

LOUDON FREE PRESS.

LOUDON, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 20, 1852.

Rev. A. T. Foss.—It has become necessary for the Democratic party to heap all kinds of abuse upon this gentleman because he was the Reporter of the celebrated New Boston Speech, delivered by Gen. Pierce last January, when the General was not dreaming of the Presidency.—They have published him all over the country as a convicted horse-thief, who had served his time in the Penitentiary of N. H., and as guilty of perjury, and every other offense in the catalogue of crime. It turns out, however, that Mr. Foss is a Baptist Minister of good standing in his Church and the community in which he lives,—and that he never before was accused of stealing and of being a convicted felon. He never was in the Penitentiary. The following is the sworn testimony of his neighbors:

Mancheater, Aug. 14, 1852. Having been intimately acquainted with Rev. A. T. Foss, of this city, during the last seven years, on most cheerful state that he always has sustained an unblemished moral character, and is regarded in our community as a clergyman of ability, intelligence, and piety.

FREDERICK SMYTH, Mayor of Mancheater, N. H.

Goffstown, N. H., Aug. 9, 1852. This is to certify that Rev. Andrew T. Foss, is a member of the Baptist Church in Goffstown, N. H., in good and regular standing, and is a minister in regular standing in the Baptist denomination.

J. W. POLAND, Pastor. J. T. PLUMER, Ch. Clk.

We, Abraham Cochran, Solomon M. Curdy, and James M. Curdy, citizens of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that we were at a political meeting in this town on the second day of January, 1852, at which Gen. Pierce made a political speech; and we further say, that we saw a report of said speech immediately after in the Manchester Democrat, and we then thought the report a faithful statement of Gen. Pierce's remarks on the slavery question; and our attention having been recently called to this subject, we say that, according to our best recollection the report on the part relating to slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law is correct.

ABRAHAM COCHRAN, SOLOMON M. CURDY, JAMES M. CURDY.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, Hillsborough, ss.

On this 27th day of July, A. D. 1852, personally appeared the above named Abraham Cochran, Solomon M. Curdy, and James M. Curdy, and made solemn oath that the foregoing affidavit by them subscribed is true. Before me.

JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I, Daniel Andrews, of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I was present at a political meeting held in this town on the second day of January, 1852, which was addressed by Gen. Franklin Pierce; and I further say, that I saw the report of said speech made by A. T. Foss, and I then believed the report to be true and correct report of said speech, and I never heard any person say that they doubted the correctness of the report until it became necessary to contradict it to save Gen. Pierce's credit with his Southern friends.

D. ANDREWS.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I, Cyrus W. Campbell, of the town of Goffstown, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I was at a political meeting held at New Boston, in said county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, on the second day of January, 1852, at which Gen. Franklin Pierce made a political speech; and while I cannot recollect any precise words, I do recollect that he spoke of his dislike of the Fugitive Slave Law; and I recollect that, after returning, I said to a number of individuals, that he, Gen. Pierce, was as good an abolitionist as myself, if not a better one.

C. W. CAMPBELL.

Sworn, July 27, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I, Rodney McCollom, of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I was present at a political meeting held in this town on the second day of January, 1852, which was addressed by Gen. Franklin Pierce; and while I cannot now testify to the words used, I do recollect that he spoke of his dislike to the Fugitive Slave Law, and that I then thought, and made the remark to a number of persons, that he, Gen. Pierce, was as strong an anti-slavery man as any we had here.

RODNEY MCCOLLOM.

Sworn, July 27, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I, E. W. Griffin, of Pepperville, in the county of Middlesex, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, depose and say, that I was at New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, on the second day of January, 1852, at which Gen. Franklin Pierce, and that I heard A. T. Foss ask him several questions, and heard General Pierce's replies.

E. W. GRIFFIN.

Sworn, August 10, 1852, before ROBT. MOORE, J. P.

We, Robert Warren and William P. Warren, of the township of Goffstown, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that we were present at a political meeting held in New Boston, in said county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, on the 2nd day of January, 1852, which meeting was addressed by General Franklin Pierce, and we distinctly recollect that he said, in answer to questions proposed to him, that the Fugitive Slave Law was opposed to moral right and to humanity, and that his feelings revolted at the idea of giving up a fugitive slave.

ROBT. WARREN. W. P. WARREN.

Sworn, July 27, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I, Sandy Smith, of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, 1852, I attended a political meeting in this town, which was addressed by Gen. Franklin Pierce, and I distinctly recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law as morally wrong, and odious to his feelings, but which he thought should be submitted to for the present, to preserve our National Union.

