

The Huntingdon Journal.

"LIBERTY AND UNION, NOW AND FOREVER, ONE AND INSEPARABLE."

HUNTINGDON, PA., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1856.

VOL. XXI. NO. 37.

WILLIAM BREWSTER, } EDITORS.
SAM. G. WHITTAKER, }

PLATFORMS & CANDIDATES.

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J. PERRY,
OF MAINE,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 7, 1856.

Mr. PERRY said:
Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are now on the eve of a presidential election—an election alike important to the interests of the whole country. Old party issues have been settled, and new ones have taken their place; old party organizations have had their day, and gone to the tomb of the Capulets. A universal sentiment everywhere prevails among the American people to "let the dead bury their dead," and they are now turning their attention to the other living issues now presented for their consideration.

Amid the din of battle, and the clash of sounding arms, there is substantially but one great leading question which now engrosses the attention of the American people; all other questions hold a subordinate relation, and are secondary to this, both in their importance and position. All our political organizations not only assent to this proposition, but unite in declaring its truth. Whether African slavery is to be extended into free territory, or forever hereafter restricted to its present limits, is plain, direct question, so incorporated in the political machinery of parties in this country that it has got to be squarely met and settled. Neither politicians nor political parties can ignore this issue without striking a fatal blow at their own existence. In the coming contest we are nominally to have a triangular fight. Three parties are in the field under the lead of their several chosen standard-bearers; each party has erected its platform, unfurled its banners to the breezes of heaven, and taken its position in the great battle-field.

The memorable words of the great sage of Marshfield, "Where shall I go?" are ringing in the ears of every American citizen; and every independent sovereign, entitled by the laws of the land to exercise the elective franchise, is called upon to enroll himself in the ranks of one or the other of these contending parties. No American citizen should now content himself with being an idle spectator. A responsible rests upon every man and no patriot should seek to avoid it. In deciding the question, as to which of these three parties is right, we must look not only to their candidates, but their platforms, we must examine not only their professions, but their acts. As intelligent men we should not merely content ourselves with a survey of the present, but should glance at the past; we should call to our aid the histories of bygone days, and then look ahead, and, as with prophetic ken, penetrate beyond the misty veil which conceals the future.

It is my purpose, upon the present occasion, to make a brief examination of the three platforms to which I have alluded, and, at the same time, invite the attention of the committee and the country to the candidates presented for their suffrages.

Before entering upon the discussion, I desire to say a few words as to the relative position occupied by the three parties.—I have before remarked that there is but one great, leading issue, and that is the slavery question; hence, while the fight may be considered nominally a triangular one, there is really but one question, and, while there are three parties in the field, circumstances, not arbitrary in their character, tend to concentrate upon each of these parties to a stand point upon one side or the other.

The "American" or Know Nothing party was originally made up of members from all parts of the Union. Its original platform did not recognize the slavery question; and for a short time it traveled undisturbed by this agitating subject. Strong and powerful as was this new political organization, it could not withstand the surging waves of popular opinion.—The slavery question, in the spirit of the vigilance of "sentinels," without stepping into the "password" or "salutation," singled into the halls of the secret order, and with the power of a despot seized the "charter," threw open the doors, drove out its members, dictated a compromise which resulted in 1836 '37, but in the old landmark known as "Mason and Dixon's line." The Philadelphia American Convention, held in June, 1835, was the end of the American Order as a national organization. The members from the northern and southern States, after a protracted, stormy session separated, never to be again united. I have no time to go into history of subsequent events, to detail the negotiations since entered into to unite the party. It is sufficient for my present purpose to say that they have all proved failures.

