

MOUNTAIN SENTINEL.

Andrew J. Rhey, Editor.

EBENSBURG, PA.

Thursday, September 2, 1852.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

For President,
FRANKLIN PIERCE,
of New Hampshire.

For Vice-President,
WILLIAM R. KING,
of Alabama.

For Supreme Judge,
GEORGE W. WOODWARD,
of Luzerne County.

For Canal Commissioner,
WILLIAM HOPKINS,
of Washington.

County Nominations.

For Assembly,
THOMAS COLLINS, of Washington.

For Sheriff,
AUGUSTIN DURBIN, of Washington.

Commissioner,
JACOB R. STULL, of Richland.

Auditor,
JOHN A. MCCONNELL, of Clearfield.

Coroner,
CAMPBELL SHERIDAN, of Johnstown.

The Editor is absent this week which will account for the lack of Editorial in this number.

The State Nominations.

We have the pleasure of announcing to our readers the harmonious termination of the Democratic State Convention, and the nomination of Hon. Geo. W. Woodward, of Luzerne, for Supreme Judge, and Col. William Hopkins, of Washington county, for Canal Commissioner. No better selections could have been made. Both of these gentlemen were the choice of a large majority of the party throughout the State, and both will rally to their support a united and enthusiastic Democracy.

Speaking of the nominees, the *Pennsylvanian* has the following well-deserved tribute to their worth and integrity.

"Judge Woodward at present occupies a place on the Supreme Bench—a position which, in a short time, he has adorned with the influence and power of the most brilliant abilities. As a jurist he has no superior. Sound in all his opinions—well fortified and balanced by great legal attainments—incorruptible in morals and generous principles, he is a man eminently fitted for the high honors and responsibilities of a Supreme Judge. No man in the State has more thoroughly studied the historical jurisprudence of Pennsylvania—no man given more attention to the resources, the wealth and the wants of the people—and therefore the Commonwealth will be equally fortunate in securing the eminent services of GEORGE W. WOODWARD.

WILLIAM HOPKINS belongs to that class of men who have made the prosperity of Pennsylvania part of their ambition. He is a stern, reliable and uncompromising Democrat. A man imbued with the largest principles of public enterprise—always successful in his projects for the public good. He has resided for many years the encroachments of Federalism in this State—and during the memorable buckshot war, he manfully battled against the party that desired to treat the elections as if they were never heard. He is known to the people of the State—he has discharged every trust with honor and ability—and will be supported with that zeal which attaches to every honest public servant.

Who is William A. Graham.

The Cincinnati Commercial, which has an editor who is a fast man generally, said the other day:

"Since writing the above the telegraph announces the name of William A. Graham, of North Carolina, as the nominee for Vice President. Mr. G. was, we believe, Secretary of the Navy at one time, and has acted as Representative and Senator in Congress from his State."

The Cincinnati Atlas gives the following account of him:

Mr. Graham has been Governor of North Carolina, and became a member of the Cabinet after the accession of General Taylor, from which he retired after the death of the President.

So here we see how the present most distinguished and highest admired Secretary of the Navy has been perpetrating greatness to little purpose. He is set down by this whig editor as one of the squad of Galphinites who slid away from the public gaze upon the death of General Taylor, very much to the relief of the country in general, and of whiggery in particular.

Whig Extravagance.

Sixty millions of dollars a year! Only think of it. Nearly one hundred and fifty tons of gold, or twenty-five hundred tons of silver.—This is the annual expenditure of a whig administration, and it is truly monstrous to contemplate. Why, the annual expenditure of the government would load a train of a hundred wagons with silver. Two-thirds of the annual product of California cannot more than keep the treasury supplied. The cotton crop of this country is reckoned to be immense, but the annual expenditure of the federal government would swallow up the whole of it. Sixty millions gone, consumed and sunk in a single year! This sum would educate every youth, male and female, in the Union. It would build three thousand miles of railroad, nearly one-third as many miles as have been built in the United States up to this time. This is paying too dearly for government, as it would require all the savings of nearly half a million of day laborers to support the government. It is time that a reform was made in this kind of extravagance.

The Charges Against Gen. Scott.

