

TERMS.
Per annum, in advance, \$2 00
Six months, " " " 1 25
Three copies, in advance, " " 3 00

TO CLUBS
Of 10 the Herald will be sent for \$1 50 per copy
Of 20 " " " " " 2 50
Of 30 " " " " " 3 50

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.
One square, ten lines or less, first insertion, \$0 25
Each subsequent insertion, " " " 0 15
One square three months, " " " 0 75
" " " six " " " 1 25
" " " twelve " " " 2 00
Half column, one insertion, " " " 0 50
Half " " " " " " " 0 30
One column, one insertion, " " " 0 75
One column, per annum, " " " 3 00

Transit Advertisers will be required to pay in advance. When an advertisement is inserted in the number of times it is to be inserted must be stated, if not stated it will remain in the paper until ordered out, and charged accordingly.

Those who advertise for six months or one year have the privilege of changing and renewing not exceeding once in three weeks.

We hope that the above will be plain enough to be understood by all who have a desire to advertise. Instead of trying for hours to lower our prices, the Editors of the Herald have no time to spend in bargaining. This is a business to be done, we have no disposition to do work cheaper for a close-fisted customer than for our liberal patrons, who are willing to let printers live.

The Herald has an extensive circulation, and a business man will find it advantageous to make use of its columns as a means of communicating with the public generally.

CASH.
Since we have enlarged the BARDSTOWN HERALD our expenses have been considerably increased; we are therefore compelled to adopt the CASH SYSTEM. Our object in doing this, is to enable us to meet promptly the demands on us for CASH for Paper, Ink, Labor, Office rent, &c. &c. Could we collect as we go, it would be better for us as well as for our customers. From those who advertise we will accept no payments quarterly.

For advertising Job Work and Advertising, the money must be paid when the work is done—this rule is without exception.

WONDERFUL PROOF!
Dr. Blackwell's Compound Syrup of Sarsaparilla and Iris Verzeola.

IN this age of humbuggery, it behoves every one to guard with a suspicious eye in the interests of individuals and classes. And even then the cunning schemes of ostentatious impostors are too many to be able to guard against. They are too many to be able to guard against. They are too many to be able to guard against.

Dr. Blackwell's Compound Syrup of Sarsaparilla and Iris Verzeola, and request the same investigation, by way of trial, that has been extended to other objects of less importance. He asserts its superiority to any similar compound ever yet introduced, and defies the patient to produce its equal for the cure of the following Diseases: Scrofula, or Kings Evil, Dyspepsia, Jaundice, Female Diseases, Eruptions of the Skin, Scalded Heads, and all diseases arising from an impure state of the blood.

In testimony of the eminent virtue of this Compound we submit a certificate from a reliable citizen with the opinion of an excellent physician.

Dr. Blackwell—Dear Sir: I wish through this medium to inform you of the success of your Sarsaparilla upon my little daughter. She is now eight years of age. From her infancy she has been troubled with a swelling out over her body, resembling Scrofula. At times her arms and legs were covered with large running sores. Towards the close of last winter she grew so much weaker than the last, and before that I sent her to a physician, and was making application to a Physician when I accidentally heard of your Sarsaparilla as being a GREAT PURIFIER OF THE BLOOD. I immediately procured a bottle and commenced its use. Before the first week had passed she had marked change for the BETTER. Continued its use until the third bottle was taken, when an eruption of sores was effected. I am now happy to say she has been freed from all her troubles. In justice to you and my little daughter your Sarsaparilla one of the best medicines now in use for purifying the blood, and curing all diseases arising from its impurity. With this, please accept my most sincere thanks and well wishes.
J. A. DOUGHERTY.

Dr. I. P. Blackwell—Sir: In reply to your letter I will state that I have examined your receipt for your Compound Syrup of Sarsaparilla and Iris Verzeola, and consider it an excellent and meritorious Compound.

W. W. RILEY, F. B. MUIR, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, Louisville, Ky.

WILL practice Law in the various Courts held in Louisville—the Court of Appeals and in the Circuit Court of the State of Kentucky, in the City and in the several Counties.

Office on Jefferson, between 5th and 6th. Where our names may always be found to give our professional services to our clients on terms as liberal as possible.

SAMUEL CARPENTER & SON, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, Bardonia, Ky.