SANDY SMITH.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I, David Kelson, of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, A. D. 1852, I attended a political meeting held at said New Boston, at which Gen. Franklin Pierce made a political speech, and I distinctly recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law as a great moral wrong, and as repulsive to his feelings, and he used the expression, I never saw a human being in bondage without feeling my heart revolt at it; but

he said we must submit to it as an evil for the sake of preserving the Union.

DAVID KELSO.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I, C. M. Fisher of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, 1852, I attended a political meeting held at New Boston, at which meeting General Franklin Pierce, made a political speech, and I distinctly recollect that he, Gen. Pierce, spoke of slavery as morally wrong, and as repulsive to his feelings. He said that he never saw a human being in slavery but he felt his heart revolt at it. He further said that we ought to submit to the compromise measures for the sake of quiet, and that our National Union might be preserved.

CHAS. M. FISHER.

Sworn, July 29, 1852, before GEO. A. FRENCH, J. P.

I, George W. Clark, of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, 1852, I attended a political meeting in this town, which was addressed by Gen. Franklin Pierce, and I recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law as a great moral wrong, and as odious to his feelings. He said that no man abhorred slavery more than himself, and that no man would do more than himself to abolish slavery if it could be done consistent with the constitution; that he thought we ought to adhere to the compromise for the sake of the National Union.

G. W. CLARK.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

GEN. PIERCE'S LETTER.

Desiring to meet our equal justice to both Whigs and Democrats, we publish the following letter from Gen. Pierce, in which he denies the correctness of the Report made of his New Boston speech by Mr. Foss. We feel no desire to attempt to advance the Whig cause by misrepresentation and concealment. If the Whig party cannot stand without such aid, we want it crushed to a thousand atoms!

If Gen. Pierce is elected President we shall have no fears of injustice being inflicted upon the South thereby. We feel the same way in regard to Gen. Scott. They both stand on the same great Platform on this subject, and that Platform is the one upon which Fillmore's Administration rests. There is a conservative influence surrounding the Presidential office no where else felt to the same extent. Governors may be bound in their feelings by the lines enclosing the territory which they govern—Congressmen by an isolated constituency. The President feels that the eyes of the whole country are upon him—and that his constituents live in Maine and in California—Texas and Michigan. He has been honored with the suffrage of all—he feels bound to protect the interests of all so far as he may be able.

From the Washington Republic.

A LETTER FROM GEN. PIERCE.

The accompanying correspondence will commend itself to public attention. It embraces a letter from Gen. Pierce, excoriating himself from the charges founded upon the published reports of his New Boston speech, and giving his own version of his position before the country on the slavery question.

WASHINGTON, July 17, 1852.

DEAR SIR: I enclose you will find an article in which one of the editors of the Southern Press, of this city, I too discuss with my colleague in advocacy of your claims to the Southern support for the Presidency. That action was predicted upon my belief of your entire soundness upon the slavery question. Within the last week two Democratic papers in your own State, which are said now to support you. On the truth or falsity of this much depends. Neither those with whom I act, nor myself, can consent that any doubt should rest on a matter of such importance; but placing full reliance on the fearless frankness of your character, on their belief that report which your Southern supporters believe to be without foundation, as opposed to your previous course, is correct? The peculiar position which I occupy must plead my apology for troubling you with this letter. Very respectfully, your obedient servant.

EDWIN DELLEON.

Gen. F. Pierce, Concord, N. H.

CONCORD, N. H., July 23, 1852.

MY DEAR SIR:—Surrounded by pressing engagements, I seize the earliest opportunity to reply to your letter of the 17th instant. I much regret that anything connected with myself should have been the cause of disagreement between you and gentlemen with whom you have been associated in the editorial department of the Southern Press. I do not remember ever to have seen what purports to be a report of a speech delivered by me at New Boston, in this State, in January last, until my attention was called to it as republished in the Republic. The pretense report is, and I presume was designed to be, an entire misrepresentation. It is not merely untrue, but is so grossly and absurdly false as to render, in this vicinity, any denial of its authenticity entirely unnecessary. The two papers quoted—the Independent Democrat, published in this place, and the Democrat, published in Mancheater—are thoroughly abolition journals; and have been, and are zealously opposed to the Democratic party. For a long time prior to the meeting at New Boston, and ever since they have been unsparring in their attacks upon me personally, and in their denunciation of what they have been pleased to term my pro-slavery sentiments. But it would be something new for either of these papers to deny the consistency of my opinions upon the subject of the constitutional rights of the South in relation to slavery. My opinions, and the avowal of them, have been everywhere the same. Ever mindful of the difficulties and dangers which have brooded over the assemblage of wiser men and pure patriots to whose spirit of concession and earnest efforts we are indebted for the constitution under which we have enjoyed such signal prosperity, advancement, and happiness, I have regarded the subject as too vital and delicate to be used as an element of sectional appeal in party conflicts. My action and my language in New Hampshire, touching this matter, have been at all times and under all circumstances in entire accordance with my action and language at Washington. My votes in the Senate and House of Representatives were not republished in the Era for the first time. They have been again and again paraded to arouse the passions and prejudices of our people against me individually, and against the party with which it has been my pride and pleasure to act. There has been no attempt to evade the force of the record. It has been at all times freely admitted, and my position sustained upon grounds satisfactory to my own mind. I am not surprised to know that the attempt to prove me an abolitionist provokes much merriment among men of all parties here; and this weak and untruthful sketch of what purports to be my speech is really too ridiculous to be considered in any serious light. I am in the daily receipt of letters, propounding the greatest variety of curious questions upon all conceivable subjects. Letters of this character cannot be answered, of course. No individual could command either the time or strength the Herculean task would require. I may add, that such a correspondence would by no means comport with my views of duty. The

