The Daily Bee.

S. P. WEISSE, Proprietor.

DAILY PAPER, one year in advance, $10 00
COUNTRY PAPER, one year in advance, $6 00

OFFICIAL PAPER OF THE STATE. — NEW ORLEANS, TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 24, 1852.

No. 4846, Vol. 10.—NEW SERIES.
Vol. XXI.—Whole No. 6003.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

☞ Advertisements inserted at the rate of $1 per square for the first insertion and 75 cents for each subsequent insertion. No Advertisement inserted for less than one dollar for each insertion.

☞ Advertisements inserted at intervals will be charged as new ones every TEN times for each insertion.

☞ The privilege of Annual Advertisers is limited to parties who confine strictly within the lines of their business, and in extent to one square every other day.

THE DAILY BEE

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE STATE.

Tuesday Morning, August 24, 1852.

FOR PRESIDENT
WINFIELD SCOTT,
of Virginia.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT
WM. A. GRAHAM,
of North Carolina.

Electors for President and Vice President.

First District.—JACQUES TOUTANT, of St. Bernard; (substitute, J. W. BUELING, of Plaquemines.)

Second District.—CHRISTIAN ROSELIUS, of Orleans; (substitute, CYPRIEN DUFOUR, of Orleans.)

Third District.—DUNCAN F. KENNER, of Ascension; (substitute, FERDIS GARDERE, of Jefferson.)

Fourth District.—GEO. W. WATTERSTON, of Livingston; (substitute, R. J. BARROW, of West Feliciana.)

Fifth District.—ALEXANDER DE CLOUET, of St Martin; (substitute, J. K. ELOEE, of Rapides.)

Sixth District.—JOHN RAY, of Ouachita; (substitute, D. F. REYNDER, of Caddo.)

THE COMPROMISE.
WHIG PLATFORM.

8 The series of acts of the 31st Congress, commonly known as the COMPROMISE or adjustment, the act for the recovery of fugitives from labor included, are received and acquiesced in by the Whigs of the United States, as a final settlement in principle and substance, of the subjects to which they relate, and so far as these acts are concerned, we will maintain them, and resist to their strict enforcement, until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation to guard against the evasion of the laws on the one hand, and the abuse of their powers on the other—not impairing their present efficiency to carry out the requirements of the constitution, and we deprecate all further agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts in Congress or out of Congress, on whomever, wherever, or however made—and we will maintain this settlement as essential to the nationality of the Whig party, and the integrity of the Union.

THE CONTRAST.

Gen. Scott.	Gen. Pierce.
Sir, I was asked if I liked the Fugitive Slave Law. I answered that it was a most revolting feature in the Constitution, and I detested it. I have never—and I shall never—hesitate to say, I am opposed to them, or either of them!	*I have been asked if I liked the Fugitive Slave Law. I answered that it was a most revolting feature in the Constitution, and I detested it. I have never—and I shall never—hesitate to say, I am opposed to them, or either of them!*

(Speech of General Scott before the Mississippi Delegation.

Speech of General Pierce at Manchester (N. H.) on the 3d January, 1850.

THE NORTHERN MAIL came through yesterday with the latest dates.

A WARNING TO THE SOUTH.

The Free Soil Democracy recommending Pierce.

☞ **STARTLING PROOF—Read! Read!** ☜ At the Free Soil Democratic National Convention held at Pittsburg, on the evening of the 11th inst., Col. WATSON G. HATHES, a leading democrat and Democratic Presidential Elector, N. Y., delivered a speech, which we copy in full from the proceedings published in the Pittsburg *Journal*. We have all along contended and labored to convince the South, that the Free Soil party were disposed to sustain FRANKLIN PIERCE, because they were satisfied that *he agreed with them substantially in their views*. The speech of Col. HATHES is FAVOR of PIERCE, at the Free Soil National Convention, places the fact beyond dispute. It will be seen that Col. HATHES claims that the VAN BURENS, BUTLER, DIX, BRYANT, GROVET, FLOYD, HALLETT, ATWOOD and a host of other Free-Soilers and Abolitionists whom he names, will vote for PIERCE because "THEY KNOW THEIR MAN," and will use their influence on his mind, after his election, to bring about a *repeal* of the Fugitive Slave Law. And again, Col. HATHES directly asserts, as a recommendation of PIERCE to the Free Soilers, that all the Abolitionists who support him "WILL NOT ASK FOR THEIR FULL SHARE OF THE OFFICES OF THE GOVERNMENT, AND SET THEIR INFLUENCE AGAINST SLAVERY AND MAKE IT EFFECTUAL!!"