SAMUEL CARPENTER has resumed the practice of Law, and will, in partnership with SA. CARPENTER, Jr., practice in the several Courts and the surrounding counties and the Court of Appeals. All business entrusted to their care promptly attended to.

T. W. RILEY, F. B. MUIR, J. C. BAILEY, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, BARD-TOWN, KY.

WILL practice Law in the several Courts and County Courts, Office, the same formerly occupied by Riley & Muir. They will give prompt and diligent attention to all business confided to them.

BALM LICK WATER for sale by WILSON & NOURSE.
PRIME OLD JAVA COFFEE for sale by COLLINGS & SUTHERLAND.
FOUR—Continued on hand and for sale by COLLINGS & SUTHERLAND.

THE BARDSTOWN HERALD.

Devoted to Politics, Literature, Science, Commerce and News.

VOL. 2. BARDSTOWN, KY., THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1852. NO. 27.

JOB PRINTING.
We have, since the expiration of the first volume of the Herald, made several very necessary and handsome additions to our JOB OFFICE, which will enable us to get up our work in a style that cannot be surpassed.
BOOKS, FARMERETS, CARDS, BLANKS, BALL TICKETS, BILLS, POSTERS, BILL-HEADS, &c., &c., will be printed on fine white or fancy paper, with Black, Blue, or Red Ink, on short notice. We are determined to use all means within our power to please those who favor us with their patronage.
GIVE US A CALL.

THURSDAY, - - JULY 13, 1852.
All Communications addressed to the Editor must be pre-paid.
Single copies of the Herald for sale at the Office. Price, 5 cents.

SPEECH Of Mr. Stanly, of North Carolina. (CONTINUED.)

We had platforms shortly after I came first to Congress. We had Congressional platforms. We had the Democratic party dodging upon the subject of slavery since the first hour I took a seat upon this floor. The Abolition resolutions were a part of the platform; resolutions concocted by Nullifiers, Disunionists, and Abolitionists. Who sustained them? You will find that Martin Van Buren was the godfather, if not the father of them. What has become of him and his platform, and where has he gone? He and his followers in New York, (Preston King and others,) now supporting Pierce and King. We had Tappan, of Ohio, here, who said that he would subscribe money to furnish powder and shot to kill Virginia men, women, and children, in case of an insurrection and war. When it was charged on this floor that he had made some such declaration, Mr. Weller—then from Ohio, now Senator from California—tried to deny it, and said that Tappan was as much opposed to "modern abolition" as anybody in Congress. "Modern abolition!" And then Tappan, to keep up the game, made a speech, on presenting an abolition petition, and was forthwith regarded as a friend of the South, and a supporter of platforms.

These are the men—Tappan, Van Buren, Hallett, and others—who stand upon your platforms. They stood on the platform of 1815. B. F. Hallett was the chairman of the committee who reported the resolutions of '45—the same man who had the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Rantoul) kicked out of the Democratic Convention, because he would not disgrace himself by promising in advance to support any platform that might be made, and because he had brought to light the fact of Hallett's reporting abolition resolutions at an anti-slavery meeting in Massachusetts. Hallett—the "soldier of fortune," he is called in Massachusetts—has written one of the funniest pamphlets I have seen—I wish I had an hour to devote to it—especially where he is so affecting in his appeals to his Democratic brethren to sustain "good fellowship, unquestioned faith and fidelity, and firm brotherhood," among each other! Among letters, indeed, are the "Three letters of B. F. Hallett to Colonel C. G. Green, editor of the Boston Post." Brotherhood with Hallett! [Laughter.] "Angels and ministers of grace defend us!" from that brotherhood! God forbid that we should get into it! Give me Johnson, of Pennsylvania, instead of Johnson, of Virginia—the Kellogg instead of the Rantouls and Floyds. As far as I can help it, I will have no "brotherhood or good fellowship" with any of them. If I must choose, I would rather endure those who will aid us in giving protection to American industry, and improving our rivers and harbors, and to the old States some share of the public lands. I will vote for the bill advocated by my friend from Michigan, (Mr. Stuart), because I like these improvements in the first place, and because he afforded me the opportunity to make this short personal explanation. [Laughter.]