In reply to the Nashville Banner, which stated that the charges against Gen. Scott were made upon anonymous authority, the Nashville Union has the following cogent reply, embodying facts which should be kept before the people:

"1. The first and most serious charge is that Gen. Scott is in the hands of Seward, the abolitionists, and free soilers. For the truth of this charge, among other good and true men, Messrs. Gentry and Williams, of Tennessee, are responsible.

"2. Another charge against Gen. Scott is that he is opposed to the existence of slavery. The proof of this charge is found in his own letter, in which he declares that it is 'a high moral obligation of masters and slaveholding States to employ ALL MEANS not incompatible with the safety of both colors to meliorate slavery, EVEN TO EXTERMINATION.'

"3. Another charge against Gen. Scott is that he is in favor of annexing a large number of free States to the Union, and thus giving to the anti-slavery power an overwhelming weight in the councils of the nation. The proof of this charge is found in Gen. Scott's letter, dated June 1849—which we have published in full—in which he says: 'In my judgement, the interests of both sides would be much promoted by the annexation—the several provinces (Canada, New Brunswick, etc.) coming into the Union on equal terms with our present thirty States.' And further: 'Though opposed to incorporating with us any district densely peopled with the Mexican race, I should be very happy to fraternize with our Northern and Northwestern neighbors.' The territory which Gen. Scott is thus in favor of annexing to our Northern and Northwestern boundaries is nearly as large as all the territory now embraced in the Union.

"4. Another charge against Gen. Scott is that he is in favor of a national bank. The proof of this charge is found in his letter to a committee of gentlemen, dated October 25, 1841, in which he says that he regards such an institution as indispensable, in peace and in war, to the operations of the treasury and the wants of commerce.

"5. Another charge against Gen. Scott is that he is in favor of a practical destruction of a bankrupt law. The proof of this charge is also found in his letter of 1841.

"6. Another charge against Gen. Scott is that he is in favor of a practical destruction of the veto power. In his letter just alluded to, he declares himself in favor of reducing the veto now so essential to the slaveholding States—so as to give a bare majority in Congress the power to overrule it. This would be a practical destruction of the power.

"7. Another charge against Gen. Scott is that he is supported almost entirely by the enemies of the fugitive slave law at the North.—The fact that Seward, Johnston, and Greeley, the leaders of the higher-law men, are his warm friends, is sufficient proof of this charge.

"8. Another charge against General Scott is, that he is in favor of modifying our natural franchise upon only one condition, viz: that they serve one year in the army or navy of the United States. The evidence of the charge is found in Gen. Scott's letter of acceptance, and in a communication written by him to the *National Intelligencer* in 1844. Taken together, these two documents show him to be in favor of this dangerous and unjust modification.

"9. Another and a most serious charge against Gen. Scott is, that he stubbornly refuses to define his position on the compromise. The proof of this charge is abundant, but we will not go into it in detail. Suffice it to say that Gov. Jones has declared that he, 'with a hundred to back him,' implored General Scott to define his position on the compromise, 'and he would not.'

"These are the principal and most important charges against General Scott. With the exception of two or three, they are susceptible of documentary proof from under his own hand.—And yet the *Banner* would have its readers believe that they are made upon anonymous authority; and that no known person is responsible for them."

Catholic Testimony.

The New York Freeman's Journal, in referring to the statement that General Pierce had sustained the religious test in the Constitution of New Hampshire, thus speaks:

"The Democracy have nominated a man acknowledged as an able lawyer, a man of a family, and of antecedents entitling him to respect and confidence, and one who has the rare and high qualifications of rather shunning than seeking official promotion. Every thing that we have known or heard of General Pierce has been in his favor. He hails from a State that has an invidious distinction as sustaining persecuting laws against Catholics, but we have heard that General Pierce has been one who has favored the repeal of the shameful statutes imposing disabilities on Catholics in New Hampshire.—On this subject we will have ample time to obtain correct information. He is a Democrat of the old school—not a French radical Democrat. He has not been mixed up with the base pandering to the mob, that have characterized too many Washington politicians."

And the New York Truth Teller adds its testimony, refuting the unjust charge of religious intolerance against our brave and noble-minded candidate for the Presidency:

"Mr. Pierce, it is universally conceded, possesses all the requisite qualifications to administer the affairs of Government with credit and ability. We are assured by those who have known him long and well, that a more liberal, high toned, true republican, does not live. On the question of the 'Catholic test' which has ever been a bone of contention in New Hampshire, Mr. Pierce has been faithfully and zealously arrayed in just opposition to the stain upon the laws of that State; and, although unsuccessful in his efforts to have it expunged, he is nevertheless fully entitled to the gratitude of every liberal mind, for his exertions in the matter."