The nomination of Mr. Fillmore was made, and is now supported by the smith-wing of the American party. His claims to the Presidency are urged by the great body of his supporters not so much upon the ground of his Americanism as upon his alleged soundness upon the slavery question. His friends in the South are, Gilpinlike, running a race with the friends of Mr. Buchanan, to show that the former is more reliable as a southern man than the latter; that Mr. Fillmore is a better friend of the South than Mr. Buchanan. While the Buchananites are overhauling the old musty files of congressional records to prove Mr. Fillmore an Abolitionist, the South American are after Mr. Buck with "sharp sticks," hunting up his old Free Soil resolutions and other

evidences of Abolition affinities, each in their turn declaring the other sound or unsound upon the slavery question, just as the circumstances of the case happens to require.

This same war has been raging in this House. The special friend of Mr. Buchanan, in the person of the Hon. J. Glanville Jones, of Pennsylvania, prior to the Cincinnati Convention, fearing that President Pierce and Senator Douglas were heading off his favorite candidate down South, made a speech upon this floor, the whole tenor of which was an elaborate vindication of Mr. Buchanan from the charge of Free Soilism, and to show that he was as good a pro-slavery man as either Pierce Douglas, or any other man; and the speech of the honorable gentleman, which I listened to and have since carefully read, proves very conclusively to my mind that he made out his case. The special reason assigned for this vindication of the "sage of Wheatland" was a speech from another honorable member from Pennsylvania, Mr. FILLMORE, in which he has clearly proved that Mr. Buchanan had been an old Federalist, a Free-Soiler, a Native American, for the Wilmot Proviso and against it, and, in fact, that he had by shifts and turns been for and against almost every political question that had been before the American people for the last half century. In this game of battle-door and shuttle-cock between the Buchanan and Fillmore parties, the Republicans do not choose to interfere. Americanism, with the supporters of Mr. Fillmore, is a secondary question; the slavery issue with them, as with the friends of the pro-slavery Democracy, is the paramount idea. Whenever these two questions come in contact the latter overrides the former.—We have conclusive evidence of this spread upon the records of this House.

I have only time to refer to two cases proving this allegation. First, the organization of the House by the election of the present Speaker. After the adoption of the plurality rule, and upon the final ballot every single supporter of Mr. Fillmore from the slave States, with two exceptions voted for the honorable member from South Carolina, [Gov. Aiken,] a gentleman who never belonged to the Order, and always had been and was then, in full fellowship with the Democratic party, and against Mr. Banks, who is an American, and was the first man in the last Congress to raise his voice in vindication of the principles of the American party.


These Americans not only voted for Governor Aiken, but they did it in the very teeth of a resolution passed at a Democratic caucus of members of the House, denouncing the American party—which resolution the Democrats obstinately refused to repeal or modify. The second case to which I wish to call your attention was the contested election between Mr. Allen and Colonel Archer, of Illinois. Mr. Allen is a Buchanan Democrat, and, as I have been informed, had always been a determined opponent of the American party—denouncing the Order both in public and private. Mr. Archer is an American, and recently nominated by that party for the office of Governor in his State. After the question between these two gentlemen assumed a party aspect, and the Buchanan Democracy supported Mr. Allen upon party grounds, the whole Fillmore party in the House voted against Colonel Archer, and deprived him of a seat, while nearly every member of the same party voted for Mr. Allen.

Mr. Fillmore's antecedents are before the country. His congressional record shows much in favor of Freedom; and yet his southern friends say he has repudiated it all; and for this reason they give him their support. For proof they cite his official doing while President, in signing the fugitive slave law, other acts almost equally offensive to the people of the free States.

It is not my purpose to go into any extended remarks touching Mr. Fillmore, or the platform on which his friends have placed him. I forbear to do this, for the reason that there is no reasonable probability of his election; hence his position as a candidate becomes unimportant. In the North he is supported only by a small fraction of the American party. In every single free State, the great battle is to be fought between Fremont and Buchanan; while every friend of freedom must distinctly see the importance of a union of all the anti-Nebraska sentiment upon the most available candidate. Mr. Fillmore may carry a portion of the South. If a majority of any of the southern States can be made to believe that he is more subservient to the slave power than Mr. Buchanan, he will receive their electoral votes, otherwise he will be everywhere defeated.