Here is Mr. Hallett's pamphlet—the "Three letters to Colonel Green." In this pamphlet he charges that General Harrison was elected in 1840 "by a successful fraud, in making him pass as an Abolitionist in the North, and a firm supporter of slavery at the South." He also says there is a movement at the South, headed by Senator Mangum, of North Carolina, to run General Scott as a non-committal candidate. Then he alleges that the "whole Democracy at the North mean to abide by the compromises, and stand where they have stood—upon the Baltimore platform." We shall see presently how they stand on that platform—if they stand as he does.

These letters, be it remembered, are written in answer to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Rantoul), made in this House on March 9th, 1852. He was defending the coalition in Massachusetts between the Democrats and Abolitionists. He says the coalition was formed in 1849. In 1850 and in 1851 they succeeded; "the first time a failure, the last two times successful." The gentleman from Massachusetts says in that speech what I have before me, which I will print, and cannot, for want of time, read. It is as follows:

"Now, before the coalition was made, of course those Democrats who came the nearest to the peculiar opinions of the Freesoilers had no difficulty, and felt no repugnance. The repugnance must have been on the part of those who were furthest from the Freesoilers, and I propose to show where they stood. I hold in my hand the resolutions reported by the honorable Benjamin F. Hallett, September 19th, 1846, the week the coalition was formed, and gentle men will see how far Mr. Hallett and those who thought with him had to go before they could act without repugnance with the Freesoil party. The following is one of the resolutions reported by Mr. Hallett:

"Resolved, That we are opposed to 'slavery in any form and color, and in favor of freedom and free soil, wherever man lives throughout God's heritage.' That is one of the resolutions; here is another:

"Resolved, That we are opposed to 'the extension of slavery to free Territories, and in favor of the exercise of all constitutional and necessary means to restrict it to the limits within which it does or may exist by the local laws of the States.' 'Now, gentlemen will ask me, what is the vote upon these resolutions of Mr. Hallett? It was a very full Democratic Convention, and the vote in favor of these resolutions was a unanimous one, on the 19th of September, 1849. Gentlemen who write one kind of resolutions for the newspapers, unannouncedly adopted circulating them 'trotted' out the State of Massachusetts, in a printed form, for effect, and who will write another kind of doctrine in private letters to members upon this floor, must submit to have their two systems compared.

When this information startled some of the members of this House, the gentleman from Florida asked if the Mr. Hallett was the chairman of the Democratic National Committee? To which the gentleman (Mr. Rantoul) answered: "It is the same man. What is called at the North a Hunker Democrat."

Now let us see what the "chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the man of 'two systems,' the builder of platforms for Secessionists and Abolitionists to stand upon—what does he say in answer to this? He alleges that the sole evidence upon which the allegations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Rantoul), and others are made "rests upon the quotation on the floor of Congress of one resolution and half of another, disjointed from the whole series of resolutions, passed by the Massachusetts Democratic State Convention at Springfield, September 19th, 1849." "One resolution and half of another!" Why did not the three letters give us all the resolutions? Now, mark how a plain tale shall put this down. I have before me a paper, published at Lynn, Massachusetts, April 29th, 1852. It is a Democratic paper. Its motto is: "We go where Democratic principles lead." The editor of this paper applies to Mr. Hallett a harsh expression I shall not use to ears polite. He says the resolutions were "written by Mr. Hallett, as 'chairman of the committee on resolutions,' and reported by him to a Democratic State Convention held in Springfield, September 19th, 1849!" "He brought them in his pocket, all cut and dried," says the editor of the Bay State. The editor is replying to a letter addressed by Mr. Hallett to a gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Thompson), and published in the Union. The gentleman from Virginia was probably selected as the medium of communication on account of his well-known opinions in former times on the subject of slavery. The same gentleman is also the biographer of our Speaker. But in my printed remarks I will allow the editor to speak for himself. Extract from the Bay State, a Democratic paper published at Lynn:

"There are in the above quotations several direct falsehoods. We can call them by no milder name. 'First, in relation to the resolutions referred to: Mr. Hallett wrote them unsolicited, uninstigated, and was directed to report them just as he had prepared them. He brought them in his pocket, all cut and dried. The charge against Mr. Rantoul, that he is quoted as 'isolated part of a resolution,' Mr. Hallett knew to be false when he made it. Mr. Rantoul quoted two resolutions, and would, undoubtedly have quoted the remainder if he had had them; and Mr. Hallett's glaring inconsistency would have appeared the stronger.