Gen. Scott as a Civilian—In favor of the old Land distribution bill, United States Bank, and Bankrupt Law.

As General Scott has become the whig candidate for the presidency, (by a small majority,) his fitness for that highest civil station on earth becomes a matter of most serious inquiry.—With his character as a general we have nothing to do. As a commander of our armies he has been successful, and so, as a general thing, have all other commanders of our American troops. It would be important to canvass the merits of a mere civilian who should aspire to the chief command of our armies in time of war, it certainly is imperative on the American people now to seriously examine the claims of an exclusively military man who aspires to the chief directorship of the civil affairs of our nation.—General Scott's name has several times been mentioned in connexion with the presidency, when the whig party have been casting about for purely an available candidate, and as often has the old General sat down and in 'haste' scribbled his opinions to somebody. Last October, the 27th day, he issued from Washington a general circular in answer to numerous questions, giving his views on civil affairs in *extenso*. We shall from time to time make extracts from this document. For the present we will give our readers his views in his own words on "land distribution," "bankrupt law," and a "United States Bank."

[Extract from the Circular.]

"Leading measures of the late extra session.—If I had the honor of a vote on the occasion, it would have been given in favor of the land distribution bill, the bankrupt bill, and the second bill creating a fiscal corporation—having long been under a conviction that in peace, as in war, something efficient, in the nature of a Bank of the United States, is not only 'necessary and proper,' but indispensable to the successful operations of the treasury, as to many of the wants of our commerce and currency."

WINFIELD SCOTT.

Here we have it. The extra session referred to was that called soon after the coon campaign of 1840, at which an 'old-fashioned United States bank' was attempted to be thrust upon the country, but was three times vetoed, in different shapes and under different names, by John Tyler. "Land distribution" was one of the same nefarious schemes—a measure to arrest the increase of new States by giving the monopoly of the public lands to the old States, cutting off all homestead bills and all revenue arising therefrom to the general government. The "bankrupt law," got up for the benefit of stock-jobbers, defunct bankers, and unsuccessful speculators, which did more to doom and damn that administration than all other schemes put together—a measure of general repudiation which even now stinks in the nostrils of the people—to this now, or as late as last October, 1841, Gen. Scott gives his entire sanction.

This is all the democratic party want to know of Gen. Scott's ideas of a civil government. A ranker blue-bellied old federalist and foggy does not live than he, and the honest portion of the whig party will yet endorse Greeley's opinion of him, as expressed in a private letter to a friend just before the Whig Convention in 1848. The extract reads thus:

"Send a delegate to the convention, if you can, for Clay; if not for Clay, for Corwin; if not for Corwin, for Seward; if not for Seward, for Taylor. But last of all for Scott. Scott is a vain, conceited coxcomb of a man. His brains—all that he has—are in his epaulets; and if he should be elected President, he would tear the whig party into tatters in less than six months."—*Cleveland Plaindealer*.

Gen. Scott's Hatred of his Officers.

The bitter was the hatred of Gen. Scott toward the gallant and lamented Worth, that he suffered no opportunity to pass, whereby he could insult him, and bring him into disgrace, and so palpable had his design become that the Department at Washington were obliged to interfere to protect him. The following is from the scathing, withering rebuke administered to him by Mr. Marcy then Secretary of War:

"When a General at the head of an army of freemen, who do not lose their rights as citizens by becoming soldiers, sets up pretensions to the authority of his Government, and is much more ready to censure than to execute its orders and instructions—when he denounces as an outrage and a punishment the attempt to submit his acts, charged to be an offence against a subordinate officer, to an investigation in the midst of war—when he administers an indignant reproof to his superior for upholding the sacred right of appeal upon which depend the security and protection of all under his command, such a General sets an example of insubordinate conduct of wide and withering influence upon sound military discipline."