The recent elections and other passing events, make it quite certain that Mr. Fillmore is to be deserted by the South.—The elections in some half dozen of the southern States, show this fact. Within a few days, a leading member of the American party in this House, [Hon. Percy Walker,] announced his determination to go over to Buchanan. Senators Benjamin, of Louisiana, Pratt and Pearce, of Maryland, and Jones of Tennessee, have all gone over to Buchanan. Mr. Fillmore from present appearances, will not get a single electoral vote in the South, and it is evidently extreme folly for his northern friends, opposed to Buchanan to throw away their suffrages upon a candidate who has no availability, and thereby keep up a division of the anti-Administration forces in the North.

I now pass along. I shall briefly notice the Republican platform, and the gallant standard-bearer of the people's party.



WILLIAM L. DAYTON;
THE PEOPLE'S CANDIDATE FOR
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

In doing this, I desire first to call the attention of the committee to a grave and serious charge made against this party by their political opponents—I mean the charge of disunion. Both the Buchanan and Fillmore parties have "let loose the dogs of war," and one universal howl of "disunion! disunion!" is set up against the Republican party from one end of the country to the other. This charge is neither made, and shall be as boldly met and refuted; not in the malicious, vindictive spirit in which it is presented, but in candor, fairness, and truth. To judge correctly of a party, it is necessary to examine its acts, its platform, and the avowed principles of its candidates. If the application of this test to the Republican party, treason is found concealed, then cry treason, and not till then.

In the conventional proceeding of the Republican party, I defy its most relentless enemies to find a single act that even tends to disunion. It cannot be done. No sir; this charge of disunion is made without specifications; it is an indictment couched up in vague generalities, unsupported either by the forms of law, or the allegation of a single specific offense.

The high court of public opinion will order it abated, and the grand inquest to whom it owes its paternity will be discharged, both for incompetency and moral corruption.

But is there anything in the Republican platform which looks like disunion? I have it before me. I have read it carefully, and I defy any man to point out a single word or sentence from such a sentiment can be even inferred. I will read the first resolution in the series adopted at the Philadelphia convention, which nominated Col. Fremont, and let it speak for itself:

"Resolved, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution, are essential to the preservation of our Republican interests, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States, must and should be preserved."

In this resolution, the Republicans assembled from all parts of the Union solemnly pledge themselves to the country that "the union of the States must and should be preserved." Upon this platform every Republican in the country stands to-day pledged to stand by the "doctrines" of the Declaration of Independence, the Federal Constitution, and the Union. With this declaration of Republican principles staring them in the face, the advocates of slavery extension, both in the Buchanan and Fillmore parties, have the audacity to charge the Republican party with disunion. So much for the shameless perversion of truth—so much to the disgrace and dishonor of two political parties, who to hide their own political deformities, band together to libel and slander their neighbor.

But is there anything about the past life or present position of the Republican nominee for the Presidency, which will justify warrant those who oppose him in charging his party with disunion? Nothing, sir. And I here challenge his opponents to find a single act of his whole life, either public or private—a single word or sentence by him spoken in the Senate, or the stump, at the fire-side, or in any other place, where he has ever advanced a sentiment, in any degree, however remote, in favor of disunion.

He has accepted a nomination for the Presidency in a letter from which I will read an extract:

"I am elected to the high office for which your partiality has nominated me. I will endeavor to administer the Government according to the spirit of the Constitution, as it was interpreted by the great men who framed and adopted it, and in such a way as to preserve both liberty and the Union."

And yet the Republican party are branded as disunionists. Sir, I hurl back the charge. I brand it as a perversion of every principle of truth and fair dealing.—I appeal to all honest American citizens to judge between the accusers and the accused, to stamp these assumptions with the scorn they richly merit. So much for these groundless charges of disunion, made against the Republican party. But I will not leave this part of my subject without carrying the war into the enemy's camp. I here charge, that the party which supports James Buchanan for the Presidency is in disunion party of this country, and I will prove it. The very men that control the destinies of the Buchanan pro-slavery Democracy, have for a long series of years boldly threatened disunion, and I will show it to a demonstration.

