hope to blind the eyes of the citizens interested, and to cheat them out of their votes, in support of a candidate whose conduct they must despise. Since the time when an infernal home was opened for outcast villainy, has any rascality meaner and more stupid than this been perpetrated?

OTHER VOTES AND TRIALS.

The question which had been decided in Committee of the Whole afterward came before the Convention. Mr. Cass of Holderness, a Loco-Foco friend of Franklin Pierce, and, I believe, a relative of Lewis Cass, of Michigan, spoke against Catholic Emancipation. So, also, did Mr. Brewster, of Dutton, (a Loco-Foco,) and Mr. Wingate, of Stratham, (also a Loco-Foco.) Franklin Pierce descended not from his chair, but put the question, and it was carried, with only 7 Nays. The names are not given, but I believe the whole seven were political friends of Franklin Pierce.

Nov. 14. Franklin Pierce made two speeches on giving the election of Judges to the people. Like everything else from him, it was non-committal; but the effect of his remarks was in opposition to the election by the people.

Nov. 18. The question was taken whether the word "Protestant," should be stricken from the qualifications of Representatives. Carried—but not a word from Franklin Pierce.

Nov. 19. The question was taken on striking the word "Protestant" from the qualification for Senators. Carried, on a division, "several members voting in the negative." Franklin Pierce still silent on Catholic Emancipation, though he found time, the same day, without descending from the chair, to make four or five speeches on minor matters—one of them nearly a column long.

Dec. 4. The question was taken on striking the word "Protestant" from the qualifications for Governor. Mr. Cass spoke against it; several members voting in the negative. No word from Franklin Pierce. Judge Woodbury was absent, attending Court at Washington, and there was nobody to speak for the Catholics; but Mr. Pierce found time to make three speeches on the basis of representation during the evening session of that day.

Dec. 5. Mr. Franklin Pierce made another speech on representation.

ABJURATION OATH PROPOSED.

Dec. 9. Mr. Cass offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That an article be inserted in the Constitution as follows: "No one who is bound by the oath of allegiance to any monarchical or foreign power whatever, or who is bound by his religious faith to put down free toleration, shall at any time hold any office of trust or profit in the State."

Dec. 10. The President, Franklin Pierce, decided that Mr. Cass's resolution, as reported above, was in order. Now, here was a chance for Mr. Pierce to descend from the Chair.

Mr. Cass (Loco-Foco) asked: "Was it safe to elect a man Governor who was sworn to the Pope of Rome, and believed that all Protestants were heretics, and should be persecuted unto death? He would not have it left open so that persecutors could come in and take the helm of Government. He thought it right to put up the bars. Was it ever known that Catholics gained the power over any people, and got the Government into their own hands, that they did not persecute, even unto death, all that were opposed to them? And was it not their religion, though they might be bound by all the oaths that could be imposed on them, that they might be absolved by the Pope? And were they not striving for conquest everywhere, and to set up their religion of Church and State? * * * Were not nunneries and Catholic schools springing up all around us? And were they not teaching the children that we are all heretics? * * * And should Ireland be free from England to-day, would she sustain a Republic? No. Let Ireland be free from England, and the Pope would have the power. And would he sustain a Republic? Look to Mexico," &c.

Mr. Richardson, (Loco Foco,) of Hanover, followed Mr. Cass, and spoke against the resolution, but took occasion to have a fling at the Catholics. He said: "It was idle to suppose that a narrow-minded Jesuit should be elevated to office. * * * In this country, with its liberalizing influence, we had no reason to fear anything from Catholics."

Other speeches followed on the same question, and I submit to Mr. O'Conor whether this was not an occasion when religious liberty needed a champion?

PIERCE FAILS TO DEFEND.

Did Franklin Pierce jump from his chair to answer his two friends? Did he rule Cass's resolution out of order, as he might have done? No; he opened not his mouth against it, though one might suppose that Judge Woodbury being absent, the mantle of religious championship would fall upon him. He quietly put the question, and the resolution was indefinitely postponed. During that same day, however, he found time to make another speech on the everlasting question of Representation, occupying nearly a column in the official report.

The Concord Patriot of Dec. 13, speaking of this Representation amendment, calls it "*the most important amendment proposed.*" This declaration, by the official organ of Franklin Pierce and printer to the Convention, showed that the party attributed very little importance to the religious test. In fact, Pierce and his party adopted a system of Representation similar to the rotten borough system of Great Britain, for no other apparent reason than to defeat all amendments of the Constitution.