It will also be remembered that Pillow and Duncan were implicated in the same court martial, and preferred charges against Gen. Scott to the Department at Washington. In referring to this, Mr. Marcy uses the following just language:

"The crowning outrage, as you regard it, is the simple fact that you and 'the three arrested officers,' are all to be placed together before the same court; 'the innocent and the guilty, the accuser and the accused, the judge and his prisoners, are dealt with alike.' 'Most impartial justice!' you exclaim. And why is it not impartial justice? On what ground of right can you claim to have your case discriminated from theirs? It is true you have determined to be their judge, and have pronounced them guilty; and complain and repine that the laws of the country do not allow you, their accuser, to institute a court to register your decree.—But you are not their rightful judge, although they were your prisoners. Before that court you may have the self-satisfying conviction that you are innocent and they are guilty, the government could act upon no such presumption.—By becoming an accuser you did not place yourself beyond the reach of being accused; and unless you are clothed with the immunity of des-

potic power, and can claim the benefit of the maxim 'THAT THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG,' I know not why your conduct, when made the subject of charges, may not be investigated by a court of inquiry, nor can I perceive what other, or better right you have to complain, and arraign the government, that to the other officers whom you have accused, and whose cases, with yours, were referred to the same court. If your's is a hard case, theirs is not less so: if you can rightfully complain of persecution by the government, so can they, with equal justice, and an equal claim to public sympathy."

If your extraordinary pretensions are to derive any support from your distinguished services in the field, you ought to be mindful that three accused officers put under arrest by you, have like claims for distinguished services. On the pages of impartial history their names, and deeds, must appear with yours, and to monopolizing claims, seeking 'malignant exclusions,' at the expense of the 'truth of history,' will be permitted to rob them of their fair share of the glory won by our gallant army while under your command."

Gen. Scott and Gen. Taylor.

Gen. Scott and his friends have calculated largely on the prestige of General Taylor's triumph availing him in the canvass. They are mistaken in that calculation. No two men unlike each other, or impressing the popular mind more unequally. Taylor was supposed to be a simple-hearted old man, (they might have added simple-headed, who was plain, frank, unassuming and meaning well, and who would honestly try to perform the duties of the office of President, if elected. His manners were so plain as to amount to vulgarity on some occasions, if tested by the ordinary standard of polite society. His clothes were always made to do full duty, and were never discharged, except upon 'certificate of disability.' That old brown coat of his, which was the subject of as much comment as Suvaroff's old coat, won him thousands of votes. At a barbecue in Virginia in 1848, I received the first foreboding of defeat for the Democratic ticket, on hearing a gray-haired old lady, who may have seen the revolutionary war, for aught I know, launch out in blessings on the dear old General, and his old coat, followed by a croaking warning to prepare for defeat as certain as election day came round. How does General Scott figure in comparison with this picture? He is known to be the very quintessence of splendid show on parade, a situation he always seeks—always wearing every inch of tinsel, and every button, feather and chain which the army rules permit—as vain as a peacock, evidently courting the admiring gaze of every spectator, down to the boys and negroes—while at the same time, his manners, not only to the masses, but to his equals, are haughty, presuming and aristocratic. Even at a respectful distance, under circumstances which would unbend any man's manner, who had a soul of chivalry or kindness. Military service and the participation in common dangers and hardships, bring all men, except Gen. Scott, to a certain community of sympathy and feeling, or makes them feel like brothers.—General Scott is not a man of sympathy. His vanity swallows up every noble emotion and has made him a solitary man in the midst of thousands. Such is not the man who can rouse the popular enthusiasm. There is no element in his character, which will inflame the love, affection or esteem of the people. None but those who expect to gain political preferment, will raise the shout when his name is heard. The people remember his concomitants, of Seward, Abolitionism, slavery agitation and danger to the Union, and they fly instinctively to the standard of the only National parties in the Union, now represented by Pierce and King on the Baltimore platform.

Proceedings of the Democratic State Convention.

HARRISBURG, Aug. 26.

In pursuance of the call of the State Central Committee, the members of the Democratic State Convention of the 4th of March last, assembled in the hall of the House of Representatives at 11 o'clock, A. M., when they were called to order by the Hon. Wm. Hopkins, President, who addressed the Convention as follows:

Gentlemen of the Convention.—We have met under circumstances very different from those under which we assembled in March last. Then we were full of hope. A large majority of this body believed that the time had arrived when Pennsylvania's distinguished statesman James Buchanan, could be nominated for the Presidency. To this end delegates were appointed who were known friends of that gentleman. With what fidelity these delegates discharged the trust that was reposed in them, let the four days balloting which occurred at Baltimore, answer. They adhered to him with a devotion rarely equalled and never surpassed.

They were not alone in their preferences for the man of your choice. They had the proud satisfaction of receiving the warmest co-operation of the sterling Democracy of the 'Old Dominion,' of North Carolina, Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi, but they were obliged at last to yield.

This great and good man had to be offered up as a sacrifice to the union and harmony of the Democratic party. The sacrifice was a great one, and one which seemed like parting with the last friend, but still, it was not too great to be made, in order to accomplish so desirable an end.

It is proper to state in this connection that a respectable minority of this Convention expressed a preference for another distinguished gentleman, the patriot and statesman of Michigan. He too had a large, perhaps I might say, controlling number of friends at Baltimore, who, with equal fidelity adhered to him. He was altogether worthy of this support.

Then again, the intellectual giant of Illinois, and the scar covered patriot of Texas had their admirers, who exhibited as much anxiety for their nomination, as did the others for their favorites. Thus it became apparent that personal preferences must be laid aside and some one selected who would harmonize all the conflicting interests.

After surveying this widely extended confederacy, the attention of the Convention was turned towards New Hampshire's favorite son. The moment his name was introduced (in the language of a delegate in my eye) "it took like wild fire," and Franklin Pierce was, by the unanimous voice of the Convention declared the nominee of the great Democratic party. And who, I ask, could have been selected that would have been more acceptable to all? Superadded to talents of the highest order, he will bring to the administration of the government a large amount of political wisdom and experience, and besides a more brave and more disinterested patriot does not live. As to his entire fitness for the exalted position assigned him, he has the endorsement of some of the most eminent statesmen of the age. It is only necessary to mention two—James Buchanan and Lewis Cass—who would desire more? Of the nominee for the Vice Presidency I need hardly speak. The name of Wm. R. King is as familiar to the Democracy of Pennsylvania as "household words;" with them he has long been a favorite. Perhaps there is not a man in the Union who would command a more cordial support.

But, gentlemen, how sadly different are the circumstances which surround us now, from those under which we last met. Then the Hon. Richard Coulter was, so far as we know, in the full vigor of health—occupying a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court. Now, his mortal remains lie slumbering in the dust. He was, indeed, an eminent jurist—a profound scholar and a courteous gentleman. Then, the lamented Searight was a member of this body, with a promise of many years of usefulness, and it was my pleasing duty, as your organ, to procure him the 'nominee' for the office of Canal Commissioner. Now it is my mournful duty to announce to you that he, too, has 'gone down through the valley of the shadow of death.'—This is not the occasion for pronouncing a eulogy upon his character, nor would I be competent to such a task. But you will, I know, allow me to make a remark or two. It was my privilege to enjoy the personal acquaintance of the deceased for upwards of twenty years, during the last fifteen of which our intercourse was of the most friendly character. I was both his predecessor and his successor in office as Commissioner of the Cumberland road, and transacted business with him to the amount of thousands of dollars, and I here publicly (as I have often privately) bear my humble testimony to his inflexible integrity. A more honest, honorable, or gentlemanly man I have never met. In all the relations of life, he was courteous and kind. His heart and hand were always open to dispense of his ample means towards alleviating the wants of the necessitous. But the character of this truly good man was still more strikingly exemplified in the domestic circle.—A more indulgent and devoted husband and father could no where be found. But he is gone, and I respectfully suggest, in view of the relation he sustained to this Convention, that appropriate resolution should be passed expressive of our profound sorrow on account of his demise. Thus you see, gentlemen, that an inscrutable Providence has, within a few brief months, stricken down two of our most prominent citizens—each of them representing one of the political parties of the country—and thus demonstrating the great truth that 'death is no respecter of persons' or parties, and reminding us of 'what shadows we are and what shadows we pursue.'

Should we not, therefore, learn from these afflicting dispensations of Divine Providence, to cultivate a spirit of mutual forbearance and brotherly kindness towards those of the same political faith with ourselves, but also our political opponents? Let us remember that 'to err is human, to forgive divine.'

While we should adhere to our principles with manly firmness, we ought at the same time to treat those who differ with us, courteously, and never say of the living what we would regret having said after they are dead.

But I must not detain you. It only remains for us to proceed to the performance of the duty for which we have met.

In accordance with the recommendation of the President, resolutions, expressive of the high regard of the Convention for the lamented Mr. Searight and of sympathy with his family in their bereavement, were introduced by Mr. FULLER and passed unanimously.

The following resolution, submitted by Mr. Hirst, of Philadelphia, was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the members of this Convention cordially approve and will support heartily and enthusiastically the nomination of Franklin Pierce as president of the United States, and Wm. R. King as Vice President of the United States, and that we adopt as sound and enduring Democratic doctrine, the National Platform of principles of the Baltimore Democratic Convention.

Mr. Dougherty, of Dauphin, moved that the Hon. George W. Woodward be nominated by acclamation as the Democratic candidate for the Supreme Court.

The motion was agreed to amid much applause. A large number of nominations were made for Canal Commissioner. The Hon. Wm. Hopkins, the President, being among the number, he requested permission to resign his position as President of the Convention, which was granted. He then named the Hon. Hendrick B. Wright as his successor, who took the chair.

On motion, the Convention adjourned until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention re-assembled at two o'clock. On motion of Mr. Badger, the Convention proceeded to a first ballot for a candidate for Canal Commissioner with the following result:

William Hopkins	had	43	votes
Joel B. Danner	"	19	"
Henry S. Mott	"	14	"
F. R. West	"	11	"
Perry Baker	"	9	"
A. S. Feather	"	6	"
J. P. Patterson	"	7	"
—Forsyth	"	5	"
Thos. Osterhant	"	5	"
John Creswell	"	3	"
T. J. Power	"	2	"
R. J. Lloyd	"	1	"

No candidate having received a majority of all the votes cast, there was no choice. A second ballot was then had without effecting a choice, as follows:

William Hopkins	had	47	votes
Joel B. Danner	"	24	"
Henry S. Mott	"	16	"
Perry Baker	"	9	"
F. R. West	"	14	"
J. P. Patterson	"	6	"
—Forsyth	"	2	"
D. B. Kutz	"	5	"

THIRD BALLOT.

William Hopkins had 70 votes. Joel B. Danner " 30 " H. S. Mott " 14 " F. R. West " 11 "

Wm. Hopkins of Washington county, having received a majority of all the votes cast, was declared the nominee of the Democratic party for the office of Canal Commissioner.

On motion the nomination was made unanimous.

Mr. Hirst, Chairman of the State Central Committee, invited the members of the Convention to attend the Democratic Mass Meeting to be held at Reading on the 4th of September next, which was accepted.

Mr. Strong on behalf of the Berks county Committee, promised a cordial welcome to all who might attend upon that great occasion.

After a brief address from the chairman, the Convention adjourned sine die with three cheers for the nominees, Woodward and Hopkins.

A Clincher.

The *Baltimore Argus* has been furnished by a gentleman just from Accomac county, with an account of a joint Democrat and Whig meeting held in the district of Hon. Henry A. Wise.—The latter spoke four hours, and was replied to by Mr. Mass, a Whig presidential elector and a member of the Virginia Legislature, who charged Frank Pierce with being identified with Free Soilism and Abolitionism, and gave for his authority the Concord Democrat and Manchester Democrat. He had been in New Hampshire some two years ago, and heard speeches from John P. Hale and General Pierce. Mr. Wise took the stand, and rebutted the charges most successfully, and made Mr. Mass acknowledge that Franklin Pierce was not what these Abolition Whig papers (although called Democrat) represented him to be. 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, to put down slavery?'

Mr. Mass.—I was there: heard Mr. Hale speak, and say what you state.

Mr. Wise.—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. Mass.—I did.

The court house rang with shouts of applause repeated again and again. Mr. Wise then requested his opponent to state the facts again, which he did to an almost breathless auditory. "General Pierce did say (slapping his hand upon his breast) that Hale would have to pass over his dead body before he marched upon the South."

A pretty figure these Southern Whigs cut in charging Gen. Pierce with Abolitionism. No wonder such impudence is watered after this fashion. It ought to make every soul of them, all their lives long.

"The sad burden of some merry song."