In January, 1850, an honorable gentleman, then a member of this House from Mississippi, now a member of the Senate from that State, [Gov. Brown,] is reported to have said:

"We of the South have ever been fast friends of the Union." * * * "If you fancy our devotion to the Union will keep us in the Union you are mistaken. Our love for the Union ceases with the justice of the Union."

"I tell you candidly we have calculated the value of the Union. Your injustice has driven us to it. Your oppression justifies me to-day in discussing the value of the Union, and I do it freely and fearlessly." * * * "Does any man desire to know at what and for what cause I would dissolve the Union? I will tell him at the first moment after you consummate your first act of aggression upon slave property. I would declare the Union dissolved, and for this reason: given an act, perpetrated after the warnings we have given you, would evince a settled purpose to interpose your authority in the management of our domestic affairs, thus degrading us from our rightful position, as equals, to a state of dependence and subordination."—*Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, part 1, pp. 235, 239.

In February, 1850, Mr. Stanton, of Tennessee, then a member of this House, among other things, remarked:

"But if California be forced upon us without such an adjustment of the questions involved in that measure, I shall be very glad to make the final struggle upon this very ground. I shall be prepared to go with the southern people in whatever they may determine, even though it be to abandon the Union, when the rights of the Southern States cannot be otherwise protected."—*Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, part 1, p. 250.

"GENTLEMEN: You call me to a high responsibility by placing me in the van of a great movement by the people of the United States who, without regard to past differences, are uniting in a common effort to bring back the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson."

"Comprehending the magnitude of the trust which they have deposed themselves willing to place in my hands, and deeply sensible of the honor which their unreserved confidence in this threatening position of the public affairs implies, I feel that I cannot better respond than by a sincere declaration that, in the event of my being elected, I will devote my whole energy upon the execution of its duties upon a single-hearted determination to promote the good of the whole country, and to direct solely to that end all the power of the Government, irrespective of party issues, and regardless of sectional selfishness."

"Trusting that I have a heart capable of comprehending our whole country, with its varied interests, and confident that patriotism exists in all parts of the Union, I accept the nomination of your convention, in the hope that I may be enabled to serve usefully its cause, which I consider the cause of constitutional freedom."

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
J. C. FREMONT."

At the same session of Congress, in the debate which preceded the election of Speaker, Mr. Colecock, of South Carolina, said:

"I here pledge myself, that if any bill should be passed at this Congress abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, or incorporating the Wilmot proviso in any form, I will introduce a resolution into this House, declaring, in terms, that this Union ought to be dissolved."—*Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, part 1, p. 23.

In December, 1849, an honorable member from Georgia, [Mr. Toombs,] then a member of the House, and now a Senator from said State, in a speech in this House, said:

"I do not, then, hesitate to avow before this House and the country, and in the presence of the living God, that if by your legislation, you seek to drive us from the Territories of California and New Mexico, purchased by the common blood and treasure of the whole people, and to abolish slavery in this District, thereby attempting to fix a national degradation upon all the States of this Confederacy, I am for disunion. And if my physical courage be equal to the maintenance of my convictions of right and duty, I will devote all I am and all I have on earth to its consummation."—*Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, part 1, p. 25.

Another honorable Representative from Georgia, now a member of this House, (Mr. Stephens,) upon the same day, in following Mr. Toombs, said:

"I tell that gentleman, (Mr. Baker) and I tell this House, whether he believes it or not, that the day in which aggression is consummated upon any section of the country—such and deeply as I regret it—this union is dissolved.—However much gentlemen may refuse to believe it, they will find it true."
"We do not intend to submit to aggression on our rights, and I tell this House that every word uttered by my colleague meets my hearty response. (Applause.)"—*Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, part 1, p. 25.

Mr. Meade, of Virginia, a member of the House, in December, 1849, in a speech, said:

"But, sir, if the organization of this House, is to be followed by the passage of this bill, (admitting California and adopting the Wilmot proviso,) I trust, in God, sir, that my eyes have rested upon the last Speaker of the House of Representatives."—*Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, part 1, p. 26.