FOREIGNERS NOT PEOPLE.

Dec. 12, Gov. Steele, (Loco,) on this subject of the basis of Representation, moved that paupers and foreigners be not counted as part of the people.

Mr. Cass complained that "two towns, during the building of the Northern Railroad, had sent two extra representatives on the score of the Irishmen at work on this road." (Awful!)

Here now was a glorious chance for the champion of Catholics and Irishmen, but Mr. Franklin Pierce was dumb, and Gov. Steele's amendment was carried by 102 to 63.

Dec. 13. In the evening the religious test on representation was stricken out, but no remarks from Mr. Pierce.

PIERCE ON OTHER MATTERS.

Dec. 19. Franklin Pierce spoke two or three times on the Judiciary. In fact, Catholic Emancipation seemed to be the only subject on which his tongue was tied.

Dec. 24 Franklin Pierce spoke on the calling out of the militia.

Dec. 26. Franklin Pierce opposed the election of clerks of the Courts by the people, and had that clause stricken out. The same day he spoke several times on the election and jurisdiction of petty Judges. No subject was too petty for his tongue but Catholic Emancipation.

Dec. 27. Franklin Pierce opposed districting the State into twenty Senatorial Districts, on the ground that it would endanger his party's superiority, and it was defeated. The same evening he spoke four or five times on Petty Justices' Courts.

CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION.

The Convention finally adjourned on the 3d day of January, 1851, and during its whole session Franklin Pierce found time to speak on almost every subject, trivial, petty, State and National, and that, too, without descending from the Chair, *but never once* during the whole session of the Convention, while the religious test was before the Convention, did he say *one word* in favor of striking it out.

And yet every lying sheet and Loco-Foco mouth is full of fulsome praises on Franklin Pierce for doing what he never did! What dependence, then, can naturalized citizens place upon anything these people say?

SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE.

The question was submitted to the people at the regular election held in New-Hampshire on the second Tuesday of March, 1851. During the whole of that time, from January to March, no public meeting was called by Mr. Pierce or his friends to speak in favor of Catholic Emancipation. *They* did not, *he* did not give himself as much trouble to rescue the Catholics from their disabilities as a common humane person would take to extricate a fly from the meshes of a spider's web.

The amendments were submitted in the form of fifteen questions, and the repeal of the anti-Catholic test was No. 8. Let us look at a few of the towns to see the unblushing effrontery of Geo. M. Dallas and the whole Loco-Foco party. I take these returns from *The Concord Patriot*, of March 27, 1851, which says, in announcing the result: "Every proposition submitted has been *rejected by a very large majority.*" Geo. M. Dallas says it was rejected for want of a two-thirds vote!

THE VOTE.

I have given the vote in the same towns, the same year, for Dinsmore, the Pierce candidate, a man whom Franklin Pierce had put up against Atwood, the regular Loco-Foco candidate. It will be seen that in towns where Franklin Pierce rallied his party to vote by hundreds for his candidate, he did not think it worth while to secure a single baker's dozen for Catholic Emancipation. Here are a few towns.

On the eighth proposition, as voted for in March, 1851, with votes for Governor given at the same election, from *The New-Hampshire Patriot* of March 27, 1851:

	Dinsmore Catholic Loco Pierce Candidate.	Emancipation.		Dinsmoor Catholic Loco Pierce Candidate.	Emancipation.
Brentwood	76	11	Sandwich	113	6
Seabrook	85	12	Wakefield	176	1
Windham	46	7	Wolfborough	279	11
Durham	155	8	Loudon	130	12
Farmington	204	11	Alexandria	134	12
New-Durham	113	4	Ellsworth	59	1
Stafford	244	12	Hill	130	11
Chatham	82	7	Holderness	153	9
Effingham	129	1	Milan	64	6
Ossipee	194	12			

A QUESTION.

Ye men of too credulous a disposition, who may have too easily yielded credence to the supposition that a Loco-Foco *can* tell the truth, compare the above table with the assertions of Geo. M. Dallas and the Loco-Foco party, and what little word will involuntarily flutter on every tongue!

Here is the Loco-Foco town of New-Durham, which gave 113 votes for Pierce's pet for Governor, and only four votes for Catholic Emancipation. Yet George M. Dallas and party say that it failed only because the Whigs and Free Soilers combined against it! Here is the Loco-Foco town of Effingham, 129 votes for P