democratic party sent its delegates to Baltimore not alone to nominate candidates, but to reaffirm principles and to present the leading issues upon which the canvass should be conducted.

DAVID KELSO.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before JOSEPH COCHRAN, Jr., J. P.

I could deem myself capable of improving the platform there adopted, it is quite certain that I should decline, either at the call of individuals or associations, to incur the charge of arrogance to which any attempt to alter, amend, or enlarge it, would inevitably subject me. Your letter is of an entirely different character. It seeks truth in relation to an alleged fact; it speaks of history, to which too searching an appeal cannot be made. I appreciate the estimate you seem to have of my character for directness, and beg you to accept my thanks for your efforts to vindicate my claim to that trait, at least, before the public.

I am with high esteem, your most obedient servant,

FRANK PIERCE.

Edwin DeLeon, Esq., Washington, D. C.

GEN. SCOTT AND THE COMPROMISE.

Gen. Scott's speech to the Mississippi Delegation.

"I feel gratified, gentlemen, at this unexpected call, and am glad to see before me the accredited men of Mississippi. The nomination which has been conferred upon me by the Convention of which you were members, is an honor greater than I deserve, and whether defeated or elected, I shall on my return regard it as the highest compliment which could be bestowed upon me, and as more than repaying me for the little service I have rendered my country. I am well pleased, too, gentlemen, with the platform you have adopted; it meets MY HEARTY AND COMPLETE APPROVAL; and let me assure you, gentlemen, that this is no new born faith in me. Years ago I entertained the sentiments expressed in that platform on the subject of Southern rights. I can assure you that I was one of the first to give in my hearty and cordial approval and endorsement of those measures, when they were before Congress. There were but two others ahead of me in point of time in their advocacy, and approval of those measures. I mean Mr. Clay and Senator Foote, of your State. As early as 1850, when first brought before Congress, I openly avowed myself the friend of those measures, and then, and since, as many I think as an average of five times a day, have I openly and publicly declared my sentiments to every man, woman and child who has approached me on the subject. I have not sought nor have I desired any concealment of my views and opinions in reference to them, and it is a matter of profound astonishment and regret to me that any misapprehensions have been so grossly misrepresented, and that I have been made the subject of such unjust and malicious slander. My name has been coupled with that of Mr. Wm. H. Seward, and I have been charged with entertaining sentiments in common with him in reference to Southern institutions. Nothing can be more unjust and false. It is true, I am personally acquainted with Mr. Seward, and he is my friend; but I am not responsible for his peculiar sentiments, nor those of any other man who may see proper to support me, and no man living knows better than he, what my opinions are, and always have been. I made his acquaintance sometime in the year '36 or '7. I had not met with him or correspond with or interchanged communications with him, however, during the intervening years, until the year 1849. In the latter year, during the pending of the compromise measures before Congress, I met with him in traveling through New Jersey. He approached me upon the subject of those measures, and asked my opinion in reference thereto. I replied to him in these words: 'Sir, I am dead for the compromise—dead for the Union—dead for the compromise.' He replied to me in these words: 'You are a man of principle, and I shall be glad to have you on my side.' He then said to me: 'I have endeavored to gain a name for uprightness and candor; and I challenge the world to produce a single witness, who would be believed in a court of justice, who will say that I have ever, by thought, word or deed, said or done anything to justify the misrepresentations that have been made as to my sentiments and opinions, or that they have been otherwise than as expressed to you here this day. If any such man can be found, let him be brought forward, and I will be glad to stand by him, and his services shall be forgotten, and his word infamous shall be written before and after my name.'"

LETTER OF MR. HALE.

The following letter, addressed by the Hon. John P. Hale to the editor of the Union, appears in that journal of yesterday:

DOVER, N. H., Aug. 11, 1852.

To the Editor of the Union.

SIR: In the Washington Union of the 6th instant, under the head "Meeting in Accomack, Virginia—Thrilling Dialogue," a conversation is reported to have occurred between Mr. Wm. M. Map, at a meeting, in which the following thrilling dialogue took place:

Mr. Wise: "Were you in New Hampshire two years ago, and did you not hear Hale speak, and say in his speech that 'he would head an army to march upon the South and put down slavery?'"

Mr. Map: "I was there; heard Mr. Hale speak, and what you state; and he said: 'I will head an army to march upon the South, and put down slavery.' Did you not hear Franklin Pierce reply to this, and say: 'If Hale should head an army to march on the South, he had first to march over his (Pierce's) dead body; for he would head an army to oppose him?'"

Mr. Map: "I did."

The account then proceeds: "You can imagine the feeling which this reply elicited in the court-house, rang with the applause, repeated again and again. Mr. Wise then requested his opponent to state the facts again; Gen. Pierce did so, (slapping his hand upon his breast), that Hale would have to pass over his dead body before he marched upon the South." "This pertinent reply," says the Washington Union, "was received with a burst of applause, and it is not a syllable of truth in the whole of it. No such remark was ever made by me, and of course no such answer by Gen. Pierce, nor was there a meeting held in New Hampshire or elsewhere in which such a dialogue could have occurred. Gen. Pierce and myself have been taken at the same public meeting since 1846—when we both spoke on the same side—but one, and that was at the North Church, in Concord, New Hampshire, in June, 1849, and I am sure that of the thousands who attended that meeting not one can be found who will pretend that anything of the kind took place at that time. That, however, has nothing to do with the statements as the remarks related by Mr. Map were made at a meeting held in Accomack, Virginia."

Respectfully yours,

JOHN P. HALE.

P. S. Any one who doubts the correctness of my statement can be satisfied by applying to Mr. Pierce himself.

Still they come.—Gov. Robert Lucas, formerly of Ohio, and for many years of Iowa, has come out for Scott & Fremont. No one in Ohio will dispute Lucas' Democracy. And there are hundreds of Democrats in Iowa who have come out in the same way.—Cincinnati Gazette.

I have been asked if I liked this Fugitive Slave Law. I answered no, I loathed it. I have a most revolting feeling at the giving up of a slave; the law is opposed to humanity. It is contrary to moral right.—Speech of Gen. Pierce at Mancheater, N. H., on the 2nd Jan., 1852.

DEMOCRATS AND WHIGS, READ!

Pierce and the Free Soilers—why they Support Him!

The following is the Speech of Col. W. G. Hayes, one of the Free Soil delegates from New York to the Convention, which recently nominated John P. Hale at Pittsburgh:

Sing I question no man's motives, and trust none will question mine. If I understand the call for this convention, it was for the Free Democracy, where an interchange of opinions would be fully permitted.

As many gentlemen have expressed a preference for Mr. Hale, and some manifested a preference for Gen. Scott as against Gen. Pierce, I take the liberty of saying something in favor of the latter—to present some of the reasons why Franklin Pierce has some claims, at least, upon the anti-slavery vote of the country, presuming, as I do, that if slavery is ever abolished it must be by the Democracy.

In the ranks of the Democracy the friends of freedom have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not these men stated that they are even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can bear on the administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected (as he is pretty sure to be, by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it, and the greater furtherance of our cause?

President-elect have been found in the greatest numbers. It is also true that many of the former friends of freedom have now left us, a distinct organization, and ranged themselves under the banner of Pierce. Can we impeach their motives? Many of them profess to be as firm friends of freedom now as in any past time.—Many newspapers opposed to the fugitive slave law have also given their support to Pierce. Now, can we suppose that all these men and papers, who now advocate Pierce, have entirely abandoned their former principles and professions of fidelity to the cause of freedom?

"NOTE THE BRIGHT HOURS ONLY."

A lesson in itself sublime.

A lesson worth enshrining.

Is this—I take no heed of time,

Save when the sun is shining?

These motto-words a dial bore,

And wisdom never teaches

To human hearts a better lore

As life is sometimes bright and fair,

And sometimes dark and lonely,

Let us forget its pain and care,

And note its bright hours only.

There is no grove on earth's broad chart

But has some bird to cheer it,

So hope sings on, in every heart,

Although we may not hear it;

And if to-day the heavy wing

Of sorrow is oppressing,

Perchance to-morrow's sun will