"These declarations come not from members of the Republican party, but from the leaders of the Buchanan Democracy; from gentlemen who stand in the front ranks of that party. In looking over the records of Congress for the last ten years, I find the same statements of disunion uttered by men opposed to the Republican party. But I will not confine my examinations to the history of the past, but will now proceed to make certain extracts from the speeches and writings of honorable gentlemen upon this floor, in the Democratic party, since the meeting of the present Congress.

In the House, December 13, (Appendix to *Congressional Globe*, page 47.) Mr. Walker, of Alabama, said:

"After all, it is not the Union—the Union alone—upon which the reflecting man of this country bases his hopes and rests his affections. With him the Union is secondary in importance to the principles it was designed to perpetuate and establish."

Mr. Bennett of Mississippi, in the House December 22, (Appendix to *Congressional Globe*, page 48.) said:

"When you tell me that you intend to put a restriction on the Territories, I say to you that upon that subject the South is a unit, and will not submit to any such thing."

On the 20th of December, in this House (*Congressional Globe*, page 61.) Mr. Mullin, of Virginia, said:

"And I tell you, sir, and I want the country to know it; I want the gentlemen from the free States, our Republicans, our Seward Republicans, our Abolitionists, or whatever else they may be called, to know it, that if you restore the Missouri Compromise or repeal the fugitive slave law, this Union will be dissolved."

"I hope that if any gentleman deems I do not properly represent the state of public feeling in the South, he will correct me."

In the House, on the 4th of January, Mr. Boyce, of South Carolina, (*Congressional Globe*, page 143.) said:

"That party which places itself upon the position of giving power to the North, will eventually succeed; and when that party does succeed, in my opinion the Union will be at an end."

In the House, March 13, (Appendix to *Congressional Globe*, page 239.) Mr. Letcher, of Virginia, said:

"So far as the South is concerned, sir, I will tell you now what I have no doubt will be the fact—what I believe firmly and conscientiously, that if you, the Republicans, should have power here, and undertake to pass measures to carry out the principles which you profess, you would find that we had spirit enough to separate from you, and make the effort, at least, to take care of ourselves."

In the House, April 9, Hon. E. S. Shorter, of Alabama, said:

"You have thoroughly aroused the southern States to a sense of their danger. You have caused them coolly to estimate the value of the Union, and we are determined to maintain our equality in it, or independence out of it."

"The South has planted itself where it intends to stand or fall, Union or no Union—and that is, upon the platform laid down by the Georgia convention."

"We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, selected for the first time from the Free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by suffrages of one part of the Union only, to rule over the whole United States. Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow, in case of success? (Cheers.) Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate? (Cheers.)

In his closing remarks he went through the old farce of "dissolving the Union."—Such a speech, from such a source, must be not only a matter of extreme surprise, but deep regret, to patriotic men of all parties. Here we have the mortifying spectacle presented of a man who has been once President of the United States, and the candidate of a respectable party for reelection—declaring in substance, on a public occasion, that if an opposing candidate, representing an equally respectable and much larger party, is elected, the South ought not to submit, but should be justified in going into open rebellion breaking up the Government, and destroying the Union.

But Mr. Fillmore is not alone in uttering sentiments of this character. Many of his supporters indulge in the same strain of remarks. Neither are these threats of insubordination confined exclusively to Fillmore men. Almost every Buchanan Democrat who has spoken upon the question since the nomination of Colonel Fremont, has uttered similar sentiments. We have had speech upon speech in this House, which declare that the election of Col. Fremont would be an end to the Union. The Buchanan and Fillmore presses are thundering forth the same revolutionary sentiments in all parts of the Union, while their stump orators are breathing "fire and sword" in case the Republican candidate is elected.