"The following are the resolutions touching slavery, written by Mr. Hallett, and adopted by the convention: '1. Resolved, That we are opposed to slavery in every form and color; and in favor of freedom and free soil, wherever man lives throughout God's heritage.' '2. Resolved, That by common law and common sense, as well as by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, (in Prigg vs. Pennsylvania, 16th Peters,) the sale of slavery is a mere municipal regulation, founded upon and limited to the verge of the territorial law; that is, the limits of the State creating it.

"3. Resolved, therefore, That as slavery does not exist by any municipal law in the new Territories, and Congress has no power to institute it, the local laws of any State authorizing slavery can never be transported there, nor can slavery exist there but by a local law of the Territories sanctioned by Congress, or the legislative act of a State in its sovereign capacity.

"4. Resolved, That we are opposed to the extension of slavery to free Territories, and in favor of the exercise of all constitutional and necessary means to restrict it to the limits within which it does or may exist by the local laws of the States; but

"5. Resolved, That these sentiments are so universal at the North as to be on no party, being held in common by all men north of a sectional line, while they are repudiated by most men south of that line, and therefore they cannot be made a national party test.

"Mr. Rantoul quoted the first and fourth resolutions. Now, what is the purport of each and all of them? Did Mr. Rantoul quote an 'isolated part of a resolution?' No. Nor did he misrepresent Mr. Hallett."

To inform the Southern people, who do not know what is the character of the builders of Democratic platforms, I will only ask them to read these resolutions, with the three letters asking their "good fellowship and brotherhood!" Hear how colly Mr. Hallett, in his three letters, speaks of the convention at Springfield, in 1849:

"Certain it is that neither Mr. Hallett, nor those who thought with him, or anybody besides, had the least conception that the State Convention of 1849 had, in any form, endorsed Freesoilism; and if any such construction can be put upon the doings of that convention, the discovery has been reserved until the present time, for all contemporaneous exposition set down that convention as having utterly repudiated 'political Freesoilism, and taken the platform of the Baltimore Convention!'"

Can any man read this, and not be suspicious of platforms? Will not the New York Evening Post furnish "a contemporaneous exposition" of the last Baltimore platform, when it says the resolutions were "not even heard, a considerable number of members present voting against them, and those who said they did not know to what they were giving their applause?"

Mr. Hallett, in these three letters, gives an extract from the "series of two columns" of the resolutions of the convention of 1849, but omits all those quoted by the Lynn paper. He charges that General Taylor was elected by the "bad faith" of the South; and he adds that, although the Northern Democrats keenly felt, as they were bound to, the defeat of the great American statesman, General Cass, and the election, by aid of "Southern Democratic votes," of the "abolition slaveholding chief, General Taylor, they did not forget to weaken the bonds of brotherhood between the North and South, nor deny to the latter the full measure and security of their 'constitutional rights.'"

General Taylor "an abolition chief," says the master-workman of the Baltimore platform of 1849 and 1852—the man who drafted the resolutions of the Springfield Convention? And in his three letters he answers the charge of his being an Abolitionist in 1849, by giving copies of various resolutions, in other years, in which he was opposed to "cratic State Conventions" held in Springfield, September 19th, 1849!" "He brought them in his pocket, all cut and dried," says the editor of the Bay State. The editor is replying to a letter addressed by Mr. Hallett to a gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Thompson), and published in the Union. The gentleman from Virginia was probably selected as the medium of communication on account of his well-known opinions in former times on the subject of slavery. The same gentleman is also the biographer of our Speaker. But in my printed remarks I will allow the editor to speak for himself. Extract from the Bay State, a Democratic paper published at Lynn:

"There are in the above quotations several direct falsehoods. We can call them by no milder name. 'First, in relation to the resolutions referred to: Mr. Hallett wrote them unsolicited, uninstigated, and was directed to report them just as he had prepared them. He brought them in his pocket, all cut and dried. The charge against Mr. Rantoul, that he is quoted as 'isolated part of a resolution,' Mr. Hallett knew to be false when he made it. Mr. Rantoul quoted two resolutions, and would, undoubtedly have quoted the remainder if he had had them; and Mr. Hallett's glaring inconsistency would have appeared the stronger.

"The following are the resolutions touching slavery, written by Mr. Hallett, and adopted by the convention: '1. Resolved, That we are opposed to slavery in every form and color; and in favor of freedom and free soil, wherever man lives throughout God's heritage.' '2. Resolved, That by common law and common sense, as well as by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, (in Prigg vs. Pennsylvania, 16th Peters,) the sale of slavery is a mere municipal regulation, founded upon and limited to the verge of the territorial law; that is, the limits of the State creating it.

"3. Resolved, therefore, That as slavery does not exist by any municipal law in the new Territories, and Congress has no power to institute it, the local laws of any State authorizing slavery can never be transported there, nor can slavery exist there but by a local law of the Territories sanctioned by Congress, or the legislative act of a State in its sovereign capacity.

"4. Resolved, That we are opposed to the extension of slavery to free Territories, and in favor of the exercise of all constitutional and necessary means to restrict it to the limits within which it does or may exist by the local laws of the States; but

"5. Resolved, That these sentiments are so universal at the North as to be on no party, being held in common by all men north of a sectional line, while they are repudiated by most men south of that line, and therefore they cannot be made a national party test.

"Mr. Rantoul quoted the first and fourth resolutions. Now, what is the purport of each and all of them? Did Mr. Rantoul quote an 'isolated part of a resolution?' No. Nor did he misrepresent Mr. Hallett."

To inform the Southern people, who do not know what is the character of the builders of Democratic platforms, I will only ask them to read these resolutions, with the three letters asking their "good fellowship and brotherhood!" Hear how colly Mr. Hallett, in his three letters, speaks of the convention at Springfield, in 1849:

"Certain it is that neither Mr. Hallett, nor those who thought with him, or anybody besides, had the least conception that the State Convention of 1849 had, in any form, endorsed Freesoilism; and if any such construction can be put upon the doings of that convention, the discovery has been reserved until the present time, for all contemporaneous exposition set down that convention as having utterly repudiated 'political Freesoilism, and taken the platform of the Baltimore Convention!'"

Can any man read this, and not be suspicious of platforms? Will not the New York Evening Post furnish "a contemporaneous exposition" of the last Baltimore platform, when it says the resolutions were "not even heard, a considerable number of members present voting against them, and those who said they did not know to what they were giving their applause?"

Mr. Hallett, in these three letters, gives an extract from the "series of two columns" of the resolutions of the convention of 1849, but omits all those quoted by the Lynn paper. He charges that General Taylor was elected by the "bad faith" of the South; and he adds that, although the Northern Democrats keenly felt, as they were bound to, the defeat of the great American statesman, General Cass, and the election, by aid of "Southern Democratic votes," of the "abolition slaveholding chief, General Taylor, they did not forget to weaken the bonds of brotherhood between the North and South, nor deny to the latter the full measure and security of their 'constitutional rights.'"

the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, (Mr. Brown), the former Governor of the State, does not pursue the course of our friend from Florida. He will not rule every man out of the party who wishes to act with him. When another gentleman wanted to "kick" the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Rantoul) out of the party, he said he would take his support, and co-operate with him. He is more sensible than some others. I beg pardon for drawing comparisons, I know they are "odorous." The gentleman from Mississippi, in his speech of April 13 and 14, 1852, said, in reference to the bank, tariff, and distribution—the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Rantoul) was appointed by President Polk district attorney for Massachusetts, being accepted as a sound Democrat: "I will not reject the aid of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Freesoiler though he be, in upholding the 'Democratic side of these questions.'"

"When a good work has to be done, I will accept aid from any quarter." "If so staunch a Southern Rights Democrat as the gentleman from Mississippi can accept such aid, cannot my friend from Florida take some such aid in getting river and harbor improvements, and tariff, or his Florida railroad? I warn the gentleman, with his sublimated opinions, to keep out of the Democratic party; they will have the whole or none, and unless he yields he cannot stay with them two months.

I heard it said when I was a child, in homely phrase, that it was allowable to "make the devil take the bribe to build a church." Who is there that would not worship there because the devil did "take" some of the bricks to build it?—Who so overrighteous as to refuse to worship in a church because some had made elders and deacons of them, but let them sit near the door. Hallett was a high priest in the Democratic Conventions. If any Kelloggs come among us, we will try and place them on the stool of repentance. My friend from Mississippi, who is a strong Southern Rights man, if I am not mistaken, and is quite ultra upon the ground of secession, ran fold his arms, and stand upon the platform of the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Rantoul), who must stand there, although he was kicked out of the convention, in accordance to the dictates of party, and dare not refuse. He is like many other men I have seen in this country, who would seek "the bubble reputation at the cannon's mouth," and vindicate their honor in a

personal contest at the certain risk of their life. I have seen such, when King Caucus stamps his foot, tremble like an Eastern slave.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. RANTOUL) may talk about revolutionary heroes. I listened to him with pleasure, and felt kindly towards him when he referred to those old times, and told us that he was a descendant of revolutionary sires, and that his blood flowed through his veins, and the veins of his constituents, as I understood him. I hope it does; but he must stand on this Baltimore platform. You must come down to "Captain Scott," of Richmond, and go the platform. There is nothing that will save you. [Laughter.] My friend from Florida (Mr. Cabell) will have to go there, if he quits us. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who defends the coalition, can have no scruples in submitting to any platform. Since the days of Judas Iscariot, there has not been so abominable a coalition as this in Massachusetts between the Democrats and Abolitionists. Gentlemen who can defend that, can submit to any thing else in the way of platforms. The gentleman from New York, (Mr. King) over the way, made a speech giving us a denunciation of the Fugitive Slave bill, has endorsed it, and matches right into line; and afterwards the gentleman from South Carolina, a Secessionist, (Mr. Orr), comes in and give it support, though he does not approve all of it. Of what use is a platform, if Abolitionists and Secessionists without surrendering their opinions, can unite in supporting it, or supporting the nominee who stands upon it? The New York Evening Post, a Democratic Abolition paper, disseminates from the platform, denounces it, approves Pierce's nomination, and says that Scott "claims publicly to be one of the authors of the compromise, Fugitive Slave law and all so far as to have earnestly and successfully used all his influence with Congress to procure its passage." I quote the very words. I have the paper before me. I give another extract for the benefit of my friend from Florida, and those who read the Tribune to frighten southern gentlemen.

The editor of the New York Evening Post, June 5, 1852, speaking of General Scott's declaration, that he procured the passage of the Fugitive Slave law, says: "His declaration to this effect, as taken down from his own mouth, has been published in the Tribune itself, and nobody has denied the authenticity of the statement. There is not a colored man carried off from his family under this infamous law, not a free man or woman enslaved by what are denominated its summary processes, who may not, if we take General Scott's own word, thank him for all that they are made to endure. There is not a marshal or his deputy employed to seize the pretended fugitive, or a commissioner who sits to administer the law, who is not indebted to General Scott for the odious and ungrateful duty imposed upon him. Yet this is the man whom those zealous advocates of liberty select as their favorite candidate for the Presidency, at the very moment he is making his boasts that, but for his personal influence, the detestable bill of which we are speaking might never have become a law."

The New York Evening Post, noticing the recent nomination, says: "The nomination of Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, appears to diffuse general satisfaction among the Democratic party."

Why? Because of the platform?—Far from it. Hear farther from the Post in the same article. The Post rejoices in the nomination of one "who did not think it worth his while to answer Robert G. Scott's letter." It says, also: "Mr. Pierce did not, like General Scott, if we may believe the boasts which Scott is so fond of publicly making, procure the passage of the Compromise of 1850. He has none of the partialities of nationality to induce him to employ the influence of his office to put down freedom of speech on this topic."

The resolutions were adopted by those who nominated the candidate. They were not put till a large number of the members had withdrawn; they were not debated, not considered, not even heard; a considerable number of members present voted against them, and those who said they did not know to what they were giving their applause. The presence of passing resolutions, of adopting a platform of political belief, under such circumstances, is the merest farce in the world—a proceeding as destitute of moral force as if the resolutions had been adopted by a dozen chance travelers on board a steamboat."

And yet we are told we nationalize parties by making them stand on platforms. Hear the Post further: "With regard to what is called the platform adopted by the convention, we have but a few words to say. Some part of it is excellent—that which refers to the resolutions of 1798 is worthy of all commendation, inasmuch as it re-adopts those principles of construction which the legislative authority is beginning to disregard. That portion which relates to the Fugitive Slave law, founded on a doubtful construction of the Constitution, would appear to many to be in direct contradiction with this, to say nothing of the inhuman provisions of the law itself, on which, how-

ever, the resolution expresses no opinion. But whether the resolutions are good or bad we regard as a matter of very little moment. They undoubtedly speak the sense of the committee who framed them, but in no respect can they be considered as speaking the sense of the convention.

In the article referred to before me, the Post says: "Mr. Pierce voted, when in Congress, to respect the right of petition, as exercised by the abolitionists."

It adds: "The right to ask for the extinction of slavery in the District of Columbia is now admitted; but Franklin Pierce, whatever be his opinions respecting the compromise, was one of the earliest to insert it."

The paper of the 5th of June says: "With regard to the resolutions said to have been adopted by the convention just before its close, called in some quarters 'the platform,' we consent in stronger terms what we said yesterday. Further inquiries into the circumstances satisfy us that in saying that they did not express the sense of the convention, we used the least expressive phrase the case would justify. They were not adopted by the convention. Three-fourths of the members—more than three-fourths it is said by some—had left the room; not more than a dozen of the rest knew what was doing."

Now, sir, is the Democratic party "nationalized?" Is agitation stopped by their platform? Hear the Post further: "From one of the members, then in convention, who was decidedly opposed to a part of the resolutions, and who would have voted against them if he had been given an opportunity, we have it that he did not even hear the resolutions put to vote, and was not aware of this pretence that they had been adopted till he heard of it afterwards. A platform made in this manner does not even deserve the name of a farce, which we yesterday gave it. A farce is played before an audience which is aware of what is going on."

Here we have the proof that the platform is not binding on Abolitionists; and the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Orr) has shown us it is not binding on Secessionists. It only influences those who are sound without it.

The platform denounces a National Bank; yet Mr. King, the nominee for Vice President, was a republican member of Congress in 1816, from North Carolina, and voted for the very monster bank that the platform says is unconstitutional. Mr. King is a gentleman of irreproachable character, whom I highly respect. I have defended him when attacked by Democrats at home. I think he voted for the Force bill, which Nullifiers say was intended to enable General Jackson to destroy the State of South Carolina.

Mr. Dezz, The Journal will show that Mr. King, of Alabama, voted against the celebrated Force bill of Messrs. Brown and Mangum, Senators from North Carolina.

Mr. Stanly, I would be the last man to do injustice to Mr. King, but I understand that he voted for the Force bill. I stand corrected.

We used to hear the cry of bargain, intrigue, and corruption raised against Mr. Clay because he voted for Mr. Adams. The country was prejudiced for years against Mr. Clay on this account. The vile slander is not believed now by any intelligent Democrat. We have recent evidence from Benton and Cass that they never believed it. Coalitions like that lately charged on Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams, have always been admitted to be disgraceful, amply defeated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Rantoul.)

The Speaker of this House published a speech some years ago, in which he charged bargain, intrigue, and corruption upon Mr. Clay. He is occupying the speaker's chair, and we are in the Committee of the whole, he can have a chance to reply, and defend himself, if I do him injustice. There is a great deal more truth in the charge of a coalition of the Democrats with the freesoilers in this House than there ever was between Clay and Adams. Look at the Anti Slavery Annual Report in Massachusetts, which I quote in a letter published on the 7th April last. That report, referring to the attempt to endorse the compromise in the Democratic caucus, at the early close of the present session, says: "The motion was laid on the table; and Mr. Linn Boyd, of Kentucky, obtained the Speaker's chair solely on this occasion."

Here is the gentleman from Connecticut now in his seat. [Mr. Cleveland,] however much we may condemn his opinions, he always has the mainlines to avow them. To play dough-face does suit his nature. He was in that caucus; he voted for our speaker, [Mr. Boyd.] I ask him if the Speaker of this House was not elected "solely on the condition" that the compromise measures were laid on the table in the caucus? He is too prudent to answer now. I dare him to deny it. It would not have voted for him if that platform had been adopted. Here is a great deal more proof of a coalition between our speaker and the Abolitionists than of any ever brought against Clay or Adams.

Sir, I abhor these coalitions—the country abhors them. If I had never abhorred them before, they would now be odious, when I see the result of the Massachusetts coalition. The good old Bay State, so full of glorious revolutionary associations, by means of this coalition sacrificed Winthrop—and what have they sent in his place? However