This, however, is but a part of the strong array of reasons in behalf of PIERCE, which this Free Soiler presents. While the Locofocos here about are trying hard to persuade the South never was opposed to the Catholics, Col. HATHES, *who knows his man*, lands PIERCE as being anti-Papist in his sentiments, and praises the Democracy of New Hampshire for having, under the leadership of PIERCE, so managed matters, that "*Catholics can now no more hold a place there than slaves do in the South*, etc." But we will not occupy more space with comments to-day. We submit to honest and intelligent Southrons of all parties, this bold avowal of PIERCE by a member of the Free Soil Democratic Convention, and a friend of the Democratic candidate if they can consist, after perusing it, to act in concert with the fanatics and Abolitionists who are aiding his election, in order that they may hold offices, and employ their influence against slavery, the responsibility of the act will rest upon themselves!

REMARKS OF COLONEL WATSON G. HAYNES,

OF PUTNAM COUNTY, N. Y.

At the Free Democratic National Convention, at Masonic Hall, on the evening of Thursday, August 12, 1852.

SIR: I question no mans motives, and trust none will question mine. If I understand the call for this Convention, it was for the Free Democracy, where an interchange of opinions might be fully permitted.

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

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

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not most of them stated that they are, even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can, to bear on the Administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected, (as he is pretty sure to be), by the great Protestant Democratic party of this Union) for a REPEAL OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW, and the ABOLITION *of slavery wherever the Federal Government can reach it*, and the great further object of our cause. Do we find the strongest anti-slavery Presidential candidate of that election, amongst them—ranged under the banner of Franklin Pierce, the favorite son of a free State—a Presidential candidate, in a Slave State—in which Popery has no power, and a Roman Catholic cannot hold office. Our old friends, I ask you, have they—men, and I have no kind of doubts on my mind, but these men will exert an influence on his mind after his election, if any such influence be needed, as to bring about a repeal of the Fugitive Slave law. It is certain, Mr. Pierce cannot be elected any more than Gen. Cass, in 1848, if all the Free-soilers are to forsake the good old Democratic Platform of Equal Rights—I don't mean the late platform adopted at Baltimore; I don't respect that platform, nor is it possible that such men as the following can respect it:

Ex President Martin Van Buren, John Van Buren, Hon Benj F Butler, Hon J A Dix, Wm C Bryant of the Evening Post, Editors of the Buffalo Republic, Rochester Advertiser, Albany Atlas, Hon Preston King, Hon Martin Grover, Hon G Dexter Sherrill, Hon Gerrit Smith, Hon Jas S Chatfield, Hon H H Van Dyke, Hon Horace Winston, Hon Timothy Jenkins, and Hon T Y Howe, Jr., all of New York.

In Ohio I will merely point to J W Gray, of the Cleveland Plaindealer, Hon B K Carter, Hon J Cable, Judge Bobbins, Hon Brinkerhoff, Judge Pitzer, — Walker of the editorial corps, Judge Kennon, and Gen W M Blake, among others.

In Indiana—

B F Hallett of Mass
Hon John Wentworth and Dr. Mahoney of Illinois
Hon T H Benton of Missouri.
John Atwood of N H.
Hon Chauncey F Cleveland of Ct.
Hon B H Thompson of R I.
Hon Hannibal Hamlin of Me.
Hon A H Bond of Mich.
H Dodge, J P Walker, and Ex-Gov J D Doty of Wis.

With Hons D Wilmot and G A Grow—G Sanderson and F W Guernsey of Penn.

And Dr E D Gaveson and Hon Judge D Lynch of this very city.

The list of the friends of freedom zealously supporting Mr. Hunter, Mr. Dix, or, rather, those men can be induced to prefer to any one? Never! They are Democrats, the core of Democracy, where an interchange of opinions might be fully permitted.

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

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

I cannot believe that so many men are now recreant to the principles they strongly advocated in 1848. Have not most of them stated that they are, even now, as strongly attached to the principles of freedom as in 1848, and that they intend to bring all the influence they can, to bear on the Administration of Gen. Pierce, if he is elected, (as he is pretty sure to be,