Are Mr. Fillmore and the men who put forth these threats, sincere and honest in what they say? If so, into what kind of a position do they place themselves? It is a declaration that, in a certain contingency, they boldly strike for a revolution and civil war, to end in a certain dissolution of the Union. And what is that contingency? Nothing but this: If a majority of the legal electors in this country exercise their constitutional rights, and elect the man of their choice to the Presidency, then treason is sundered to atoms. These threats are a stab aimed at the very vitals of the Confederacy. It is a declaration put forth that the majority shall no longer rule.—These men and these parties declare, not only that the majority shall no longer rule, but the go for striking down the individual right of the elector, and undertake to dictate to the sovereign people, and say to them that they must vote for certain candidate, or we will dissolve the Union. They usurp the authority of tyrants, and, Louis Napoleon like, would compel every American citizen to vote with caudges brandished over their heads, and bristling bayonets pointed at their bosoms.

The Constitution of our common country contains the great fundamental principle that must govern the election of a President. It expressly provides that the majority shall rule; and the man or the party that preaches a different doctrine, instigates and encourages rebellion against it. I want it to go to the country, that the followers of Messrs. Buchanan and Fillmore, upon this floor, are openly declaring that the election of Mr. Fremont will be an end of the Union. I want the country to know what parties in this House and the Senate threaten rebellion—resistance to the Constitution of the country and disunion of the people—and the people shall know it. If the constitution of the country is to be trampled in the dust—if the majority are hereafter to be denied the right to rule—if revolution is to be threatened, and the country menaced with a civil war—for exercising a constitutional right in a legal manner—then the year 1856 is as good a time to try as any other. And I here say to our Buchanan and Fillmore friends, whether North or South, we plant ourselves firmly upon the rock of the Constitution; we cast your admonitions to the whistling winds; your threats pass away from our memories like a "tale that is told"; we are American citizens and we will exercise the rights of American citizens so long as we have a constitution or a country.

Of Mr. Buchanan I shall speak respectfully. Against him, as a private citizen, I have no words of reproach to utter; but as a candidate for the highest office in the gift of the American people, his official acts are public property, and I have a right to review them. "That he commenced" his public career as a Federalist, his friends do not deny; that he opposed the war of 1812, and denounced Mr. Madison and the Democratic party, is equally certain. In his 4th of July oration at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in 1815, a copy of which I have before me, he speaks of the "diabolical passions" of the Democracy; he charges President Madison with "suffering his private interest to the public good"; and when speaking of his administration says: "Time will not allow me to enumerate all the other wild and wicked projects of the Democratic Administration."

But the great question the American people now desire to have answered is what is Mr. Buchanan's past record and present position upon the slavery question?

For fear I may be accused of misrepresenting his opinions, I will let his own friends answer the interrogatories. The *Richmond Enquirer*, the leading Democratic paper in the whole South and in the Union, in its issue of July 15, 1856, contains an article of three columns, giving the record of Mr. Buchanan's votes and acts, and winds up as follows:

"1. In 1826, Mr. Buchanan supported a bill to prohibit the circulation of Abolition papers through the mails.
"2. In the same year he proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas.
"3. In 1836-7 he denounced and voted to reject, petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.
"4. In 1837, he voted for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolutions, defining the rights of the States, and the limits of Federal authority, and affirming it to be the duty of the Government to protect and uphold the institutions of the South.
"5. In 1838-39 and 40 he invariably voted with southern Senators against the consideration of anti-slavery petitions.
"6. In 1841-45, he advocated and voted for the annexation of Texas.
"7. In 1847, he sustained the Clayton compromise.
"8. In 1850, he proposed and urged the extension of the Missouri compromise to the Pacific Ocean.
"9. But he promptly acquiesced in the compromise of 1850, and employed all his influence in favor of the faithful execution of the fugitive slave law.
"10. In 1851, he reconcoiled against an enactment of the Pennsylvania Legislature for obstructing the arrest and return of fugitive slaves.
"11. In 1855 he negotiated for the acquisition of Cuba.
"12. In 1856 he approves the repeal of the Missouri restriction, and supports the principles of the Kansas Nebraska act.
"13. He never gave a vote against the interests of slavery, and never uttered a word which could pain the most sensitive southern heart."

I have examined the records of Congress and find they correspond with the statements of the *Enquirer*. I have a large number of Democratic papers which I should like to put upon the stand to show Mr. Buchanan's position upon the slavery question, but have only time to read a single extract from the *Mobile Tribune*, the leading Democratic paper in Alabama.—That paper in a recent number, says:

"Mr. Buchanan now stands on the platform which guarantees to the South everything which she has ever demanded, and is himself the standard-bearer of a party warring to the death with Free-Soilism."

I call upon all northern men to look the record Mr. Buchanan's friends make up for him, square in the face, without dodging, and then, as honest, liberty-loving men, swallow the dose, if they can, by voting for him, as our forefathers some months ago published himself, it may be thought interesting to look a little after his "remains."

In a speech at Wheatland, to the Keystone Club, soon after his nomination, he said:

"Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made a longer speech; but now I have been placed upon a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it."

"I have examined the records of Congress and find they correspond with the statements of the *Enquirer*. I have a large number of Democratic papers which I should like to put upon the stand to show Mr. Buchanan's position upon the slavery question, but have only time to read a single extract from the *Mobile Tribune*, the leading Democratic paper in Alabama.—That paper in a recent number, says:

"Mr. Buchanan now stands on the platform which guarantees to the South everything which she has ever demanded, and is himself the standard-bearer of a party warring to the death with Free-Soilism."

I call upon all northern men to look the record Mr. Buchanan's friends make up for him, square in the face, without dodging, and then, as honest, liberty-loving men, swallow the dose, if they can, by voting for him, as our forefathers some months ago published himself, it may be thought interesting to look a little after his "remains."

In a speech at Wheatland, to the Keystone Club, soon after his nomination, he said:

"Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made a longer speech; but now I have been placed upon a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it."

"I have examined the records of Congress and find they correspond with the statements of the *Enquirer*. I have a large number of Democratic papers which I should like to put upon the stand to show Mr. Buchanan's position upon the slavery question, but have only time to read a single extract from the *Mobile Tribune*, the leading Democratic paper in Alabama.—That paper in a recent number, says:

"Mr. Buchanan now stands on the platform which guarantees to the South everything which she has ever demanded, and is himself the standard-bearer of a party warring to the death with Free-Soilism."

I call upon all northern men to look the record Mr. Buchanan's friends make up for him, square in the face, without dodging, and then, as honest, liberty-loving men, swallow the dose, if they can, by voting for him, as our forefathers some months ago published himself, it may be thought interesting to look a little after his "remains."

In a speech at Wheatland, to the Keystone Club, soon after his nomination, he said:

"Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made a longer speech; but now I have been placed upon a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it."

"I have examined the records of Congress and find they correspond with the statements of the *Enquirer*. I have a large number of Democratic papers which I should like to put upon the stand to show Mr. Buchanan's position upon the slavery question, but have only time to read a single extract from the *Mobile Tribune*, the leading Democratic paper in Alabama.—That paper in a recent number, says:

"Mr. Buchanan now stands on the platform which guarantees to the South everything which she has ever demanded, and is himself the standard-bearer of a party warring to the death with Free-Soilism."

I call upon all northern men to look the record Mr. Buchanan's friends make up for him, square in the face, without dodging, and then, as honest, liberty-loving men, swallow the dose, if they can, by voting for him, as our forefathers some months ago published himself, it may be thought interesting to look a little after his "remains."

In a speech at Wheatland, to the Keystone Club, soon after his nomination, he said:

"Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made a longer speech; but now I have been placed upon a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it."

"I have examined the records of Congress and find they correspond with the statements of the *Enquirer*. I have a large number of Democratic papers which I should like to put upon the stand to show Mr. Buchanan's position upon the slavery question, but have only time to read a single extract from the *Mobile Tribune*, the leading Democratic paper in Alabama.—That paper in a recent number, says: